Introduction

The Other Voice

[Monsieur de Voysenon] told [the soldiers] that in the past he had known me to be a good Catholic, but that he could not say whether or not I had remained that way. At that moment arrived an honorable woman who asked them what they wanted to do with me; they told her, “By God, she is a Huguenot who ought to be drowned.”

Charlotte Arbaleste Duplessis-Mornay, Memoirs

The judge was talking about the people who had been arrested and the sorts of disguises they had used. All of this terrified me. But my fear was far greater when both the priest and the judge turned to me and said, “Here is a little rascal who could easily be a Huguenot.” I was very upset to see myself addressed that way. However, I responded with as much firmness as I could, “I can assure you, sir, that I am as much a Catholic as I am a boy.”

Anne Marguerite Petit Du Noyer, Memoirs

The cover of this book depicting Protestantism as a woman attacked on all sides reproduces the engraving that appears on the frontispiece of the first volume of Élie Benoist’s History of the Edict of Nantes.¹ This illustration serves well Benoist’s purpose in writing his massive work, which was to protest both the injustice of revoking an “irrevocable” edict and the oppressive measures accompanying it. It also says much about the Huguenot experience in general, and the experience of Huguenot women in particular.

When Benoist undertook the writing of his work, the association between Protestantism and women was not new. Sixteenth-century Catholic theologians attributed the success of Protestantism to a “feminization of society.” In their view,

¹. Élie Benoist, Histoire de l’Édit de Nantes: Contenant les choses les plus remarquables qui se sont passées en France avant et après sa publication, 3 vols. in 5 (Delft: Beman, 1693–1695). On this important work, see Hubert Bost, “Élie Benoist et l’historiographie de l’Édit de Nantes,” in Coexister dans l’intolérance: L’Édit de Nantes, 1598, ed. Michel Grandjean and Bernard Roussel, Bulletin de la société de l’histoire du protestantisme français 144 (Jan.–June 1998): 371–84, and Charles P. Johnston, “Élie Benoist, Historian of the Edict of Nantes,” American Society of Church History 55, no. 4 (1986): 468–88. Benoist was the Huguenot refugee minister of the Walloon Church in Delft (Netherlands); the Walloon churches were Calvinist churches founded by French-speakers from France or the southern Low Countries.
the Reformation was able to spread through the kingdom of France because men were showing signs of femininity. Drawing on the rich repertoire of misogynistic stereotypes, Catholic polemicists associated the Reformation with female attributes such as mutability, unreliability, foolishness, inability to follow rules, and immorality. \(^2\) They frequently referred to heretics as *femmelettes*, a word which at the time designated effeminate men whose conduct did not comply with socially acceptable standards of manhood. This derogatory term was meant to point at the heretics’ ignorance and gullibility and, at the same time, caution society against the blurring of gender roles and the overall chaos brought about by the Reformation. From the Catholic point of view, Protestantism was a source of divisiveness capable of upsetting the “natural” hierarchy between the sexes and turning “the world upside down.” \(^3\) Not only did it change men into *femmelettes*; it also allowed women to exert authority over men, which was considered contrary to both nature and the will of God. In the eyes of Catholic censors, the Reformation unduly gave women a more active part in the religious life of their communities and allowed them to meddle in spiritual matters when they were considered unfitted, both intellectually and morally, to understand theology. \(^4\) Where women needed to be restrained (they were commonly viewed as lustful and prone to disorders such as hysteria), Protestantism gave them more freedom.

Claude Haton, a priest from Provins, argued that, due to their inherent weakness, women were the first to be seduced by the new faith. In his account of the Reformation from 1553 to 1582, \(^5\) he claimed that debauchery was the means by which Reformed men tried to win over converts to the new faith, that they willingly abandoned their wives and daughters to ecclesiastics who abjured Catholicism. He viewed Huguenot women as morally corrupt and Protestantism as a possible source of women’s perversion. A case in point: princesses and noblewomen who escaped the surveillance of their husbands to attend mixed-gender

---

2. The popularity of Protestantism was viewed as a woman’s whim. See Luc Racaut, *Hatred in Print: Catholic Propaganda and Protestant Identity during the French Wars of Religion* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2002), 90.


4. Protestant women generally received a better education than their Catholic counterparts in order to read the bible, run their households, and share with their husbands the responsibility of rearing the children. In the early days of the Reformation movement some could be seen holding meetings, christening children, and even preaching. However, from 1560 onwards, women were no longer allowed to play such roles in church life, and men were generally given preference over women in positions of authority.

clandestine meetings during which they changed from good and honest women to whores and sluts.\(^6\)

In a culture in which women were continually associated with sin and deemed inferior to men, and Huguenots were perceived as dangerous agitators and heretics, Huguenot women were in effect doubly marginalized. Judged by the gender and partisan ideologies\(^7\) that prevailed at the time, they were ostracized both as women and as Huguenots.

From the point of view of the Huguenots themselves, women's conversion to and persistence in the Reformed faith was a sign of their strength rather than their weakness. The present collection includes texts written by three Huguenot women, describing their valiant struggles to escape persecution and death during different stages of the Reform in France. Charlotte Arbaleste Duplessis-Mornay writes of her escape from Paris at the time of the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre in August 1572; Anne de Chaufepié and Anne Marguerite Petit Du Noyer recount their own experiences and those of many women whom they encountered as they risked escape from France in the years following the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes on October 22, 1685.

**Charlotte Arbaleste Duplessis-Mornay (1548–1606)**

Charlotte Arbaleste was born on February 1, 1548, to Gui II Arbaleste (ca. 1518–1570), lord of Corbeil and de la Borde, viscount of Melun (1552), and president of the Chamber of Accounts of Paris (1555), and to Madeleine Chevalier, lady of Esprunes et Vignaux. In early youth, Charlotte embraced the Calvinistic faith, but her parents had fallen on different sides of the spiritual divide. For a while her father vacillated between Catholicism and the Reformed religion, but in 1569, he definitively embraced the new faith. Her mother remained Catholic until her death, and had her three sons convert to Catholicism when the religious conflict became more violent. Charlotte, as noted in the first part of her story translated here resisted her mother's pressure and fulfilled her spiritual obligations. In 1567, she married a Huguenot, the younger son of the marquis of Feuqu(i)ères, known as Jean “Fringallet” de Pas (ca. 1510–1569), lord of Martinsart, commander of a company of light cavalry and governor of Roye in Picardy. He took part in the Amboise Conspiracy of 1560 and died at La Charité on May 23, 1569, by a musket.

---


shot to the chest while fighting alongside the Huguenot leader, the Admiral Gaspard de Coligny.8 Charlotte had a daughter with him, Suzanne de Pas de Feuqu(i)ères, who was born in Sedan on December 29, 1568, without ever seeing her father. At nineteen, Charlotte was left a widow.

While in Sedan, Charlotte was introduced to Philippe de Mornay (1549–1623), lord of Plessis-Marly, and governor of Saumur.9 Anne and Philippe had much in common: they both had grown up in religiously divided families; they both were in Paris at the time of the St. Bartholomew’s Day Massacre and narrowly escaped death; they had strong religious convictions and a common interest in science. In 1575, Philippe proposed to Charlotte. From the outset, she had seen their “intellectual idyll” as “the sign of a spiritual election.”10 She bragged that Philippe chose her above wealthier noblewomen from Sedan, although she did not have a dowry. Charlotte and Philippe were married on January 3, 1576, after Philippe returned from a campaign in the Netherlands. Out of the eight children they had together, only four survived: Marthe, born on December 17, 1576; Elisabeth, born June 1, 1578 during Duplessis-Mornay’s embassy at the court of England and named after Queen Elizabeth; Philippe, born in Antwerp on July 20, 1579; and Anne, born in 1583.

Charlotte and Philippe’s union appears to have been the egalitarian marriage that was championed among Calvinist elites.11 Philippe made Charlotte mistress of their estate and gave her the legal rights to have full control of the household

8. Gaspard II de Coligny (1519–1572), marshal, then admiral, most prominent military and political leader of the Huguenot party, one of the first of countless victims of the St. Bartholomew’s Day Massacre. As Admiral of France, Coligny authorized several expeditions to establish colonies abroad in which Huguenots could find a refuge.

9. Duplessis-Mornay is known for his political and military activities, as well as his diplomatic skills. He was entrusted with several important missions: he made a name for himself in 1578–1582, when charged by Coligny with a confidential assignment to assist William of Orange, and again in 1584, when, at the death of François d’Anjou, he led an action for a legitimate accession of the king of Navarre to the throne of France. But upon Henri’s ascension to the throne as Henri IV in 1589 and his subsequent attempt to rally the principal Catholic lords, Duplessis-Mornay, who had been at his right hand since 1576, was progressively removed from royal initiatives. Duplessis also distinguished himself as a warrior in the decisive battles between the Huguenots and the League’s armies, and in particular at the Battle of Coutras, on October 20, 1587. See Eugène Haag and Émile Haag, La France protestante, ou vies des protestants français qui se sont fait un nom, 10 vols. (Paris: J.-B. Gros; Geneva: Joël Cherbuliez, 1846–1859), 7:512–42.

10. The expressions are from Évelyne Berriot-Salvadore, Les femmes dans la société française de la Renaissance (Geneva: Droz, 1990), 127. On Mornay, see 123–33.

11. Recent studies have questioned the positive effect of Calvinist doctrines on marriage. For different perspectives on this matter, see Amanda Eurich, “Women in the Huguenot Communities,” in A Companion to the Huguenots, ed. Raymond A. Mentzer and Bertrand Van Ruymbake (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 118–49.
Introduction during his frequent absences. The religious wars, however, brought Charlotte unique challenges in her task of caring for the estate and the growing family. Most of the time, she was left to cope alone with her delicate health, her miscarriages, and the births and deaths of their children. During his political career, Philippe was sent on numerous diplomatic missions in France but also in England and in the Low Countries. In order to lend support to her husband’s career, Charlotte accompanied him as often as she could and sometimes joined him later, even if this meant undertaking long and perilous trips with their young children. She was privy to Philippe’s professional affairs because many political meetings took place at their home and she had access to her husband’s correspondence and secret papers. When she stayed home, Philippe relied heavily on her assistance. She would exchange coded letters with him on matters of utmost importance, and smuggle clandestine messages to key figures of the Huguenot party. It was she who saw to the publication of her husband’s writings.

The death on the battlefield of their beloved son, Philippe, deeply affected Philippe and Charlotte. When they first learned of the tragic news, their pain was so profound that they could not even speak to each other. Their strong religious convictions helped them find solace and accept this trial as God’s will, but Charlotte never completely recovered from the shock caused by this bereavement. On May 23, 1606, approximately six months after the loss of her son, Charlotte died, unable to surmount her grief.

Charlotte Duplessis-Mornay was a prolific letter writer, but today she is best known as the author of her Memoirs about her husband. We know of three extant manuscripts of the Memoirs. The first, generally considered to be the most complete and reliable, has handwritten notations in the margins identified as Charlotte’s own. The second, found recently at the library of the Musée

12. See Mémoires de Madame de Mornay, suivies des lettres inédites, ed. Henriette de Witt, 2 vols. (Paris: Veuve de J. Renouard [Société de l’histoire de la France], 1868–1869), 1:140 (for the birth of Anne). Unable to arrive in time at Charlotte’s bedside for the birth of their first daughter Marthe, Philippe sensed the exact moment at which Charlotte delivered the baby (1:111–12), a fact indicative, in her eyes, of their symbiotic relationship.

13. The doctors who examined her attributed her death to constitutional and other maladies with which she had been struggling all her life and which were aggravated by grief: “the melancholic humor spreading in the intestines eroded the colon causing the insupportable colic that tormented her.” See Patricia Phillippy, Women, Death, and Literature in Post-Reformation England (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 163–65.

de Chantilly, is a replica copy of the first.\textsuperscript{15} The third is written in the hand of Elisabeth de Fontenay, Charlotte’s daughter.\textsuperscript{16}

Charlotte’s \textit{Memoirs}, which was written over the years 1584 to 1606, did not appear in print until 1624.\textsuperscript{17} A modern edition appeared in 1824–1825, and like that of 1624, it includes the \textit{Memoirs} as well as the correspondence of Duplessis-Mornay and many scattered papers.\textsuperscript{18} Another edition appeared in 1868–1869, containing seventy-nine previously unpublished letters including many letters from Philippe to Charlotte, among them letters from their son, and other works.\textsuperscript{19}

In 2010, Nadine Kuperty-Tsur published a new edition, in the introduction to which she examines the historical content of the \textit{Memoirs}, providing an overview of Duplessis-Mornay’s political, diplomatic, and military career during the critical years of the Wars of Religion, and sheds light on the originality of this female-authored memoir.\textsuperscript{20} Composition of works such as Mornay’s \textit{Memoirs}—half historical, half autobiographical—gained increasing popularity in the seventeenth century, becoming a particularly female phenomenon and a major literary genre.\textsuperscript{21}

\textsuperscript{15} Bibliothèque du Musée de Condé au Château de Chantilly: Manuscrit no. 907: \textit{Memoires de Charlotte Arbaleste, dame du Plessis-Mornay}. The existence of this manuscript was made known by Nadine Kuperty-Tsur in her 2010 edition of the \textit{Memoirs: Les Mémoires de Madame de Mornay} (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2010), 14.

\textsuperscript{16} Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France: Manuscrit 10629 and Supplément français 5602: \textit{Memoires de Charlotte Arbaleste}.

\textsuperscript{17} \textit{Memoires de messire Philippes de Mornay, seigneur du Plessis Marli, … contenans divers discours, instructions, lettres et dépêches par lui dressées ou escrites aux rois, roines …}, compiled by David de Liques and Valentin Conrart, ed. Jean Daillé ([La Forest, Belgium]: Jean Bureau, 1624–1625). It is currently available on Gallica and preserved in Paris at the Bibliothèque nationale de France: RES4-LA23-3(1).


\textsuperscript{19} Mornay, \textit{Mémoires}, ed. Witt. The other works include a first-person account of the quarrel between Charlotte and the Consistory of Montauban concerning her headdress, the \textit{Discours sur la mort de dame Charlotte Arbaleste}, and two \textit{Sonnets de Monsieur du Plessis}. Witt’s edition was based upon the Sorbonne manuscript. In addition, she used the Chantilly manuscript, as Nadine Kuperty-Tsur reports (see above, note 15). While preparing her own edition of the \textit{Memoirs}, Kuperty-Tsur came across the Chantilly manuscript which contained paper marks and notes handwritten by Madame Witt. The reason why Witt does not mention this manuscript remains unknown.

\textsuperscript{20} \textit{Mémoires}, ed. Kuperty-Tsur. This edition is also based on the Sorbonne manuscript.

\textsuperscript{21} On the various ways in which late sixteenth-century and seventeenth-century female authors reconfigure the genre of history, see Faith E. Beasley, \textit{Revising Memory: Women’s Fiction and Memoirs in Seventeenth-Century France} (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1990); Susan Broomhall and Colette H. Winn, “La représentation de soi dans les mémoires féminins du début de l’époque moderne,” in \textit{Masques et figures du sujet féminin aux XVIe et XVIIe siècles}, ed. Claude La Charité,
**Anne de Chaufepié (February 20, 1640–?)**

All that we know about Anne de Chaufepié is what we read in her writings and those of her brother Samuel, which survived in family archives. Her works, which are translated in this volume, include a one-and-one-half page account of her father's and mother's lives and deaths, dated July 12, 1684, as well as a brief autobiographical piece, referred to as her *Journal*, written in 1689 in Balk, Friesland, after she had been expelled from France. Samuel's writings include his *Mémoires pour la famille des S[eigneu]rs de Chaufepié* (Memoirs of the Family of the Lords de Chaufepié), and his *Abrégé des principaux évènemens de ma vie* (A Summation of the Principal Events of My Life).

The Chaufepiés came from a noble Italian family whose name changed when they moved to France in 1495: from the Italian *Calfopedi*, it became the French *Caufapé* and its numerous variants: *Chauphapié*, *Chaufepied*, and *Chaufepié*. Beginning with Jean de Chaufepié (1536–1580), who had adopted the Protestant faith against the will of his father, all the men in the family, from father to son, were Protestant pastors.

Anne de Chaufepié was the eldest daughter of Second de Chaufepié (April 3, 1610–1684), pastor in Champdeniers and Saint-Christophe-sur-roc in the province of Poitou for some fifty years (1635–1684), and Claude de la Forest (1610–1662), whose father (Samuel de la Forest) was a pastor as well in Mauzé (Poitou). Married in 1637, the Chaufepiés had seven children, two of whom (Marie and Gédéon) died either at birth or in infancy. Among the other five, there were two sons, Samuel (1644–1704) and Second II (1645–1720), and three

---

22. Anne de Chaufepié’s *Journal* is preserved in the miscellaneous manuscript *Lettres de pasteurs, journal d’Anne de Chaufepié, état civil, sermons, papiers de Gobinaud, etc.*, Paris, Bibliothèque du protestantisme français: Ms. 4681–2; and is published as *Journal manuscrit d’Anne de Chaufepié à l’époque des dragonnades et du refuge, 1685–1688*, Bulletin de la société de l’histoire du protestantisme français 6 (1857): 57–68 and 256–68.


daughters, Anne, Catherine, and Marie-Claude, respectively born in 1640, 1642, and 1657.

In November 1685, following the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, Anne’s brothers and her uncle M. de la Forest, her mother’s brother, all of whom were pastors, were forced to leave the country. They seemed to have traveled separately to the Netherlands where Huguenots sought asylum as persecution intensified. M. de la Forest and Second II, with Anne’s youngest sister Marie-Claude (who must have left with them or at about the same time), all settled in Amsterdam. On November 14, 1685, Samuel left La Rochelle with his young wife, Marie Marbœuf, who was pregnant at the time, and their fifteen-month-old daughter Suzanne, who died in early March 1686. On November 29, they arrived in Falmouth (England), and on January 9, 1686, they embarked on a British ship going to Rotterdam. On February 2, they landed in Rotterdam where they spent a few days. On February 7, Samuel and his wife and child finally reached Amsterdam where they joined up with the rest of the family. In June of that year, the two brothers went to Balk, where they each assumed positions as pastors. Later on, they requested to be transferred to Leuvarde, the capital of Friesland, which, they thought, would offer their children better educational opportunities.

In 1681, François-Michel le Tellier, Marquis de Louvois and Minister of War, had revived the old custom of lodging troops at the expenses of communes and well-to-do homes, and proposed to the king that those who would abjure Protestantism be exempt for two years from such a practice. In that year, a first

26. In Samuel de Chaufepié’s Abrégé (Summation), in Chaufepié and N. W., “Mémoires de la famille de Chaufepié,” 250–52, Anne is referred to as “ma sœur de Villeneuve,” Marie-Claude as “ma sœur des Aubiers,” and Catherine as “ma sœur de la Croix.”

27. Many of the events recounted here occurred in La Rochelle and surrounding areas. The heavily Protestant city of La Rochelle had become the capital of Protestantism, and remained the stronghold of Huguenot resistance once peace was re-established in 1598. In the first part of the seventeenth century, La Rochelle continued to defy royal authority (as in the rebellions of 1621–1622, the so-called Rohan wars), but in 1627–1628, after a siege of fourteen months, the city was forced to surrender. While Huguenots retained the religious freedom granted by the Edict of Nantes, they lost territorial, political and military rights, and were left at the mercy of the monarchy. On the fall of La Rochelle, see David Parker, La Rochelle and the French Monarchy: Conflict and Order in Seventeenth-Century France (London: Royal Historical Society, 1980), 6–17.

raid, or *dragonnade*,29 took place in Poitou at the order of its Intendant,30 René de Marillac. Many of the Huguenots from Poitou fled to England and Holland.31 In the years 1681 to 1688, the king sent *dragonnades* throughout France, teams of “missionary dragoons” or “mounted soldiers” tasked to intimidate Huguenots into converting to the Catholic faith.

Around this time, Anne had gone with her sister Catherine to the home of their two aunts, the Mesdemoiselles de la Forest, in the parish of Mauzé, a place of refuge where Reformed worship was maintained until the Revocation. But at the arrival of the dragoons, Anne and her sister were forced to flee and seek refuge at a castle nearby. The Château d’Olbreuse, property of the brother of Éléonore Marie Desmier d’Olbreuse (1639–1722), duchess of Zell, offered Huguenots who were fleeing persecution in Poitou and Saintonge a safe place where they could hide temporarily before escaping across frontiers or overseas. It was most likely there that Anne met Jean Migault, a Huguenot teacher from Mougon, who also recorded the persecutions that his family suffered.32 Shortly after their arrival at the castle, Anne and her sister had to leave again. Catherine, who seemed to have found another hiding place, remained in the Huguenot stronghold of La Rochelle until an opportunity came about for her to leave the country safely. When such an opportunity presented itself, she fled and, in March 1687, joined her family in Balk, where her brothers lived at the time.

As for Anne, she attempted to leave France the year before with her two aunts and her friends, the Mesdemoiselles de Boisragon, Saint-Laurent, and Saumaise. However, things went wrong: Anne was caught on April 23, 1686, and put in prison in the citadel of Ré [on the Île de Ré, off La Rochelle], where she remained for over a year. In May 1687, she was transferred to the Ursuline convent in Niort, and about two months later, taken to a filthy prison in Poitiers where she


31. Holland, a province of the Dutch Republic, a state existing between 1581 and 1795 and the forerunner of the modern nation of the Netherlands, was a refuge for the persecuted Protestants of Europe during the religious wars of the sixteenth century. At the time of the Revocation, it became with England the principal asylum of exiled Huguenots. An estimated 35,000 French émigrés from all parts of France, from all ranks and conditions, eventually settled in the Dutch Republic. See David van der Linden, *Experiencing Exile: Huguenot Refugees in the Dutch Republic, 1680–1700* (Farnham, Surrey, UK: Ashgate, 2015).

remained five days, then to the Conciergerie\textsuperscript{33} of Chartres for an additional two weeks. Finally, she was locked up in the Abbey of Arsisse where she was strongly encouraged to convert to Catholicism, but she resisted the pressures to which she was subjected. In May 1688, she was taken to Caen, and from there put on a ship going to Rotterdam, where she arrived on June 3, 1688. In late September, 1688, Anne was finally reunited with her brothers and sisters in Balk. She was granted the honorary title of \textit{confesseuse} in recognition for her steadfastness in the face of adversity\textsuperscript{34} and later joined the \textit{Société des demoiselles françaises} in The Hague.\textsuperscript{35}

Besides the piece on her parents, the only document with Anne de Chaufepié's signature is her \textit{Journal} of the years 1685 to 1688, a manuscript roughly twenty-six pages long written in the thin and distinct hand of one of the author's nieces, and printed for the first time in 1857.\textsuperscript{36} It is translated in this volume.

\textbf{Anne Marguerite Petit Du Noyer (1663–1719)}

Anne Marguerite, Catherine Petit was born in Nîmes on June 12, 1663, to a Protestant bourgeois family.\textsuperscript{37} Jacques Petit (1615–1672) and Catherine Cotton married in 1661 and had a boy who died in infancy. In 1664, when Catherine died, Anne Marguerite was barely one year old. Marguerite Cotton Saporta (1613?–1696), her maternal aunt and godmother, adopted her and raised her as her own child. Since the Saportas had no children of their own, they made Anne Marguerite their heiress. Monsieur Saporta (d. 1717) had acquired a large fortune selling real estate, but on a gambling night, he lost most of his wealth and later went to jail for failure to pay his taxes. From an early age, Anne Marguerite was found to be “unusually articulate and self-assured.”\textsuperscript{38} Madame Saporta was proud of Anne Marguerite’s intellectual precociousness and made sure that she received the best education possible, a fact that Du Noyer willingly acknowledges in her memoir: “[Madame Saporta], who was fit to raise a queen, adopted me at my

33. conciergerie: a place of detention or the place where prisoners are held while awaiting trial.
mother’s death and took care of my education, and I must admit, to my shame, that it was up to me to turn out well. I was so well taught that with a little memory and my quick mind I said things that were far beyond my age and soon acquired the reputation of a prodigy.” As an adult, Anne Marguerite was never thought to be attractive, for she was unusually short and she became stouter and stouter as years went by, but she was generally admired for her intelligence and wit.

When persecution began in Nîmes, Anne Marguerite and her adoptive mother prepared to flee to Switzerland, but in Lyon they had to separate. Anne Marguerite went on by herself to Geneva and from there to The Hague, where one of her paternal uncles, Pierre Petit, and his family had emigrated. Her maternal uncle Gaspard Cotton, a wealthy Huguenot who lived in Paris, attempted to find her a position as lady-in-waiting in The Hague, but things did not work out and Anne Marguerite had to return to Paris. After several unsuccessful attempts to reach freedom in Geneva, Madame Saporta had joined her brother in Paris and the two of them were forced to abjure their Protestant faith. Upon her return to France on December 22, 1686, Anne Marguerite was pressed to do the same. Instead, she convinced Madame Saporta to flee with her to England, but they were caught in Dieppe.

Anne Marguerite was imprisoned in the New Converts in Paris, and then in L’Union Chrétienne, a convent on rue Saint-Denis, and did not come out until she married. After a brief and unsuccessful romance with the young navy officer Abraham-Louis Duquesne, she abjured her faith (although she claimed that she had never been a genuine convert) in order to marry, on May 8, 1688, the Catholic Guillaume Du Noyer (d. 1716), first captain of the Toulouse regiment and author of his own memoirs. This union was quite advantageous for Du Noyer: not only did he receive a royal pension of 600 livres as compensation for the conversion of a Huguenot, but Anne Marguerite’s fortune was also considerable as she was the sole heiress of the wealthy Monsieur Cotton. The family moved on a number of occasions: from Nîmes to Villeneuve-les-Avignon; then to Nîmes again (where, in December 1691, Du Noyer was appointed first consul of the city); then to Paris upon his being appointed deputy of the Province of the Court; and, in late 1695, to Toulouse after he bought the prestigious office of grand master of waters and forests in Upper and Lower Languedoc for 90,000 livres. The Du Noyers had four

39. Du Noyer, Mémoires (Amsterdam: Par la compagnie, 1760), 28; translation by Reynolds-Cornell, Fiction and Reality, 14.
40. The Nouvelles-Converties, rue de Seine-Saint-Victor in Paris. This was the name given to Huguenots who, at the time of the Revocation, remained in France and abjured. They were compelled to observe Catholic religious practices, go to mass, have their children baptized, receive the last Sacraments at the time of death. Many new converts continued to practice the Reformed faith in the family, in private meetings or in clandestine assemblies. When they were caught, they were sent to prisons and galleys. See Joseph Bergin, The Politics of Religion in Early Modern France (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2014), 262–67.
children, three daughters and a son: Anne Marguerite, also known as Poupette (born on March 17, 1689); Marie (June 27, 1690) who died in infancy; Catherine Olympe, nicknamed Pimpette (March 2, 1692); and Guillaume (1694/95–1704/05). From his childhood, Guillaume, whose godfather was Père La Chaise, was destined for a career in the Catholic Church.

The marriage was happy at first; however, in 1698 when the family moved to Paris upon Du Noyer’s appointment to deputy of the Estates-General things began to change. Monsieur Du Noyer started to spend excessively on mistresses and gambling. Furthermore, he placed their two daughters in convents to make good Catholics out of them, much to Anne Marguerite’s displeasure, as she had promised to Madame Saporta on her deathbed that she would marry her eldest daughter to a Protestant. In 1701, Anne Marguerite converted back to Calvinism and fled to Holland with her two daughters (twelve and nine years old at the time), leaving her husband and son behind. After a brief sojourn in London, she settled in Delft (Netherlands), then in The Hague. Anne Marguerite’s eccentricities and free spirit were greatly deprecated in the refuge, but nevertheless, this is where she claims to have found her own special calling in life: “The refuge made a writer out of me.” It is difficult to say what exactly led her to the village of Voorburg (Netherlands)—the hostility of the other refugees, perhaps, or material difficulties—but she ended up there and, thanks to her writing, she was finally able to earn a comfortable living for herself and her daughters. She began working for a fashionable bi-weekly newspaper, La Quintessence des Nouvelles (Essentials of the News), which had been founded by Jean Maximilien Lucas, another exile, and rapidly climbed the ranks. In 1710, she became editor-in-chief and held that position until her death in 1719.

41. François d’Aix de La Chaise (1624–1709), commonly called Père La Chaise, Jesuit priest and King Louis XIV’s confessor for thirty-four years. The most illustrious necropolis in Paris, the Père La Chaise Cemetery, takes its name after him. See “La Chaise, François de.” In 1911 Encyclopædia Britannica, vol. 16. At Wikisource: <https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/1911_Encyclop%C3%A6dia_Britannica/La_Chaise,_Fran%C3%A7ois_de>.

42. refuge: in addition to the ordinary meaning of “refuge” (as in the statement “the Huguenots sought refuge in La Rochelle”), in this context “refuge” has the further meanings of an asylum, a place of refuge; the community of Huguenots in exile, as is the case here; and, sometimes capitalized as “Refuge,” the whole phenomenon of Huguenot exodus from France and resettlement abroad during the era of persecution.


44. Clearly, she did not expect such hostility from her fellow refugees: “I had expected to find hunger, thirst, the dangers of travel, but not those of traitors … I had thought that refugees would be of one heart and one soul.” Du Noyer, Mémoires (1760), 196. Our translation.

45. On Du Noyer’s journalistic activities, see Henriette Goldwyn, “Journalisme polémique à la fin du dix-septième siècle: Le cas de Mme Dunoyer,” in Femmes savantes, savoirs des femmes: Du crépuscule de
Du Noyer won national and even international acclaim during her lifetime for her writing talents. From the time it passed into her hands, La Quintessence des Nouvelles became “one of the most important, most influential, and most widely read newspapers in the early eighteenth century.” Between 1703 and 1710, Du Noyer composed her Memoirs to combat the poisonous calumnies of the refugees, which she saw as a many-headed monster. In 1707 she tried her hand at yet another genre, a chronicle, which took the form of a fictitious correspondence between a lady from Paris and a lady from the south of France. Between 1707 and 1713, seven volumes of the work entitled Lettres historiques et galantes (Historical and Polite Letters) appeared, containing a total of 111 letters. Both the Historical Letters and the Memoirs were so successful that they underwent several reprints during the eighteenth century, the latter work sometimes included in the same volume as the former.

---

46. Nabarra, “Anne Marguerite Petit Dunoyer.”
49. The Mémoires were composed between 1703 and 1710. In the 1710–1711 Pierre Marteau edition of the Mémoires, the first two volumes, dated 1711, are from a second edition, revised and augmented, where the three last ones are from a 1710 first edition. During the eighteenth century, volumes 1 and 2 were reprinted on several occasions as part of the Lettres historiques et galantes. The 1757 edition of the Lettres is generally considered the standard edition: Lettres historiques et galantes par Mme C*** (London: Nourse et Vaillant). It has 9 parts in 8 volumes including the Mémoires de M. Des N. [Monsieur Du Noyer] in vol. 7 and the Mémoires de Mme Des N. écrits par elle-même [Madame Du Noyer] in vol. 8, part 1. A copy is preserved at the Bibliothèque nationale de France in Paris (FB-11793-11798) but access to it is very restricted. The Bibliothèque nationale de France also owns two reprints of the Lettres: The Hague: Pierre Husson, 1761, and Paris and Avignon: F. Séguier, 1790. Based on the Pierre Marteau edition of 1710–1711, the 2005 edition by Henriette Goldwyn gave a new life to Anne Marguerite Petit Du Noyer’s Mémoires. Although this is not a complete edition of the Mémoires, it takes into account all five volumes and is organized into chapters with summaries of what was eliminated for the benefit of the reader. On the relation between the Mémoires and the Lettres, see Isabelle Trivisani-Moreau, “Vers un usage public du privé: Mme Du Noyer entre ‘Lettres historiques et galantes’ et ‘Mémoires,’” in Dialogues intérieurs: Les écrits des mémorialistes dans leurs “Mémoires,” ed. Myriam Tsimbidy and Frédéric Charbonneau (Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2015), 137–50.