

Mother Knows Best: The Dowager Duchess of Guise, a Son's Ambitions, and the Regencies of Marie de Medici and Anne of Austria

Jonathan Spangler

In 1661, Louis XIV firmly grasped the reins of power from his mother, Anne of Austria, and thanked her for her wise guidance of the state during his minority. Around the same time, Henri II, fifth duke of Guise, was awaiting the outcome of a lawsuit he had launched against the actions of his own mother, Henriette-Catherine de Joyeuse, claiming that she had taken actions during Queen Anne's regency that were prejudiceable to his estate, in secret, without his knowledge or consent.¹ Louis XIV was grateful to his mother for the calm state in which he received his kingdom, especially in terms of crown-grandee relations. Guise had only abusive words for his mother, claiming restitution of properties or annuities worth millions. But in fact, Guise's accusations were unjust, as inspection of the facts reveals that there might have been no Guise patrimony at all in 1661 were it not for the actions of his mother and her prominent place in the circles of power of Anne's regency government. This prominence was derived from the twin factors of princely rank and princely trans-regionalism which allowed Guise's mother, and other women of his clan, to perform actions of great use to their families that were denied to most other courtiers. In particular, Guise women relied on an inter-dynastic network of sovereign families, the 'society of princes', which played a prominent part in the regencies of both Anne of Austria and her predecessor, Marie de Medici. Marie was herself a product of this society, at the intersection of a tri-family 'super-clan', the houses of Lorraine, Medici

¹ Bibliothèque Nationale de France [henceforth BNF], Thoisy 131, fol. 19.

and Gonzaga, referred to in a recent study by Jean-François Dubost as ‘une dorsale catholique européenne’.²

Within this dynastic superstructure, the role of Guise matriarchs lies at the intersection of two important historical themes: the myth of crown-noble relations, notably that of the ‘Gilded Cage’; and the nature of ‘trans-regional’ princely dynasties, and their relationships with early modern monarchy.³ The Guise serve as a good case study for these two themes, both as representatives of the French high nobility, but at the same time as ‘foreign princes’ (*princes étrangers*) rather than French subjects, each with the potential, however remote, to succeed to a sovereign throne.⁴ This potentiality exempted them from the severest manifestations of a king’s

² Jean-François Dubost, *Marie de Médicis: la reine dévoilée* (Paris: Payot, 2009), p. 73. The France-Tuscany-Lorraine-Mantua ‘matriline’ passes from Catherine de Medici, Queen of France, to her daughter, Claude de France, Duchess of Lorraine, to her daughter Christina of Lorraine, Grand Duchess of Tuscany, to her niece Maria de Medici, Queen of France, and on to her niece Margherita Gonzaga, Duchess of Lorraine. This link is more than merely nominal: Christina of Lorraine became the heiress of the personal properties of Catherine de Medici, and these continued to circulate amongst her female descendants for several generations. For a recent focused study of trans-regional princely women’s networks, see Mirella Marini, ‘Female Authority in the *Pietas Nobilita*: Habsburg Allegiance During the Dutch Revolt’, *Dutch Crossing*, vol. 34, no. 1 (March 2010), pp. 5-24.

³ These two themes form the core of my monograph on the Guise: *The Society of Princes: The Lorraine-Guise and the Conservation of Power and Wealth in Seventeenth-Century France* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), as well as a more recent chapter on trans-regional princely families: ‘Those In Between: Princely Families on the Margins of the Great Powers – The Franco-German Frontier, 1477-1830’, in C. Johnson, D. Sabean, S. Teuscher and F. Trivellato, eds., *Trans-regional and Transnational Families in Europe and Beyond: Experiences Since the Middle Ages* (Oxford: Berghahn, 2011).

⁴ Succession to a sovereign throne was not merely a theoretical pipe dream, as seen by the Gonzague-Nevers who succeeded as dukes of Mantua in 1629. The Guise were themselves only a few heartbeats away from succession to the sovereign throne of Lorraine in the 1630s.

wrath, but also offered a useful service to monarchs as well-suited informal diplomats, able to access unofficial channels when official channels are blocked.⁵ Often the *princes étrangers* are considered by French historians exclusively as representatives of their foreign families' interests at the court of France, but it is important to remember that they were also useful diplomatic conduits for French interests abroad, especially in Italy.⁶ This is especially true for the Gonzagas, Estes and Savoyards, but also for the Guise, whose maintenance of their 'rêve italien', their dream of someday reclaiming their hereditary rights to Naples and Sicily, and perhaps beyond to Jerusalem,⁷ were both a threat to similar French claims in the peninsula and useful to French aims of destabilising Habsburg interests in the Mediterranean.

The Guise in the sixteenth century are well studied – from René de Bouillé in 1850 to Stuart Carroll in 2009 – up to the double assassinations at Blois in 1588 and the final submissions of the League captains Mayenne and Mercoeur in the late 1590s. My own book analyses the re-establishment of Lorraine-Guise power and wealth during the personal reign of Louis XIV (1660-1715). What remains is to look at the

⁵ An example of the Lorraine princes filling this role is the 1643 embassy of the comte d'Harcourt, who acted as extraordinary ambassador from the Regent Anne to Charles I of England, but also as secret informal ambassador to Queen Henrietta Maria (born a French princess), bringing her much needed funds during the time of crisis in the English monarchy. For the public role, Comte René de Bouillé, *Histoire des ducs de Guise* (4 vols, Paris, 1849–50), vol. IV, pp. 435-6; for the private role, Archives Nationales [hereafter AN], T*1559¹, cote VII, no. 1.

⁶ This two-way diplomatic avenue was the initial draw of cadets of sovereign houses from France's borderlands – the Low Countries, the Rhineland, northern Italy and the Pyrenees – and is the subject of a forthcoming article, Jonathan Spangler, 'Sons and Daughters Set Abroad: Foreign Princes at the French Court', originally presented at the Renaissance Society of America, Montréal, 2011.

⁷ See the chapter in this collection by Sturges.

period in between, roughly 1598 to 1660.⁸ Why? What light can such a study shed on historical debates? The period begins with the submission of the Guise and the generous reconciliation gestures of Henry IV, but is followed by a period of instability of crown-grandee relationships, including various rebellions of Gaston d'Orléans and his friends, the conspiracy resulting in the 'Day of Dupes', the persecutions of Cardinal Richelieu, the defection of the Prince de Condé, and the Fronde of the Princes. During this time, two queen mothers attempted to conserve power and authority for the monarchy, for their sons, or for themselves. Both faced serious opposition at the outset of their regencies, and both turned to powerful court dynasties like the Guise to support their power in government. As female sovereigns, their closest associates at court would have been women of high rank, and it is to them that both queens turned in time of insecurity, to act as liaisons with their powerful families. This chapter will focus on one of these, Henriette-Catherine de Joyeuse.

The differences in approach taken by the two queen regents are apparent from the outcomes. Marie's reliance on grandee support alienated her son, Louis XIII, and his first minister Richelieu, and resulted in her exile after the Day of Dupes (10–11 November 1630), along with most of those same grantees who had supported her.⁹ In contrast, Anne's initial reliance on the grantees was tempered by a counter-balancing relationship with Cardinal Mazarin; this sparked the Fronde of the Princes, but its

⁸ And indeed, there is also need for a study of the Lorraine-Guise in the period following the louisquatorzian age: the most junior branch of the family continues to hold high office (notably that of Grand Ecuyer de France) and royal favour until the end of the *ancien régime*, finally dying out in 1825.

⁹ See Dubost, *Marie de Médicis*, pp. 775-83; and more generally, Jean-Marie Constant, *Les conjurateurs. Le premier libéralisme politique sous Richelieu* (Paris: Hachette, 1986).

failure ushered in a new era of Crown-grandee cooperation, rather than rivalry, under Louis XIV and his successors.¹⁰

The additional ingredient to this scenario was that the Guise possessed certain notable features that most other grandee families did not, their princely and trans-regional status. Their rank permitted access to the monarch that was unparalleled in most other court families, as ladies-in-waiting and holders of the highest court offices (Grand Chamberlain, Grand Equerry), but also merely as princely companions.¹¹ They had strong links of blood and affinity with foreign powers, primarily in Italy, but also in Spain and the Empire.¹² Guise women shared both these princely and trans-regional qualities with their male counterparts, and they came to the fore in a female-run court such as those of Marie de Medici and Anne of Austria. During periods of female rule (whether sovereign or regency) normal lines of power and patronage that

¹⁰ See Donna Bohanan, *Crown and Nobility in Early Modern France* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001), specifically, pp. 60-61.

¹¹ For example, Daniel de Cosnac, confessor to Philippe de France, Duke of Orléans, explained why Monsieur's relationship with his favourite, the chevalier de Lorraine – a relationship between princes – was better than a previous example set between Gaston de France and the Duke of Montmorency, a mere gentleman. Elsewhere in his memoirs, Cosnac makes this comparison again, and opines that the chevalier de Lorraine was a good choice for a royal favourite, advantageous to Monsieur since he was of 'grande naissance', *Mémoires*, G.J. de Cosnac, ed., (2 vols, Paris, 1852), vol. I, pp. 360-61; vol. II., pp. 61-3.

¹² Other *prince étranger* dynasties had similar qualities, notably the major Huguenot grandees, the La Tour d'Auvergne, Rohan and La Trémoille, who had enduring kinship ties with the leading Protestant powers in northern Europe, such as the houses of Orange-Nassau and Hessen, and more remotely, England, Denmark and Brandenburg. See Simon Hodson, 'The Power of Female Dynastic Networks: a brief study of Louise de Coligny, princess of Orange, and her stepdaughters', *Women's History Review*, vol. 16, issue 3 (2007), pp. 335-51.

radiate from a king to his most prominent male courtiers shift to a pattern of female alliances, as is seen notably in the reign of Elizabeth I of England.¹³ But these periods of female rule had their differences in seventeenth-century France. Katherine Crawford puts forward in her work on regencies that Marie de Medici overstepped her bounds as a female regent by presenting herself publicly as sharing royal authority with her son the King, whereas Anne of Austria always ensured that the public face of Bourbon authority was her son's, never her own.¹⁴ Can we extrapolate from this idea, and judge whether aristocratic matriarchs learned from these queenly examples in periods of transition and uncertainty for the French aristocracy, and acted in a manner that publicly put their sons' interests ahead of their own? By focusing on one of these matriarchs, the Dowager Duchess of Guise, Henriette-Catherine de Joyeuse, and her relationship with her son, Henri II, Duke of Guise, we can shed light on their conflicting interests between the dynastic and the personal, and in particular, in his personal 'rêve italien' versus the reputation of the family as a whole, in France and abroad, amongst the wider European society of princes.

Henriette-Catherine de Joyeuse and the Regency of Marie de Medici:

¹³ This is shown quite clearly in the chapter on Elizabeth in Anne Somerset, *Ladies in Waiting, from the Tudors to the Present Day* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1984), which draws heavily on contemporary histories and memoirs (though the author never makes the point explicitly). It is not, however, always the case, as can be seen in the mostly male-dominated court of Catherine II of Russia. See Isabel de Madariaga, 'Catherine as Woman and Ruler,' in James Cracraft, ed., *Major Problems in the History of Imperial Russia*, (Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath, 1994), pp. 167-79.

¹⁴ Katherine Crawford, *Perilous Performances: Gender and Regency in Early Modern France* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2004).

Henriette-Catherine de Joyeuse (1585-1656) was a product of the union between the families of two court favourites raised to great prominence and wealth by Henri III, the Duke of Joyeuse and the Duke of Epernon.¹⁵ The House of Joyeuse had been prominent noble landowners in a remote corner of Languedoc known as the Vivarais since at least the thirteenth century. They began to serve the royal court in the fourteenth century, but remained an essentially provincial family rising slowly through the ranks of the ‘noblesse seconde’ until the stellar rise of Anne de Joyeuse, a ‘mignon’ of Henry III who was created *duc-et-pair* and Admiral of France, and married to the sister-in-law of the King himself in 1581 before he was killed leading the royal troops at Coutras in 1587. His brother François became the Cardinal de Joyeuse and Archbishop of Rouen, and although initially leading the Catholic League in Languedoc in its resistance to the new Protestant king, Henry IV, he soon became one of the leaders of the Bourbon regime after the King’s conversion. Another brother, Henri, married the sister of Henry III’s other ‘mignon’ favourite, the Duke of Epernon (Jean Louis de Nogaret de La Valette), and after her death in 1587, became a Capuchin with the name ‘Père Ange’ (though briefly leaving the order to take up his brother’s mantle as Duke of Joyeuse and leader of the League, and briefly a marshal of France after the reconciliation with Henry IV). The sole product of this union was Henriette-Catherine, Mlle de Joyeuse, who almost from birth found herself an orphan (her mother was dead, and her father was no longer ‘in the world’, known later in life

¹⁵ Genealogical histories of these two families can be found in Père Anselme de Sainte-Marie (Pierre de Guibors), *Histoire Généalogique et Chronologique de la Maison Royale de France, des Pairs, des Grands Officiers de la Couronne & de la Maison du Roy...* (9 vols, Paris, 1726-33), vol. III, pp. 801ff, and 853ff. The role of the favourites of Henry III have been analysed by Nicolas Le Roux, *La faveur du roi. Mignons et courtisans au temps des derniers Valois* (Seysssel: Champ Vallon, 2001).

as a mystic) and heiress of a vast fortune.¹⁶ She was raised as a ward of the Cardinal at his château de Gaillard in Normandy, and this environment of ultra-Catholic piety would influence her for the rest of her life, and would form an important part of Guisard public image, as we shall see below.¹⁷

As part of the process of reconciliation between the new Bourbon regime and League *grandeues*, Mlle de Joyeuse was married to a prince of the blood, the Duke of Montpensier in 1597. She became an early intimate of the new queen of France, Marie de Medici, who, on her arrival in 1600, surrounded herself with the highest ranking women at court. These included Henriette-Catherine's future in-laws, the two dowager duchesses of Guise: Anne d'Este (who was named *surintendante* of the Queen's household) and Catherine de Clèves. These women were seasoned courtiers who instructed the new foreign queen in the ways of the French court. A younger generation of Guise women, notably Mlle de Guise (Louise-Marguerite de Lorraine), kept her entertained with their gaiety and their literary friends.¹⁸ Henriette-Catherine,

¹⁶ I have estimated her inheritance elsewhere as roughly 5.6 million *livres*. Jonathan Spangler, 'Benefit or Burden? Elite Widows in Seventeenth-Century France', *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Western Society for French History*, vol. 31 (2003), pp. 65-83, here p. 68, fn 6. Joseph Bergin has described her uncle the Cardinal as one of the greatest pluralists in the history of the French Church: 'The Decline and Fall of the House of Guise as an Ecclesiastical Dynasty,' *The Historical Journal*, vol. 25, no. 4 (1982), pp. 790-1.

¹⁷ For her father, see Pierre de Vaissière, 'La seconde profession de Frère Ange, capucin, duc de Joyeuse, pair et maréchal de France (1599-1608)', *Revue d'histoire de l'église de France*, vol. 12, no. 54 (1926), pp. 34-52. A more recent study of elite women and Catholic piety in Paris in this period, the early seventeenth century, has been published by Barbara Diefendorf, *From Penitence to Charity: Pious Women and the Catholic Reformation in Paris* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).

¹⁸ Mlle de Guise, though only twelve when the new Queen arrived in 1600, soon emerged as a leading ornament of the court of Henry IV (and possibly his mistress for a short period): Louis Batiffol, *La vie*

in contrast, is said to have reminded Marie of her own pious upbringing in Florence, corresponding frequently with her from the château de Gaillon, residence of her uncle, the Cardinal de Joyeuse.¹⁹

Widowed at age twenty-three in 1608, Madame de Montpensier retained her Joyeuse fortune, as well as her prominent place at court as mother of a *princesse du sang*, Marie de Bourbon-Montpensier, whose marriage was already projected for the King's second son, the infant Duke of Orléans.²⁰ Henriette-Catherine was thus a prize catch for ambitious courtiers.

In May 1610, Marie de Medici was suddenly called to the forefront of power by the assassination of her husband the King. The Guise clan, reconciled with the Bourbon monarchy since the mid-1590s (with a few exceptional holdouts), were among the first to aid Marie in her bid for power. The fourth duke of Guise, Charles (son of the murdered leader of the League, 'le Balafre'), is said to have mounted his horse immediately on hearing the news of the King's death, and ridden around the streets of Paris, using the tremendous popularity of his family name in the capital to calm the people and to assure their loyalty to the young Louis XIII and his mother.²¹

intime d'une reine de France au XVIIe siècle (Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1906), pp. 330-33. It is thought she was the author of *Histoire des Amours de Henri IV*, published many years after her death. Dubost describes Mlle de Guise as a 'literary counsellor' to Queen Marie (*Marie de Médicis*, p. 242), see his section entitled 'La reine et les Guise', pp. 266ff.

¹⁹ Batiffol, *Vie Intime*, p. 330, citing letters in BNF, Cinq-Cents Colbert, no. 87.

²⁰ Dubost, *Marie de Médicis*, p. 266; Batiffol, *Vie Intime*, 330. Note that at twenty-three Henriette-Catherine was still considered a minor, so her uncle the Cardinal de Joyeuse acted as guardian of the infant Mlle de Montpensier (BNF, Joly de Fleury, 120, fol. 281). The infant Duke of Orléans died in 1611, but Mlle de Montpensier's engagement was transferred to the King's youngest son, Gaston (B. 1608), whom she eventually did marry, before she died in 1627.

²¹ Bouillé, *Histoire des ducs de Guise*, vol. IV, p. 355, citing the journal of Pierre de L'Estoile.

He was rewarded with a large sum of money, and the hand in marriage of the Dowager Duchess of Montpensier. They married in January 1611, but she did not lose her independence: her marriage contract specified that she was to have legal power to administer her own wealth and estates, and that there would be no community property.²² Henriette-Catherine's political and social prominence continued to be at the forefront of Marie de Medici's regency, in an unprecedented position as both a Guisard and as the mother of a *princesse du sang*. She therefore had strong links of affinity with both foreign powers *and* with the Bourbon monarchy. They were a 'power couple' *par excellence*: the Duke with his international standing as cousin to the Stuarts, newly established in England, but also to the Gonzagas, Estes and Medicis in Northern Italy; the Duchess as a member of the extended Bourbon clan, mother to the Montpensier heiress and later mother-in-law to Gaston d'Orléans.²³ Guise's sister was now herself a *princesse du sang*, married to the Prince of Conti (François de Bourbon), since 1605. These blood relationships were especially key in this period

²² BNF, Dupuy, no. 853. Normally, Parisian customary law specified that a woman's properties were administered by her husband on her behalf, and he could claim half of the community property if he survived her. Elites increasingly avoided customary law through specific clauses in marriage contracts. For a clear description of this process, see Barbara Diefendorf, *Paris City Councillors in the Sixteenth Century, The Politics of Patrimony* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983), pp. 221-31.

²³ As seen in the seating order of the Lit de Justice of 1614, in Sarah Hanley, *The Lit de Justice of the Kings of France: Constitutional Ideology in Legend, Ritual and Discourse* (Princeton: University of Princeton Press, 1983), p. 286. The Duchess would remain linked to the Bourbons well into the 1640s, as guardian of her grand-daughter, Anne-Marie-Louise d'Orléans, duchess of Montpensier (known as 'La Grande Mademoiselle'). The latter writes a great deal about her Guisard grandmother in her well-known memoirs, abruptly shifting in tone from loving to loathing upon discovery that she had been cut out of the older woman's will: *Mémoires de Mlle de Montpensier, petite-fille de Henri IV*, A. Chéruel, ed. (4 vols, Paris: Charpentier, 1858-1859), vol. I, 70-71; vol. II, pp. 296-7, 327-33, 341ff, 368, 381-2.

when the Regent's policy was to stress that this was a *family* monarchy, not solely one based on the person of the king alone.²⁴ It was thus a logical choice for Guise and his wife to accompany Princess Elisabeth to the border for her marriage to the King of Spain in 1615, and to accompany the new queen of France, Anne of Austria, back from the frontier for her marriage to Louis XIII. Ten years later the Guise family again served this function, as King Charles I of England and Scotland chose Guise's younger brother, the Duke of Chevreuse, to act as his proxy in his marriage to Princess Henriette-Marie.²⁵

Several incidents can be seen where the Guisards, both men and women, intervened to calm the court and to reconcile rebellions in the early years of Marie de Medici's regency, and in particular to smooth ruffled feathers caused by their own hot-headed sons and brothers. From the start of the regency, the Queen Mother had the wisdom to understand that the best policy was one of continuity, of maintaining a reliance on her late husband's ministers – with the notable exception of Sully – and on the *grandeues* her husband had come to trust, such as the dukes of Guise and Mayenne.²⁶ Her policy of peace was good for the country, but left the court *grandeues* with little to do but to get involved in petty quarrels over love and honour. One of the most public rows occurred between the Chevalier de Guise (François-Alexandre,

²⁴ Crawford, *Perilous Performances*, pp. 59-60.

²⁵ On roles played by the Guise as princely representatives and escorts, *Society of Princes*, pp. 38-41.

²⁶ Dubost, *Marie de Médicis*, pp. 266-7, 290, 312-14. The Duke of Guise himself wrote to Louis XIII in 1616 about his family: 'il ne faut douter de la fidélité de cette illustre maison qui a employé le sang et la vie de tous les siens, pour le service de cette couronne', from a letter of 1616 (BNF, Lb³⁶ 886), quoted in Caroline Bitsch, *Vie et carrière d'Henri II de Bourbon, prince de Condé (1588-1646)*.

Exemple de comportement et d'idées politiques au début du XVIIe siècle (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2008), p. 119.

youngest brother of the Duke) and the Baron de Luz (or Lux), a client of the Queen-Mother's favourite, Concini, and a man who had been involved in the assassination of the third duke of Guise in 1588 in 1613. Being challenged first by the Baron then by his son, the Chevalier dispatched them both. The outcome of this affair again underlines the prominent position held by the Guise women, as the Chevalier's mother, the Dowager Duchess of Guise, and his sister, the Princesse de Conti, stepped in to plead for his punishment to be light; he was banished from court rather than executed. The Dowager Duchess Catherine de Clèves's comments are illuminating here on the role of the matriarch in dynastic honour, attesting that her son had been born ready to avenge his father's death (posthumously in 1589), and that if she had been a man twenty years ago she would have done it herself.²⁷

Older biographies of the Queen Mother like that of Michel Carmona stress that Marie relied on her Italian favourites from the outset of her rule in France.²⁸ It is now accepted, however, that Marie at first relied on the French *grandees*, notably those with Italian connections like the Guise and the Gonzagas, wisely following her husband's sagacity in favouring the *princes étrangers* as a counter-balance to the *princes du sang*, Condé and Soissons.²⁹ Marie had been aware of and participating in this strategy long before her regency, for example, in arranging the marriage of Mlle

²⁷ Quoted in Bouillé, *Histoire des ducs de Guise*, vol. IV, p. 371. For a modern study of this event, see Jacqueline Boucher, 'L'assassinat du baron de Lux, 1613: une affaire bourguignonne?' in Pierre Ponsot, dir., *L'ouvrier, l'Espagne, la Bourgogne et la vie provinciale: parcours d'un historien* (Lyon: Presses Universitaires de Lyon, 1994), pp. 317-27. On the duel more generally, and efforts to stop its practice amongst the high court aristocracy in France, see Stuart Carroll, "The Peace in the Feud in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century France", *Past and Present*, no. 178 (2003), pp. 74-115.

²⁸ Michel Carmona, *Marie de Médicis* (Paris, 1981), p. 219.

²⁹ Bitsch, *Vie et carrière d'Henri II de Bourbon, prince de Condé*, p. 119.

de Guise to the most loyal Bourbon prince (malleable due to his limited mental capacity), Conti, in 1605, only five years after her arrival in France. She also cultivated links between the *princes étrangers* and their sovereign dynastic heads back home in Nancy and Mantua, for example, arranging the marriage of Duke Henri of Lorraine and her niece Margherita Gonzaga, in 1606, reminding us once again of the strength of the Catholic matrilineal ‘spine’ knitting together Europe’s dynasties in this period.³⁰

But the times changed, and Marie came to rely more heavily on her foreign favourites, the Concinis, more than the Guise. Her son Louis XIII came to rely instead on his own favourites, Luynes then Richelieu, creatures he was capable of raising up from provincial origins, and who therefore clashed with the older established court grandees.³¹ The resulting new policy of a monarchy centred on the king alone – we might call it ‘absolutist’ – rather than the more traditional collective familial or ‘corporate’ monarchy, had no real place for the Guise.³² There was also no place for a family who consistently supported a policy of peace with Spain and rejecting any alliance with Protestant powers, both of which clashed with the emerging policies of Cardinal Richelieu. This clash resulted in nearly every member of the family moving

³⁰ Dubost, *Marie de Médicis*, pp. 74, 267.

³¹ See the most recent work on this topic, Sharon Kettering, *Power and reputation at the Court of Louis XIII. The Career of Charles D’Albert, duc de Luynes (1578-1621)* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2008); and the by now classic account by Joseph Bergin, *The Rise of Richelieu* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1992).

³² For the latest discussions of the ideological struggle between ‘corporate’ versus ‘absolute’ monarchy, see Nicolas Le Roux, *Le Roi, la Cour, l’Etat. De la Renaissance à l’Absolutisme* (Seysssel: Champ Vallon, 2013), 329-55.

into exile by 1631, to Brussels, to London, to Florence.³³ And of course the Queen-Mother herself went into exile as well, for the rest of her life. It is interesting to note that the Duke of Guise and his family went to live in a Medici palace in Florence, when Marie herself did not. It is also worth noting how Marie de Medici continued to fight for her vision of a united pan-European society of princes – led by France – by supporting her son Gaston’s second marriage to a princess of the House of Lorraine in 1632. But this vision gradually crumbled, first by the defection of Gaston himself, and then by the desertion of all of Marie’s princely supporters in Brussels, most of whom belonged to the House of Lorraine, including the Princess of Phalsbourg, the Duke and Duchess of Elbeuf, the Duchess of Ognano and the Duchess of Roannez. By 1636 she was alone.³⁴

The specifics of the exile of the fourth Duke of Guise and his family in Florence have never been adequately analysed. Duke Charles had been careful to maintain his family’s strong political and social connections with the nobility of Provence (a deliberate strategy to recall his dynasty’s ancient links via his ancestor René d’Anjou, last sovereign count of Provence³⁵), acting as royal governor from

³³ On the conflict between Richelieu and the *grands*, see Robin Briggs, ‘Noble Conspiracy and Revolt in France, 1610-60’, *Seventeenth-Century French Studies*, no. 12 (1990); and on the resulting exiles in Brussels, Toby Osborne, ‘“Chimeres, monopoles and stratagems”: French Exiles in the Spanish Netherlands during the Thirty Years’ War’, *The Seventeenth Century*, no. 15 (Autumn 2001).

³⁴ For Gaston’s marriage, see the chapter ‘L’affaire du mariage de Monsieur’, in Georges Dethan’s, *La Vie de Gaston d’Orléans* (Paris: Editions de Fallois, 1992); For Marie in Brussels and her gradual abandonment, Dubost, *Marie de Médicis*, pp. 830-32; Toby Osborne, ‘A Queen Mother in Exile: Marie de Médicis in the Spanish Netherlands and England, 1631-41’, in Philip Mansel and Torsten Rlotte, eds, *Monarchy and Exile: The Politics of Legitimacy from Marie de Médicis to Wilhelm II* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), pp. 17-43.

³⁵ See the introduction to this volume.

1594, and admiral of the Mediterranean fleet. But this clashed with Richelieu's own naval ambitions, and when Guise sensed the Cardinal was about to move against him in February 1631, he departed for Italy, claiming to be merely fulfilling a pilgrimage vow to the shrine at Loreto.³⁶ His wife and four of their children followed him in November 1634 on the orders of Louis XIII, leaving behind their second son, Henri, Archbishop of Reims,³⁷ and their youngest daughter, Françoise-Renée, a nun in a convent in Reims.³⁸ They were taken in by their cousin, the Dowager Grand Duchess of Tuscany, Christina of Lorraine, daughter of Duke Charles III of Lorraine, though many of the details of their exile remain unclear.³⁹

³⁶ The only close study of these events unfortunately remains the unpublished PhD thesis of Jonathan Pearl, 'Guise and Provence: Political Conflicts in the Epoch of Richelieu' (Northwestern University, 1968). The Guise were particularly devoted to the cult of the Virgin – their eldest daughters were usually christened 'Marie', the most recent of which was even born on the feast of the Assumption (15 August) in 1615 – so Loreto was not an unusual destination. The family maintained a shrine in Champagne, Notre-Dame de Liesse (the 'French Loreto'), and one of their treasured possessions was a replica of the shrine in Italy. See Jonathan Spangler, Material Culture at the Guise "Court": Tapestries, a bed and a devotional dollhouse as expressions of dynastic pride and piety in seventeenth-century Paris', *Seventeenth-Century French Studies*, vol. 34, no. 2 (2012), pp. 158-75.

³⁷ See the chapter by Benaiteau in this volume.

³⁸ For details of the exile of the Guise in Florence, see Patricia Ranum, *Portraits Around Marc-Antoine Charpentier* (Baltimore: Self Published, 2004), pp. 353-58.

³⁹ For example, their place of residence: the French historian Charles Victor Langlois, *Les Hôtels de Clisson, de Guise et de Rohan-Soubise au Marais* (Paris, 1922), p. 51, states that they lived first at the Palazzo Settimana [sic] then the Palazzo Vecchio (citing as a source 'communication de M. Charles Terrasse'), which is repeated by Ranum, p. 354. It seems clear from Medici court records (the Diario Settimanni and the Diario Tinghi), however, that they lived from February 1635 in the Palazzo Vecchio. Stefania Andreini, librarian of the municipal library of San Giovanni Valdarno near Florence, has clarified that although there is indeed a Palazzo Settimanni in Florence, the two court diaries make

Yet Guise women abroad maintained a degree of leverage with the French court. The Duchess of Chevreuse kept up intimate correspondence with Queen Anne, attempting to maintain a ‘parti des dames’, opposed to Richelieu from exile, inviting Marie de Medici herself to London to try to set this up.⁴⁰ From Florence, Henriette-Catherine de Joyeuse, was able to negotiate successfully for the preservation of the patrimony of her husband after his death in September 1640, which was threatened by the actions of their son, the new fifth duke, Henri II. Faced with their son’s erratic behaviour in the France (notably the scandalous affair with his cousin, Anne de Gonzague⁴¹), the Duke and Duchess had colluded by means of a lawsuit to put their French estates ‘under cover’ of the Duchess’s legal claims, as a major creditor of the House of Guise. The measure of Henriette-Catherine’s position within the family at this point is summed up by the wording of a later legal document concerning this lawsuit: Duke Charles, ‘sans autre ressource que celle qu’il pouvoit esperer des soins et de l’affection de Mme de Guise [...] l’a laisse dépositaire de ses intentions, et comme elle l’avoit toûjours esté de son pouvoir dans ses affaires domestiques, il l’a chargé de soûtenir, contre la pente naturelle de monsieur son fils aîné, les justes précautions qu’il avoit prises de concert avec elle’.⁴² Matters became more serious

no indication of it as a residence of the Guise, perhaps conflating the name of the source with the name of the palace (personal communication, October 2010).

⁴⁰ Louis Batiffol, *La Duchesse de Chevreuse. Une Vie d’Aventures et d’Intrigues sous Louis XIII* (Paris: Hachette, 1913), p. 180; Paul Bondonis, ‘Une négociation difficile de Richelieu: Madame de Chevreuse en Angleterre, 1638-1639’, *Revue d’histoire diplomatique*, vol. 46, no. 1 (1932).

⁴¹ See the chapter in this volume by Benaiteau.

⁴² BNF, Factum 14859, p. 29. It seems that, although the Parlement of Paris disapproved of the Duke and Duchess premeditating their own court case in a clear case of collusion, they received nothing more than a warning.

when, threatened by Richelieu's efforts to control the *grandeues*, Guise joined the rebellion of the Count of Soissons and the Duke of Bouillon in 1641, then left for Brussels when it collapsed, where he signed a contract with the Habsburgs to serve them in their war against France.⁴³ The Parlement of Paris declared him a traitor and ordered him to be executed in effigy and his titles and estates confiscated.⁴⁴ His mother wrote a long letter to the King, pleading on behalf of her other children, who had not rebelled, and was rewarded with a grant in February 1642 of the majority of the Guise patrimony, to hold in the name of her younger children, to allow them to sustain the 'honneur de leur maison'.⁴⁵ This financial role was not new for Henriette-Catherine; she had been managing Guise estates and paying off Guise debts since her marriage in 1611.⁴⁶ She would later be known as a 'donneur d'avis', someone who

⁴³ Details of the revolt of the princes can be found detailed in Gabriel Hanotaux, *Histoire du Cardinal de Richelieu* (Paris, 1896-1947), vol. VI, pp. 90-105; but also from the memoirs of various eye-witnesses, such as the Duke of Bouillon, the Count of Montrésor, and the marshals Fabert and Châtillon. A copy of the contract Guise made with the House of Austria, August 1641, is BNF, Ms. Nouvelles acquisitions françaises, no. 29.

⁴⁴ BNF, Dupuy, no. 869, fol. 123, *arrêt* of Parlement of Paris, 6 September 1641.

⁴⁵ Bouillé, *Histoire des ducs de Guise*, vol. IV, 430-31. The letters patent giving the confiscated estates to her, February 1642 (BNF, Ms. français, no. 3710, fol. 101) note that the Duchess was still in Florence, and grant the estates 'sur la douloureuse demande de cette princesse en faveur de ses autres enfants bien élevés et désormais privés des moyens de relever l'honneur de leur maison.'

⁴⁶ BNF, Factum 14859, p. 27. See also BNF, Ms. français, no. 22431, fol. 83, a memoir from 1646 stating that even though the Duchess had long been in charge of the administration of her husband's properties, there had always been two secretaries, one for his, and one for her estates.

gave financial advice in return for a slice of the profits, during the regency of Queen Anne.⁴⁷

Henriette-Catherine de Joyeuse and the Regency of Anne of Austria

The regency of Anne of Austria started out in a similar fashion to that of her mother-in-law, with a brief questioning of the legitimacy of female rule: as the Prince of Condé had done in 1613, so did the Duke of Orléans in 1643 (though he quickly came to a power-sharing agreement with her).⁴⁸ Anne surprised many, including her favourite, the Duchess of Chevreuse, by not reversing the policies of her late husband and his late minister, but instead continued the war against Spain.⁴⁹ What she did change, however, on the advice of Cardinal Mazarin, was her policy towards the *grandeues*. In the spirit of reconciliation, the Queen recalled all the various exiles, including Guisards from Brussels, London and Florence, who returned with vigour to

⁴⁷ Daniel Dessert, *Argent, pouvoir et société au Grand Siècle* (Paris, 1984), pp. 346, 364-5. Henriette-Catherine's fiscal contributions to the House of Guise are explored in fuller detail in Spangler, *Society of Princes*, pp. 157-8, 200, 206-07.

⁴⁸ Scholarly literature on women in power, queenship and regency, has expanded hugely in recent years, led by historians such as Theresa Earenfight, Carole Levin, Fanny Cosandey, and so on. See Tracy Adams, 'Christine de Pizan, Isabeau of Bavaria, and Female Regency', *French Historical Studies*, vol. 32, no. 1 (2009), pp. 1-32; and a recent review of several new works on this topic: Katherine Crawford, 'Revisiting Monarchy: Women and the Prospects for Power', *Journal of Women's History*, vol. 24, no. 1 (2012), pp. 160-71.

⁴⁹ For Anne's regency, see Ruth Kleinman, *Anne of Austria: Queen of France* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1985); and more recently, Jean-François Dubost's chapter summarising Anne's political career, 'Anne d'Autriche, reine de France: mise en perspective et bilan politique du règne (1615-1666)', in Chantal Grell, ed., *Anne d'Autriche: Infante d'Espagne et reine de France* (Paris: Perrin / Madrid: CEEH, 2009), pp. 41-109.

support the new child king. One only need examine the first major ceremonies of the reign to see Guisards in every scene, as Grand Chamberlain, as Grand Equerry, as Dame d'honneur, and so on.⁵⁰ Like Marie, Anne relied on the powerful status of grandees like the Guise to strengthen the legitimacy of her rule as Regent at court, and in more public spheres. Once again, Guise women played a prominent role in the support of the Regency, as public and private links to their male relatives, and as advisors themselves in the dispersal of the Queen's political patronage.

The difference lies again in the central focus of the regency: as Dubost puts it, Marie aimed for peace by whatever means, while Anne focused instead on securing the dynastic principle and the rights of her son.⁵¹ Katherine Crawford has noted that Marie de Medici's advisers (notably Villeroy) had advised her in 1610 to keep the grandees away from court, as provincial governors, or distracted by squabbles over patronage, not politics.⁵² J. Russell Major notes the opposite trend for Anne of Austria in 1643, and the grandees were kept close.⁵³ Anne had learned from her mother-in-law's mistakes that holding the reins of power was fine for a woman, as long as it did not *appear* to be what was actually going on. Her authority was exercised purely to

⁵⁰ For example, the *lit de justice* of May 1643. Hanley, *Lit de Justice*, p. 308.

⁵¹ Dubost, 'Anne d'Autriche', p. 86.

⁵² Crawford, *Perilous Performances*, p. 74.

⁵³ J. Russell Major, *Representative Government in Early Modern France* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1980), p. 399. This of course sets up the model followed by her son, Louis XIV, in keeping his friends close, and his enemies closer. See Roger Mettam, *Power and Faction in Louis XIV's France* (Oxford, 1988), p. 93.

protect the authority of her son as king.⁵⁴ One of the clearest indications of this can be seen in the marked difference between the ceremonial *entrée* of her son's new queen into Paris in 1660, where Marie-Thérèse was given primacy of place and full honours, in contrast to Anne's own *entrée* in 1616, a much more discreet affair designed to avoid upstaging her mother-in-law, the Regent Marie.⁵⁵ We can perhaps see this same mentality in the actions of the Dowager Duchess of Guise.

Henriette-Catherine de Joyeuse renewed her strong connections with the monarchy during the regency of Queen Anne, which proved useful as her son Henri II got deeper and deeper into political trouble. At the start of the regency, while still in Florence, she wrote to the Queen asking for a pardon for her son, which he received in August 1643.⁵⁶ But mother was clever enough to remain wary of her eldest son's proclivities to unpredictable behaviour, based on passion rather than logic – in an interesting reversal of classic early modern gender assumptions – and she ensured that all of the Guise patrimony was *not* returned to her son. She retained control of the richest estates, notably the principality of Joinville in Champagne, in her capacity as major creditor – her Joyeuse wealth had paid off much of the Guise debts – but also as guardian of her two younger sons and daughter (Louis, Roger, Marie). Acting as 'procuratrice générale' of her eldest son in 1645 – which he later denied he had ever agreed to – she also donated his portion of the succession of Catherine de Clèves (the previous Dowager Duchess of Guise) to his uncle, the Duke of Chevreuse and his

⁵⁴ Crawford, *Perilous Performances*, p. 134. This is in marked contrast to the efforts of Marie de Médicis, long after she was driven out of France, to continue to demand respect due to a sovereign queen, not merely the mother of a king. Osborne, 'A Queen Mother in Exile'.

⁵⁵ Dubost, 'Anne d'Autriche', p. 99.

⁵⁶ Bouillé, *Histoire des ducs de Guise*, vol. IV, p. 433.

family.⁵⁷ This was done partly in exchange for the resignation of Chevreuse's office of Grand Chamberlain of France to Guise's younger brother, Louis de Lorraine, who was also given his mother's duchy of Joyeuse.⁵⁸ When Guise complained about this, an arbitrated settlement was agreed in 1646, by which Joyeuse was allowed to retain Joinville – as heir of his mother, the creditor, rather than his father, the debtor. In 1652, Guise complained again about his mother's actions favouring his younger siblings, but again agreed to another family settlement in 1654, by which the Duke ceded his brother the family's other main revenue generator, the county of Eu in Normandy.⁵⁹ But we can see that both settlements of 1646 and 1654 had other motivators, namely, Guise's need for funds and family support in his quest to claim the throne of Naples.

⁵⁷ BNF, Thoisy 131, fol. 19. Guise claims in this memoir that it was not until his mother's death in 1656 that he became aware of these transactions, done privately and kept hidden from him. It notably involved the donation to Chevreuse of a sizeable *rente* (600,000 *livres*) created by the Crown in exchange for the sovereign principality of Château-Regnault, which Guise later claimed was seized by the Crown unlawfully from his aunt, the Princess of Conti in 1629. See also AN, R⁴ 901, item 5, the act of settlement between the Duchess of Guise and the Duke of Chevreuse, 3 May 1646 (and note item 1 in this collection for the House of Orléans, heirs of the House of Guise, which reveals that this contested settlement was still a bone of contention in the late eighteenth century).

⁵⁸ It is extraordinary that the Dowager Duchess was allowed to transmit this duchy-peerage to her second surviving son, against normal practice. If the duchy had been created for 'heirs general' (the letters patent are vague), then the appropriate heir was the grand-daughter from her first marriage, La Grande Mademoiselle (as she herself would protest for decades); and if not, it should have become extinct as a peerage, or at least passed to her eldest son from her second marriage. Saint-Simon himself rails against this as an unpardonable crime, typical of the Guise, in his *Additions* in the *Journal* of the Marquis de Dangeau, E. Soulié, L. Dussieux, *et al.*, eds (19 vols, Paris, 1854-60), vol. XIV, p. 5.

⁵⁹ For this sequence of settlements, see the narrative in BNF, Factum 14859.

Once again, his mother's role was crucial. Despite her fairly clear misgivings of her son's behaviour,⁶⁰ she recognised that dynastic *gloire* was a crucial component to the overall health of the dynasty. A positive public image of the Duke, as head of the family, was paramount. So when Henri wrote to her from Naples requesting money, she once again put her considerable financial acumen to work, and mortgaged several Guise properties (including the Duchy of Guise itself), and her own jewels on her son's behalf.⁶¹ Henri's pleas to her for financial support are clad in clumsy filial affection:

I believed, Madame, that you would not disagree with me that I should take the liberty of rendering to you an account of this honour which is offered to me, not believing that I could succeed in this glorious employment if I was not fortunate enough to obtain your blessing. I therefore ask it of you this instant, and pray you do not abandon me in this engagement, in which I will be able to acquire so much reputation and to establish for myself such a great fortune. I dare to hope for the grace of your natural and powerful assistance, in having an extreme need; and you should consider that if it returns to me some advantage, it is not only for all of my family, but for yours in particular, since

⁶⁰ See above.

⁶¹ For the mortgaging of the duchy of Guise to their local clients, the Marignys, for 8,393 *livres* annually, see AN, Minutier Central, étude X, no. 97, 8 May 1646. Though this date is too early to be directly linked to the Naples expedition, Guise was already in Rome to pursue the annulment of his marriage to Honorine de Berghes (AN R⁴*1060, pp. 16-17).

I am with all my respects imaginable, Madame, your very humble, obedient and obliged son and servant.⁶²

But in a return letter she too sounds fairly insincere in relating that she ‘suffered the regret of not being in a position to provide for the debts and needs of the prince her son.’⁶³ The Duchess’ testament of 1655 specifies that she sent 44,365 *livres* to Guise for his expedition to Naples in 1647, but also refers to ‘sums which I have paid for him elsewhere, all of which amounts to *at least* 3 million *livres*’, otherwise the degree to which she actually supported her son’s ventures in southern Italy is not clear.⁶⁴

Meanwhile at home, the Duchess of Guise was dealing with the on-going international scandal of her son’s secret marriage in Brussels and subsequent abandonment of Honorine de Berghes, plus the growing Parisian tabloid scandal of

⁶² Guise to his mother, 9 November 1647, from the *Mémoires* of the Duke of Guise in Michaud and Poujoulat, eds., *Nouvelle Collection des Mémoires pour servir à l’histoire de France* (Paris, 1839), book I, pp. 41-2.

⁶³ Bouillé, *Histoire des ducs de Guise*, vol. IV, p. 455 (citing BNF, Ms. Gaignières, vol. 357, fol. 181).

⁶⁴ BNF, Factum 7290, testament of the Dowager Duchess of Guise, 25 November 1655. Further evidence for sums sent to Guise can be gleaned from a memoir for Mlle de Montpensier disputing the succession of her grandmother (the Dowager Duchess), in which she gives details of an *état* and transaction from 1646 which lists 85,000 *livres* in two loans the Duchess took out in the name of her son (the memoir mentions a third for 25,000, but is unclear if it was intended also for Guise). Since these date from before 1647, it can be assumed they went to support his trip to Rome, or possibly earlier, during his exile in Brussels (BNF, Factum 14859, pp. 35, 45). There is also a sum of 420,000 *livres* Guise confessed having received in cash from his brother Louis (AN, Minutier Central, LI, no. 243, 16 July 1654), but it is not clear whether this refers to money sent for the expedition in 1647, or a new loan in preparation for the second attempt on Naples in September 1654.

his new affair with Mlle Judith de Pons, a fille d'honneur of the Queen Mother.⁶⁵ The Duchess used her links with the Regent to prevent Honorine from coming to France to claim her rightful support as duchess of Guise and a return of her dowry, and also insisted that Mlle de Pons be dealt with. The Queen, herself offended by her own fille d'honneur assuming the airs and graces of a 'Queen of Naples', confined her to the convent of the Filles de Ste-Marie.⁶⁶ Guise wrote angry letters to the Queen, to his mother, and to Mazarin, but they refused to allow him to make himself look even more foolish than he already did, since his 'Queen' was also carrying on a liaison with one of his own gentleman servants, M. de Malicorne.⁶⁷

The melodrama continued in much the same vein following the first attempt at Naples. When Henri was imprisoned by the Spanish in 1648, his mother wrote to Philip IV herself to obtain his freedom, supported by efforts by the Queen Regent,

⁶⁵ As detailed in the chapter in this volume by Benaiteau. The Duke's marriage to his cousin Anne de Gonzague generated numerous printed and manuscript accounts of the marriage circulate: the Fonds français at the BNF contains no fewer than six accounts (10473, 16257, 17351, 19187, 20547, 23348). Anne had taken Henri to court to force him to recognise their marriage, but she eventually withdrew her suit and married (1645) Edouard, Count Palatine of the Rhine (thus securing her desire to solidify her rank as a *princesse étrangère*). *Nota bene*: original documents from the period refer to Mlle de Pons as Judith, while several printed sources call her Susanne, which was her sister's name.

⁶⁶ For Mlle de Pons 'putting herself already at the rank of the greatest queens of Europe', and Mme de Guise asking the Queen to confine her to a convent, see Madame de Motteville (Françoise Bertaut), *Mémoires*, M.F. Riaux, ed. (4 vols, Paris, 1855), vol. II, p. 2.

⁶⁷ These gossiping affairs are detailed in the memoirs of Mlle de Montpensier, who was, we must remember, the grand-daughter of the Dowager Duchess of Guise, and thus not an uninterested party. Other summaries of Henri's affairs circulated more widely in subsequent years, notably in the *Historiettes* of Tallemant des Réaux (see the Monmerqué edition of 1834, vol. IV, pp. 197-206).

who was of course, Philip's sister.⁶⁸ Guise himself claimed in his manifesto of 1652 that he had only been in Naples 'following the desires of the Queen Regent'.⁶⁹ It is useful to note a parallel instance of maternal 'brokerage' when in 1610 the Prince of Condé had offered his submission to the previous Queen Mother (Marie de Medici) via his mother, Charlotte de la Trémoille.⁷⁰ In 1653, the Dowager Duchess of Guise intervened in a similar manner regarding yet another son, the Chevalier de Guise, who was killed in the service of armies opposing France, as lieutenant-general of the Duke of Lorraine's troops in league with Condé. Again Henriette-Catherine de Joyeuse used her influence with the Queen Mother to allow her son's body to be brought back across enemy lines from Flanders.⁷¹ Other Guisard women supported her in maintaining the family's position of honour and power at the French court: her sister-in-law, the Queen's long-time favourite, Marie de Rohan, Duchess of Chevreuse, acted as informal mediator between the Regent and the Parlement during the Fronde;⁷² while her daughter, Marie, Mlle de Guise, maintained regular correspondence with her childhood companions in Florence and cousins in Rome (the Grand Duchess Vittoria della Rovere, and the Cardinal d'Este), and lent her support to

⁶⁸ Motteville, *Mémoires*, vol. II, pp. 37-8. These letters are cited in Bouillé (vol. IV, p. 479) as AN, Simancas Papers, A32, piece 4, and BNF, Ms. Gaignières, 356, fol. 121.

⁶⁹ BNF, Ms. français, no. 22431, fol. 101.

⁷⁰ Bitsch, *Vie et carrière d'Henri II de Bourbon, prince de Condé*, p. 110.

⁷¹ Bouillé, *Histoire des ducs de Guise*, vol. IV, p. 478 (BNF, Ms. Gaignières, vol. 357, fol. 223, 227).

Roger, chevalier de Guise (as Knight of Malta), had requested an abbey from Mazarin, and, when refused, joined the rebellion led by Condé (summer of 1649). Motteville, *Mémoires*, vol. III, pp. 46-47.

⁷² Kleinman, *Anne of Austria*, pp. 213, 238; Bouillé, *Histoire des ducs de Guise*, vol. IV, p. 468.

the growing party of *dévots* surrounding the Queen Mother.⁷³ This very public piety was the chief instrument of power available to the Guise women, solidified at this time by the presence of Henriette-Catherine's younger daughter, Françoise-Renée, as co-adjutrice (abbess in waiting) at the most prominent abbey in Paris, St-Pierre de Montmartre. At her very public dedication ceremony in December 1644, in the presence of most of the Guise clan, and many other lords and ladies of 'haute condition', the former Abbess of St-Pierre de Reims was welcomed to Montmartre by the old Abbess (Marie-Catherine de Beauvilliers, who had governed since 1598!) and the nuns who expressed unimaginable joy, 'voyant renouveler en cette jeune princesse l'ancienne piété de cet illustre maison'.⁷⁴ Other prominent monasteries with close royal connections were also headed by Guisard women at this time: the two daughters of the Duchess of Chevreuse, at Pont-aux-Dames from 1652 (though only briefly), and at Note-Dame de Jouarre from 1655; and a cousin at Notre-Dame de Soissons from 1643. Françoise-Renée would succeed as Abbess of Montmartre in 1657.

Henriette-Catherine herself acted as a model of Catholic piety for her entire adult life, from the foundation of an oratory at Joyeuse in March 1620,⁷⁵ to the

⁷³ Patricia Ranum, *Portraits*, pp. 354, 370-72. See also Ranum's 'Mademoiselle de Guise, ou les défis de la quenouille', *XVII^e siècle*, vol. 144 (1984), pp. 221-31. For more on the role of piety in dynastic identity, specifically as wielded by both the Dowager Duchess and her daughter, Mlle de Guise, see Spangler, 'Material Culture at the Guise "Court": Tapestries, a bed and a devotional dollhouse as expressions of dynastic pride and piety in seventeenth-century Paris', *Seventeenth-Century French Studies*, vol. 34, no. 2 (2012), pp. 158-75.

⁷⁴ BNF, Clairambault, no. 1204, fol. 166.

⁷⁵ 'Acte notarié créant l'Oratoire de Joyeuse' (from money she inherited from her uncle the Cardinal de Joyeuse's death in 1615), viewable online at www.archive.org [accessed 25 July 2013]. Patricia Ranum

foundation of a hospital at Eu in January 1655.⁷⁶ This was one of her last acts, and coincides both with her campaign to re-assert Guisard dynastic piety through the naming of her first grand-child after St. Joseph,⁷⁷ and with her own renewed display of public piety, expressed through her last will and testament of 25 November 1655, in which she requests to be buried not as a princess, but as a simple nun at the convent of the Capuchins, dressed in grey serge with a cross of white serge.⁷⁸ A book she probably commissioned appeared a few years after her death, commemorating the memory of her saintly father: M. de Caillière, *Le Courtisan Prédestiné, ou le duc de Joyeuse, Capucin*, which first appeared in 1662 and was published again several times.⁷⁹

Meanwhile, the Duke of Guise remained *de jure* head of the family, and the dynastic public face. Despite his tumultuous and scandalous past, he now commanded a large and important court department, as Grand Chamberlain of France (succeeding his brother Louis in 1654), sat on the King's Council, and was appointed by the King as escort and host to the visiting Queen Christina of Sweden in 1656, a duty full of

cites a letter from the General of the Jesuit Order in 1629, citing her for her generous support of their order (*Portraits*, p. 614, fn. 8, citing BNF, Ms. français, no. 22443, fol. 31).

⁷⁶ Louis Estancelin, *Histoire des Comtes d'Eu* (Dieppe: Marais Fils / Paris: Delaunay, 1828), p. 225.

⁷⁷ This can be seen, for instance, in the commissioning of a painting circa 1650 (the year of Prince Joseph's birth) in Rouen by the painter Pierre Letellier of St. Joseph and the infant Jesus, clearly displaying the initials and arms of the Dowager Duchess and her late husband. Sold in Paris in 2009: www.arcadja.com/auctions/fr/joseph_et_l_infant_jesus/artwork [accessed 25 July 2013].

⁷⁸ BNF, Factum 7290 (or a more complete version of her testament, Factum 16351). The convent of the Capucines in Paris (next to what is now the Place de Vendôme) was founded by Queen Louise de Lorraine (consort of Henry III) and her sister-in-law, the Duchess of Mercoeur, in 1604. Diefendorf, *From Penitence to Charity*, chapter 4.

⁷⁹ The work is, however, dedicated to Mlle de Montpensier, so she could have been the sponsor.

honour if also terribly draining on his finances.⁸⁰ Nevertheless, the Dowager Duchess of Guise had refused to allow her son's need to *appear* to be head of the family cloud her judgement, and her will had been designed to ensure that the patrimony would remain intact for future generations, by donating all of her properties to his younger brother Joyeuse (replacing him in subsequent versions after his death in autumn 1654 with his infant son, Joseph-Louis). The Duke of Joyeuse had been respected as a level-headed commander, ever loyal to the French crown, but was wounded in the French army in Flanders and died a short time later, 'much regretted by the King and all the court, and even the army'.⁸¹ Guise, on the other hand, had demonstrated remarkable inconstancy to family, to women, to the kings of both France and Spain, and a willingness to alienate properties without much consideration of the consequences, to impress women or to finance unwinnable crusades.⁸² The final version of his mother's testament granted Henri a life pension based on financial

⁸⁰ Louis, duke of Joyeuse acted as Grand Chamberlain at the coronation of Louis XIV in June 1654, but died later that year; the King agreed to transfer the post to his older brother, Henri II. Anselme, *Histoire Généalogique*, vol. VIII, pp. 456-457; AN, O¹, no. 10, fol. 91, 21 May 1655. Financial problems led the Duke to sell the post in 1658 to Godefroy-Maurice de la Tour d'Auvergne, duke of Bouillon, though he continued to exercise the charge until his death (for example presiding over the famous 'Grand Carousel' of 1662). The sale price is uncertain: a legal document from 1679 mentions claims made by the Duke's heirs that the figure of 400,000 *livres* had been omitted from his estate valuation in 1664 for the price of sale of the office. BNF, Factum 14859.

⁸¹ *Mémoires* of the Marquis de Montglat, Petitot, ed. (3 vols, Paris, 1825-26), vol. II, p. 445. Montglat had earlier commented (writing to contrast the actions of Henri during his revolt of 1641) on the valour of the eldest of the Guise sons, François, Prince of Joinville, who had served France honourably in Northern Italy where he was killed in 1639 (vol. I, p. 316).

⁸² In the words of Mlle de Guise's own lawyers, '...suivant la coûtume qu'il a conservé jusque à sa mort de signer tous les actes que l'on luy a présenté', BNF, Ms. français, no. 16573, fols 89-90.

holdings (such as the *gabelles* of Languedoc and the *recettes générales* of Rouen and Caen), but continued to restrict his access to the bulk of the patrimony, entrusting the guardianship of the young Duke of Joyeuse to her clever and thrifty daughter, Mlle de Guise.⁸³ Not to be overlooked, the Dowager Duchess' final testament was *also* strong enough to block the pretensions of her grand-daughter from her first marriage, the powerful princess of the blood, La Grande Mademoiselle, again leaving the Guise patrimony in a much more secure state.⁸⁴

Although the Duke of Guise would protest his mother's actions during his periods of exile and disgrace, his honour and that of his dynasty remained intact. He maintained his position of prestige at court and in the kingdom, famously leading one of the four armies (the 'Americans') in the equestrian ballet of 1662 in the heart of Paris, the other three being led by none other than the King, his brother, Monsieur, and the first prince of the blood, the Prince of Condé.⁸⁵ Meanwhile, the bulk of the patrimony remained intact in the capable managerial hands of his sister, Mlle de Guise, guardian of their nephew, the Guise heir, Joseph-Louis, who succeeded as

⁸³ BNF, Factum 7290, Testament of Mme de Guise. The testaments of Mme de Guise and Mlle de Guise (in 1688) and their final inventories are the subjects of a forthcoming chapter by this author on Guisard dynastic identity: 'Points of Transferral: Mademoiselle de Guise's Will and the Transferability of Dynastic Identity', in Liesbeth Geever and Mirella Marini, eds., *Dynastic Identity in Early Modern Europe: Rulers, Aristocrats and the Formation of Identities* (forthcoming, Ashgate).

⁸⁴ Although not strong enough to throw Montpensier's pretensions out of court entirely, the details of the will were enough to keep the case in the courts until the deaths of both parties in the 1688 and 1693, so a bit of a pyrrhic victory.

⁸⁵ This extravagant 'Carousel du Louvre' was well publicised by the lavishly illustrated volume by Charles Perrault, *Courses de têtes et de bague faites par le Roi et les Princes et Seigneurs de sa cour en l'année 1662* (Paris, Imprimerie royale, 1670).

sixth duke of Guise in 1664.⁸⁶ In the lawsuit of 1661, the Parlement of Paris, staffed by men the Henriette-Catherine de Joyeuse had worked with for decades, felt certain that ‘Mother’ *did* indeed know best, swiftly dismissed her son’s claims against her without much consideration.⁸⁷

Lines written in defence of the exiled Queen Mother, Marie de Medici, could be employed in summing up the attitude between Henri II de Guise and his mother: ‘God made you first of all the sons of your mother as well as made you King and he no less instituted obedience of children to their fathers, than that of subjects to their King.’ The author hints that disobedience was a source of barrenness in marriage, equally applicable in the case of the Duke of Guise: ‘It is lawful and perhaps advantageous for kings to dismiss a Councillor; it is never permitted to them to torment a mother.’⁸⁸ Another contemporary quotation could also be modified to apply to the Dowager Duchess of Guise, this time by Louis XIV himself in speaking about his own mother, Anne of Austria, after her death: ‘The Queen Mother was not only a

⁸⁶ For an example of Mlle de Guise’s direct administration, see AN, R⁴ 1056, inventory of papers, no. 54, accounts rendered to Mlle de Guise by Jean Bruneau, *secrétaire du roi, intendant des affaires* and *tuteur onéraire* of Duke Joseph-Louis, for the years 1655-65. Mlle de Guise would herself succeed to the Guise estates and titles following the deaths of her nephew, Joseph-Louis, in 1671, and his young son, François-Joseph, in 1675.

⁸⁷ Many of the loan and mortgage transactions of the 1630s and 1640s were with Parisian *parlementaires*, for example, the transaction of 1654 between Guise and Joyeuse cites loans made to the Duchess by Charpentier, counsellor of state; Maudat, maître des comptes; Bourdaloue, Guise’s secretary; d’Aligre, counsellor of state; Nicolas de Bautru, comte de Nogent; and Abel Servien, marquis de Sablé. AN, MC, étude LI, no. 243, 16 July 1654. The settlement of 1646 (cited in the same document) was witnessed by Président de Mesmes and Président de Thou.

⁸⁸ Mathieu de Morgues, *Recueil de pieces pour la defense de la reyne ...* (Antwerp, 1643), quoted in Crawford, p. 92.

great queen, but [...] deserves to be placed at the rank of the greatest kings.⁸⁹

Henriette-Catherine de Joyeuse should indeed be considered amongst the greatest of the dukes of Guise for her achievements in preserving the patrimony and the honour of her adopted house. Anne of Austria and Mme de Guise both had difficult waters to navigate in the 1640s, one in defence of her son, the other in spite of hers. Both acted behind the scenes, leaving the public glory to the male head of the house, but deftly manoeuvred to leave behind more stability than they had inherited from previous regimes.

⁸⁹ Quoted by Mme de Motteville, *Mémoires* (1847 edn), p. 569.