Joseph Bergin. *Cardinal de la Rochefoucauld. Leadership and Reform in the French Church*. Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 1988. VIII + 392.

L'intérêt parle toutes sortes de langages, et joue toutes sortes de personnages, même celui de désintéressé. (François de la Rochefoucauld [1613–1618], grand-nephew of the Cardinal, maxime # 39)

This maxim of the famous grand-nephew of the Cardinal de la Rochefoucauld would serve well as an introductory motto for Professor Bergin's book on the Cardinal (1558–1645), who was a leader of the church and a reformer of the regular clergy in France. Joseph Bergin states in the introduction:

Genuine reform 'in head and members' of a church dominated at almost every level by vested interests embedded in an archaic benefice-system would have had to have been revolutionary to be wholly successful, and there was nothing revolutionary about the Counter-Reformation church. (p.2)

The Cardinal had actually to struggle against a tight network of benefice-interests of clergy, nobility and crown which sabotaged to a large extent his lifelong attempts at reform of the clergy in general and the monastic orders in particular. Bergin uncovers in his extremely well documented study a little known aspect of French church history of the first half of the seventeenth century. In chapters one to five he describes the Cardinal's education and career, paying close attention to their political context. The following five chapters describe the Cardinal's activities as papal commissioner for the reform of the monastic orders in France and his ongoing fight against anti-reformist interests.

The king nominated François de la Rochefoucauld at the age of 26 as Bishop of Clermont. He had not reached the minimum age for a Bishop, but he had no problem in getting the papal confirmation. Both the crown and the curia had strong political interests in his becoming Bishop of Clermont. Bergin writes:

At a time when royal authority was weakening noticeably in the provinces, an episcopal nomination was an important political act ... The family seat [of the Rochefoucalds] was, after all, in the Auvergne, and one consequence of the monarchy's weakness was greater pressure to nominate bishops whose family base was in the vacant diocese. (p. 16)

The curia, on the other hand, was afraid of Gallicanism, i.e. that movement in the French church that tended toward more and more independence from Rome. François de la Rochefoucauld had no academic degree, although he had received an excellent education at the Jesuit college in Paris. In spite of that, and in spite of being too young, he received the papal confirmation soon after the king had nominated him, for, as Bergin writes, at that time "the papacy tended to worry more about the orthodoxy of incoming French bishops than their qualifications." (p.17) About the orthodoxy of this *nominé*, however, there were no doubts at all. Trained

by the Jesuits, he was ultramontane and, in addition, descended from an ultramontane family. It is ironic that François de la Rochefoucauld owed his bishopric to a system of political interests which he as a reformer was to struggle against all his life.

François' older Brother, Jean-Louis, was governor of Auvergne and a strong partisan of the Ligue, during the tensions between the Catholic Ligue and the crown. François, too, was a lifelong Liguist. He recognised Henry IV only because he received papal authorisation to do so. "His allegiance to the crown was conditional upon its support for the church, and Henry IV was not the ideal *defensor fidei*." (p.33)

But Henry of Navarre was now king of France, and in recognition of this fact, La Rochefoucauld dedicated the second edition of his treatise *De l'Autorité de l'Eglise* to him. As the king was interested in building up French influence in Rome, he made La Rochefoucauld Ambassador to the Holy See, and, on the king's suggestion, the Pope made him Cardinal. In this position La Rochefoucauld had, *nolens volens*, to represent French interests.

After the assassination of Henry IV, Gallicanism gained strength in France. La Rochefoucauld attended the Estates General as a delegate, and the dispute over state-church relations going on there

propelled La Rochefoucauld into political life. The very first article of the Third Estate's cahier demanded the enactment of a fundamental law to the effect that the king and his kingdom were subject to no external power, either spiritual or temporal; that he was answerable to God alone, to whom he owed his crown; that those holding opinions contrary to this law – which was in accordance with God's word – should be considered traitors and sworn enemies of the crown; and that all office – and benefice-holders should be required to assent to it before taking up their offices. (p. 50 f)

This article "was the distilled essence of Gallican and *parlementaire* thought." (ibid.) It is ironic again that La Rochefoucauld and other leading clergy were appointed by the Régente Marie de Medici to find a compromise between the antagonistic parties. Soon the conflict was aggravated by the clergy's (especially the Jesuits') attempt to make the decisions of the Council of Trent part of the French law.

Bergin gives a fascinating picture of French internal policy's being paralysed again and again by the conflicting interests of clergy, nobility and Third Estate. La Rochefoucauld as president of the King's Council and Grand Almoner of France stands in the centre where all those lines of interest cross. Richelieu succeeds him as president of the King's Council. (In his brilliant study entitled *Cardinal Richelieu. Power and the Pursuit of Wealth* Professor Bergin described how Richelieu as head of the administration followed his own interests and accumulated enormous wealth.)

In 1622 "the papacy finally granted [La Rochefoucauld] a special commission for six years to reform the main monastic orders of France. It was an undertaking that had the king's support, but even so the task was enormous." (p.65 f) This new task took the Cardinal away from the court. He directed the reform from his Paris *hôtel* Ste-Geneviève, holding innumerable meetings with abbots, bishops and patrons of the various monasteries. His reform work was relatively successful with the Canons Regular, but failed with Cluny and Cîteaux. In many ways La Rochefoucauld's undertaking was diametrically opposed to Cardinal Richelieu's tendencies. La Rochefoucauld represented the centralism of the curia; the reformed orders were more strictly bound to Rome than before. Richelieu, on the other hand, attempted

to define royal power more precisely, and to raise kingship above all earthly authority ... French foreign policy, directed mainly against Habsburg-Spain seemed increasingly divorced from religious considerations and hostile to the best interests of Catholicism. (p. 68)

What the author, appropriately remaining within the limits of his subject matter, does not mention is that Cardinal Richelieu substantially supported the Swedish Lutheran king's attack against the German Emperor's armies in the Thirty Years War. Habsburg surrounded France from the South (Spain), the South-East (Lombardy), the East (Alsace) and the North (Netherlands). So it was in France's national interest that Habsburg be weakened, regardless of the Emperor's Catholicity. Cecil Rhodes is said to have coined the maxim: "A country never has continual friends or continual enemies; a country only has continual interests." One is tempted to add to this one more sentence: "Neither does a country have a permanent religion or Cardinal Richelieu exemplifies this".

What is said in these maxims about whole nations could, however, also be said about smaller communities. Professor Bergin gives ample evidence for the validity of these maxims for each of the three parts of the French Estates General. And chapters six to ten of his book present a series of cases in which still small communities (families, bishops as patrons of monasteries, monasteries themselves) want to preserve their material interests against La Rochefoucauld's religiously motivated attempts at reform.

The Cardinal requested "full return to community life and observance based on the three vows of poverty, chastity and obedience; exemptions and privileges militating against them would be suppressed." (p. 167) He intended to add to every chapter of reformed Canons Regular a "*Séminaire des enfants* ... to educate young boys and to prepare those with a vocation for their entry into the religious life." (ibid.) He had, however, to give up this project at the chapter of Ste-Geneviève in Paris, i.e. at his own residence, because the Jesuits were opposed to it. They were afraid this new school might compete with their own college. (p. 174) Really, "l'intérêt parle toutes sortes de langages", including the language of the Jesuits.

The reader admires La Rochefoucauld for overcoming again and again so many frustrating experiences and for tirelessly pursuing his reform work. The church historian will be grateful to Professor Bergin for having unearthed such a complex and fascinating chapter of Counter-Reformation.

JAKOB AMSTUTZ, *University of Guelph*

Alan Young. *Tudor and Jacobean Tournaments*. London: George Philip, 1987. Pp. 224.

Twenty-five years ago, Glynne Wickham observed at the start of *Early English Stages* that "Of the many separate components that Time has welded together to form the literary drama, few have received such scant attention from historians as the Tournament." (p. 13). That was certainly the situation in 1963: Roy Strong had just submitted his dissertation to the University of London and Sydney Anglo had just begun to publish College of Arms' records of tournaments, so that apart from Frances Yates' influential article, "Elizabethan Chivalry: The Romance of the Accession Day Tilts", Wickham had only the impressionistic overviews of R.C. Clephan (*The Tournament; Its Periods and Phases* [1919]) and Francis Henry Cripps-Day (*The History of the Tournament in England and in France* [1918]) to go on. What was needed was a comprehensive account of the development of the tournament in England, and that need remained despite distinguished studies of the Great Tournament Roll of Westminster, the Burgundian origins of Tudor spectacle, and the importance of tiltyard entertainments to the cult of Elizabeth. With the publication of *Tudor and Jacobean Tournaments*, Alan Young has met this longstanding need – a surprising one too when one thinks that Peele, Sidney, Shakespeare, and Jonson wrote for tournaments, that noblemen such as Essex, Cumberland, Windsor, and Sussex commissioned paintings of themselves in tilting gear, and that money lavished upon the tournament by Tudor and Stuart monarchs "far surpassed that spent on disguisings, pageants, masques and plays ..." (p.7).

As one would expect of a book published by George Philip, a house best known for atlases, *Tudor and Jacobean Tournaments* is a handsome volume, richly illustrated. As one might also expect, it is not an altogether scholarly book. There is neither a bibliography nor a list of illustrations specifying their original contexts and dates. The terminology, methods of analysis, and chronological structure (that of the book as a whole and of its various chapters) make the book accessible to an audience much wider than that schooled in inter-textuality, cultural inscriptions, methodological self-reflexiveness, and the like. Presumably the same attempt to reach a broad spectrum of readers lies behind the inclusion of some illustrations that have been frequently reproduced and shed little light on tournaments *per se*, such as Sittow's portrait of Henry VII (his lips pursed, his parsimonious eyes smiling) with a caption which includes the commonplace note that "Henry VII united the