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Emerging from the Hundred Years’ War, the Montferrand families acquired Renaissance associations, experienced internal divisions during the Reformation, generated Bordeaux’s only saint, and came up to the Revolution with the usual noble financial challenges. Deeply opposed to the Revolution, they suffered confiscation and parcellization and barely held onto any property at all. The core estate of the Château de Landiras finds its modern renown in its fine grave wines.
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The Hundred Years’ War

Continued

Mary of Bedford, illegitimate daughter of John of Lancaster, was the last person mentioned in Part One.1 Her husband was Pierre II de Montferrand, baron of Landiras, souden of La Trau, etc., and lord of La Tour de Bessan.2 Pierre’s Anglo-French machinations (being both a vassal of the Duke of Guéyenne, the King of England, and a sub-vassal of the King of France) twice took him from Guéyenne to England and back again and were part of the events that eventually brought the War to an end. Montferrand-Landiras was also governor of Blaye-et-Sainte-

1Very few dates will be attached to individuals of either Montferrand branch in this article, since they may all be easily found in the earlier article’s Genealogy. Chronological context should emerge from other dates mentioned.

2Pierre was often referred to by one of his mother’s other titles, sire de Lesparre. Through Isabelle de Preissac, he was one of three heirs to the château de Lesparre after the death of Amanieu de Madaillan. An inquest in 1446 found that he was “the closest descendent, by his mother” (Barein, 1876: I, 159). He “took possession” in 1452 (Féret, 1889: III, 468).

Since Pierre received compensations for the non-payment of his wife’s dowry only in 1450, Henry Ribadieu doubts (1990: 194, n. 2) the marriage was actually before 1435; yet John of Lancaster-Bedford had died in September 1435, so it’s unlikely that Pierre would have sought the marriage.

Among the compensations were the barony of Marennnes and the peigne (toll gate) of Hastingues (a bastide—walled town— in Landes, Aquitaine, founded in 1289 by John Hastings, then seneschal of Gascony).

Despite his apparently low credit at the English court, Pierre was charged to guard both Dax and Blaye, which were too far apart to defend simultaneously. Thus, his defence of Blaye (Ribadieu: 194). Bertrand IV de Montferrand meanwhile defended Bourg, but only half-heartedly after the fall of Blaye (Ibid: 212). Ribadieu always refers to Pierre and Bertrand as “brothers”, but Bertrand was the son of Jean, Pierre’s half-brother. By the way, Ribadieu spells the family name “Montferrant”, as Féret recommends (III, 469).

Luce (today, Blaye), a town on the right bank of the Garonne crucial to the defence of Bordeaux, when French forces besieged it. The French were led by the now middle-aged Jean Dunois (ca. 1403-1468), count of Longueville, the famous “Bastard of Orléans”, companion of Joan of Arc. A large assault forced Pierre II to abandon the town and take refuge in its château, which itself fell on 24 May 1451, only three days later.

The city of Bordeaux was to capitulate on 23 June. Dunois gave generous terms and even let our Pierre II de Montferrand, in a private treaty, ransom his freedom for either 10,000 écus or the turning over of his son and nephew as hostages. He had to give up all his possessions, three of which would be returned provided that he swore an oath of fidelity to Charles VII of France (1422-1461) within six weeks.

Montferrand-Landiras then disappeared for about fourteen months,3 but his English allegiance was revived in August 1452 by renewed French assaults on Guéyenne. It had been Charles VII’s moderation towards the Midi in general that had helped undermine the region’s loyalty to the English crown, but now, in uncontested control, Charles imposed taxes and other obligations that provoked renewed disloyalties (Cocks, 1984: 24-25).4

In reaction, Pierre de Montferrand sailed for England with

3Ribadieu suspects Pierre II de Montferrand-LaTrau-Lesparre-Landiras was ashamed of having signed with Dunois provisions that so benefitted him personally at the expense of Guéyenne (“qui liait sa fortune à la chute de sa patrie”, “which joined his fortune to the collapse of his country”, 269).

4As heading the conspiracy, Cocks (1984) mentions “le sire de Lesparre et Pierre de Montferrand” as if they were distinct persons and says that the latter carried the title of “Souldich d’l’Estrade” (25), which looks suspiciously close to “soudon de La Trau”.

(Cocks was the first author of a work that, through at least the next seven editions, from 1868 to 1908, he co-authored with Édouard Féret and that by 2001 had seen sixteen editions.)
one of his distant relations, Jean de Foix. As it happened, the Duke of Somerset (Edmund Beaufort, 1405-1455) was then préminent at court, and he was looking for a way to re-establish his reputation and reinforce his influence after his disastrous loss of Normandy (D.N.B.: IV, 39). Montferrand’s proposal gave him this opportunity, and so the council of Henry VI (1422-1461) was persuaded to offer a sizeable force, commanded by the now eighty-year-old John Talbot, first count of Shrewsbury (ca. 1373-1453), who had been unable to save Orleans from Jeanne d’Arc and Dunois in 1429.

After a few successful engagements, the English and their Guyennese supporters lost the decisive battle of Castillon, near Bordeaux, on 17 July 1453, and so, this time definitely, all their lands in France except Calais. Talbot and his son had lost their lives in the battle, but Pierre de Montferrand-Landiras escaped to Bordeaux, which he and others attempted to secure. The château of Lesparre was taken and in part destroyed (Ribadieu: 319). On 9 October, at Montferrand, the treaty rendering Bordeaux to the French was signed, most of the generous provisions of 1451 retracted, and our baron and his uncle François de Montferrand-d’Uza-Belin were among a score of lords exempted from the amnesty and banished from France in perpetuity (Communay, 1889: 1; Cocks, 1984: 26). After returning to London, however, a motley collection of émigrés organized a new enterprise against the French, with Pierre II de Montferrand-Landiras at their head. Landing at Médoc, he was arrested during a night-time attempt to enter what was officially no longer “his” château of Lesparre, taken to Pottiers for trial, and in July 1454 condemned and executed—in fact, decapitated and quartered, with pieces of his body nailed to the city gates (Féret: III, 468; Ribadieu: 381). The Hundred Years’ War was finally over; Guyenne had been under English suzerainty for just short of three centuries.

The resulting confiscations require some attention, because, once again, the sources are not transparent. Between 1451 and 1454, this unfortunate baron of Montferrand lost two of his properties, both previously more important than Landiras itself. In April 1451, the seigniory of Lesparre had been transferred to Amanieu d’Albret (1425-1463/73), elder son of Charles II d’Albret, but without posterity himself. So Lesparre passed to a

8Baurein writes that Gaston de Foix gave his daughter to Jehannot de Montferrand, son of François de Montferrand, sgr. d’Uza (Ill, 231; Baurein spells it Uzar). Gaston de Foix was the father of our Jean de Foix, who was later to add Candale to his titles. The elder brother of François was Bertrand III de Montferrand, the father of Pierre de Montferrand-Landiras by his (second) marriage to Isabeau de Pressiac-Landiras, and so Jehannot and Pierre were cousins germane, which made Jean de Foix and Pierre de Montferrand first cousins through marriage.

9But Talbot did leave his name on various sites in the Médoc part of the Gironde, as well as on a château and a fine wine there produced.

10Cocks (1984) makes the obvious point that, after 19 October 1453, the history of the province and that of the country were combined. (This time, it is Lesparre and de l’Estrad whom he cites as distinct persons. Cf. note 4.) Ribadieu says five were banished to England (365), rather than “a score”; it’s he who names François.

By the way, Jean I de Foix-Candale was also taken prisoner at the fateful battle of Castillon and spent seven years in captivity. Back in England by 1460, he was able to make peace with the king of France in 1461-62, gave up all his possessions in England except the title Comte de Candale [= Earl of Kendal], and resumed lordship of his French estates, to the title of which he had added “Candale” (Bailey, 41, note 39). Cf. note 24, in Part One. The granddaughter of Jean de Foix-Candale and Margaret Kerdeston (aka “Marguerite de La Pole-Suffolk”) was to marry Ladislaus (Vladislaus) II of Hungary and Bohemia in 1502, so making them ultimately the ancestors of the modern Hapsburgs, the Bourbon dynasty of France after Henry IV, and the Stuarts after Charles I.

Restoration of Reputation after the War

François IV de Montferrand-Landiras, the son of Pierre II de Montferrand-Lesparre-Landiras and Mary Bedford, had been one of the hostages of the 1451 Blaye-et-Sainte-Luce treaty. He was reared at the court of Prince Charles of France, the duke of Berry, brother of soon-to-be King Louis XI (1461-1483). When Prince Charles was named Duke of Guyenne in 1469, Montferrand-Landiras was appointed his premier panetier (the person charged with supplying the prince’s bread), while cousin and fellow hostage, Bertrand IV, became the prince’s conseiller et chambellan. Prince Charles, until his death in May 1472, was at the centre of most of the conspiracies against his brother the king, so any lingering resentment towards the French conquest of Guyenne would have made the young Montferrands at home in the prince’s rebellions. But when the prince/duke died, François IV de Montferrand-Landiras entered the service of Pierre de Beaujeu, a member of the Bourbon family. In 1474 Beaujeu married Anne de France, Louis XI’s daughter, who was to be regent for her young brother, King Charles VIII (1483-1498). Thus, his new service would have brought Montferrand-Landiras over to behaviour more supportive of the French crown. In fact, he had already participated loyally during Louis XI’s last wars and later marched with King Charles into the Italian Wars. More than one baron of Landiras was to fight in these wars, as did their Montferrand cousins.

Bertrand IV de Montferrand, son of Jean I, the elder half-brother of the ill-fated Pierre II de Montferrand-Landiras and so heir to the senior line, also suffered from conflicting loyalties and so endured the confiscations and restorations just described. Through his 1473 marriage to Catherine de Lescun, Bertrand’s son Gaston became associated with what had been one of the most famous factions at the French royal court on the eve of

11The French “conseiller” can mean either English “councillor” or “counselor/adviseur”, often easy to distinguish, but not here. A “chambellan” manages the household of a noble or prince.
Joan of Arc’s arrival there. And Gaston was amongst the nobility of the Bordelaise obligated to the ban et arrière-ban (“mustering of the king’s vassals for war”) called up by Gaston de Foix in 1481 (Baurein: I, 434-36). It was from Gaston de Montferrand’s second marriage, in 1483, to Jeanne (or Jehanne) de Maingot de Surgères, that our senior line continued.

In these decades, the elder Montferrand branch sprouted two other, cadet dynasties. One, founded by Bertrand III’s brother François I (d. bf. 1456), sgr de Montferrand and (by marriage) viscount d’Uza, survived only three generations. But a later branch, titled “Cancon & Foncaude” and founded after 1474 by Gaston I’s brother, Jean II de Montferrand, survived for six generations and, in fact, succeeded the senior branch before itself relinquishing titles and lands to the barons of Landirias. The Landirias branch indulged a similar experience, in the short-lived Portets branch of the family. A son of Thomas de Montferrand-Landiras, Jehannot de Montferrand, seems to have recognized his brother’s claim to the main inheritance in 1559 and founded a parallel branch on a seigneuries brought into the family much earlier by Arnaud de Preissac.14 The establishment of cadet lines attenuated sibling rivalry, but it also had the pragmatic goal of facilitating governance in an age without modern communication. Naturally, these dynastic enterprises mean numerous duplications of names and numbers, which, together with merely some similar names held by scattered siblings, have seriously misled impatient genealogists.

From the Italian Wars (1494-1559) to the Wars of Religion (1562-1598)

Towards the end of the 15th century, both branches of the Montferrand dynasty were again active, this time in the French invasion of Italy. These wars, too, involved dynastic claims, territorial ambition, and commercial advantages. But this time it was the French who won many of the famous battles, especially in the first decades, and then lost the war. The Austrian-Spanish Hapsburgs came to dominate most of Italy, while France’s only territorial ambition, and commercial advantages. But this time it was the French who won many of the famous battles, especially in the first decades, and then lost the war. The Austrian-Spanish Hapsburgs came to dominate most of Italy, while France’s only gains (the bishoprics of Metz, Toul and Verdun) were in the Rhineland, far from the Italian peninsula. Francis I’s (1515-1547) great victory at Marignano in 1515, however, did lead to the Concordat of Bologna, in which the king of France was recognized as supreme in all but name over the affairs, finances and appointments of the French (Gallican) church. Our François IV de Montferrand-Landiras participated in the campaign that opened the Italian Wars and culminated in a temporary triumph in Naples. His grandson, Jean IV, also fought as a young man in Italy and later, as a royalist Catholic, in France. Pierre I de Montferrand, of the senior house, fought at the French disaster at Pavia in 1525, in which King Francis I was captured (Communay: xxxiii). His son, Charles I, also fought in Italy (Communay: xxxiv). Charles’s two sons (Charles II and Guy) were to defend opposite sides in the French Wars of Religion.

The 16th century had seen a profound division within the Latin Church, which soon provoked religious civil wars in several countries. The reformed religion of John Calvin had a tremendous impact on his native land. Although it was never safe for Calvin himself to return to France, scores of other Geneva-trained pastors risked (and some lost) their lives to preach the new faith there. By the late 1560s, perhaps as many as one third of the French nobility had converted, thereby entailing most of their peasants, as well as significant numbers of merchants, lawyers, teachers and royal officials. The sudden death of King Henry II (1547-1559) during a joust to celebrate the end of the Italian Wars precipitated the French Wars of Religion. He left four sons under fifteen years of age and the fortunes of France in the untested, but competent, hands of his Italian widow, Catherine de Médicis (1519-1589). The wars ended only after the vigorous Protestant successor to the throne, Henry of Navarre (1589-1610), defeated or bought off his Catholic adversaries while negotiating his own (re)conversion to Catholicism in 1593, and after he then offered religious security to his former co-religionists in the Edict of Nantes (1598).

Jean IV de Montferrand-Landiras participated in this civil war on the royalist, Catholic side “with ardour”, and in 1570 Charles IX (1560-1574) admitted him to the Order of Saint Michael (Grasset: 110). Jean’s son, Gaston II, remained loyal to the Catholic Valois kings; of this husband of (Saint) Jeanne de Lestonnac, more later. Their son, François V de Montferrand-Landiras, also seigneur de St Morillon and other places, became a gentilhomme ordinaire de la chambre of Henry IV in 1603 and the captain of a company of light horse, posts which illustrate the family’s modest status on the national stage.

As for the senior branch, Charles II de Montferrand, first baron of the Bordelaise (Guyenne), became mayor and governor of Bordeaux in 1569. Heboastfully carried out royal orders to extend the St. Bartholomew Day’s massacre of Protestants to Bordeaux (250 killed). After several military engagements

---

12Catherine de Lescun was the daughter of Jean, bastard of Armagnac, called “de Lescun”, count of Comminges and baron of Gourdon. An Armagnac from his mother’s side, Jean d’Armagnac, a marshal (maréchal) of France, was also, among other charges, lieutenant-general of Guyenne; he was legitimized in 1463 (Anselme, 1967: VIII, 94-95).

13Remember that the Montferrands had made various marital alliances to the houses of Foix and Albret in earlier centuries, where the seigneuries of Lescun and Comminges, like that of Lesparre, were to be found. Furthermore, there had also been connections to the Armagnacs, since it was members of this family who were counts d’Astarac.

14See note 70, in Part One. The seigneuries of Portets had been under the authority of the soudans of La Trau since at least the 1380s. In 1587, Jean de Montferrand sold Portets to Guillaume de Gasq, trésorier de France (Barein: III: 71 & 75). (Trésoriers de France were regional royal servants, not a unique & central officer.)

15See note 70, in Part One. The seigneuries of Portets had been under the authority of the soudans of La Trau since at least the 1380s. In 1587, Jean de Montferrand sold Portets to Guillaume de Gasq, trésorier de France (Barein: III: 71 & 75). (Trésoriers de France were regional royal servants, not a unique & central officer.)

16Of the regular noble or royal servants of noble background who ran errands or handled small tasks for his master, a gentilhomme ordinaire held such a position for at least a year, rather than, say, quarterly.

17There were, in fact, quite a few connections between this gentilhomme ordinaire and his master. King of France only from 1589, Henry IV had ruled the Kingdom of Navarre in the southwest of France since 1572. He was, furthermore, a friend of Michel de Montaigne, François V’s great uncle. And as a member of the house of Bourbon, the king was a collateral descendant of Pierre de Beauchesne, whom François IV de Montferrand-Landiras had served towards the end of his career. Finally, since Henry IV’s mother was Jeanne d’Albret (a house that ruled Foix as well as Navarre), there was also a distant family relationship between Montferrand-Landiras and his king.
against the Huguenots, he was killed by arquebus fire during the siege of Gensac in 1574 (Feret: III, 469) or in July 1475 (Communay: xxxiv). His marriage to his cousin Marguerite de Montferrand-Cancun being sterile, his younger brother, Guy de Montferrand, inherited the fiefs of Montferrand.

Guy de Montferrand-Loigoiran, however, was a Huguenot, the name given to French adherents of Jean Calvin, and so his military engagements were in opposition to those of his elder brother. On the eve of the bloody massacre of Huguenots in 1572 that broke out in Paris on St. Bartholemew’s Day (24 August), he was somehow warned and took refuge in Saint-Germain-en-Laye (Communay: xl). Among his several military exploits throughout the rest of the decade, the most striking (and most tainted) was the capture of Périgueux (Dordogne) on 6 August 1575. The following three days saw an outbreak of murder and looting, in which even priests were not spared. Because of this event, which even exceeded the norm, the memoirs of the Huguenot Duke de Bouillon (Henri de La Tour d’Auvergne, viscount of Turenne: 1555-1623) describe Montferrand-Loigoiran as “one of the most cruel and irreligious men of his time” (“Montferrand”: 14). Thiviers suffered similar pillaging later in the month, and also the rich abbey of Chancelade on 2 September. Realizing that Montferrand-Loigoiran’s actions were not advancing the Huguenot cause, King Henry of Navarre dismissed him in 1577. The irritated baron therefore made his peace with Catholicism and lived out the remaining fourteen years of his life enjoying his two noble châteaux. He and his son Gédéon died in the same year, one month apart.

Once more, we meet divergent emphases: One asserts that, to meet her debts to the city of Bordeaux, Guy’s widow, Jeanne d’Eschelles (who had died in 1594), sold the fief of Montferrand in 1595 (I) to her late husband’s distant cousin (his sister-in-law’s brother), François II de Montferrand-Cancun, scion of the younger branch of this senior line (source lost). Another asserts that Jeanne d’Eschelles sought to sell the fief and that the jurats (municipal officials) of Bordeaux, wanting to expand the city across the river and still finding the castle threatening to the city’s interests, purchased the barony on 15 August 1591. Thus, François II was obliged to begin a protracted process to recover it (Communay: xlii; Grasset: 109, 113 & 116). Regardless, the family had experienced financial difficulties throughout the century and had been selling off parcels since 1519 (Grasset: 113-115). The barony of Veyrines, for example, was sold (to the mayor and jurats of Bordeaux) in 1526 (Barein, II: 243), the barony of Langoiran in 1578 (Communay: Doc. XLIII, 121-25; Abbots date the sale to 1590 [323]), and three-quarters of the barony of Portets, Castres and Arbanats in 1587 (Barein III: 71 & 75). Indeed, nobles all over Western Europe faced financial exigencies in this extremely inflationary century that forced frequent sales from their estates.19 In interesting contrast to these sales, Thomas de Montferrand had “shared” some of his patrimony (“biens”) with residents (“habitants”) of Landiras in 1536 (“Les Seigneurs de Landiras 1”).

Earlier, in 1518, he had given some land to the Syndics of the “Fabrique et Oeuvre”20 of the church Saint-Hypolite d’Arbanats and to the syndics and parishioners of the parish for them to cultivate, in exchange for three religious services a year (at Christmas, Easter and Pentecost) for himself and his late parents (Barein: III, 76-77).

By a 1577 marriage to Claire de Pellegue, Guy de Montferrand’s heir, François II, had sired seven children. Yet, despite his marriage in 1625 to Jacquette de Beaunoncles, their son François III died without heirs in October 1660. All four of his younger brothers having pre-deceased him, titles and properties passed to the Montferrand-Landiras branch.

Before abandoning the senior branch, however, let us suggest that its name and existence may be responsible for the relative historical obscurity of the Montferrands of Landiras. Once the details of the Landiras line’s activities are discerned, one is surprised to find so little mention of it in the general histories of France. Since the name “Montferrand” identified both branches of the family and the elder line’s château, records of achievements of the Montferrands of Landiras must often have been ascribed to their cousins. For instance, in one renowned history of France, the actions of Pierre II de Montferrand are, indeed, mentioned, but without any reference to his seigneurie of Landiras (Petit-Dutaillis, 1902: 111).21

Renaissance and Reformation; Saint Jeanne (“Joan”) de Lestonnac (1556-1640)

While discussing the Wars of Religion, we alluded to Gaston II de Montferrand-Landiras. He may have trained as a lawyer and become a member of the Parlement of Bordeaux, and so a colleague of his future father-in-law, Richard Lestonnac.22 He may otherwise have performed little of note himself during his less than twenty-year possession of the lands and titles adhering to this cadet branch of the house of Montferrand. But in 1573, he married Jeanne de Lestonnac, who was to become the family’s most renowned member—the only saint born and bred in Bordeaux. Although only seventeen years old at the time of her marriage, Jeanne’s life had already been filled with the drama of late 16th-century France.

The Massacre of St. Bartholomew’s Day had occurred the year before this marriage. Jeanne’s mother, Jeanne Eyquem de

---

19Another example of property exchanges: in 1514, the owner of the Maison noble de Cagès did homage to Thomas de Montferrand; in 1574, Cagès was sold to “Messieurs Jean and Gaston de Montferrand”; and in 1580, it was sold by Gaston de Montferrand; in 1597, the new owner did homage for the property to Jeanne de Lestonnac, dame de Landiras (Barein: III, 126-127).

20The “fabrique” of a church was the group of clerics (and, after the Council of Trent, also laymen) charged with the administration of the communal goods of the parish (vestry), while the “œuvre” was the church group specializing in charitable actions.

21We speak of the relevant volume in Ernest Lavisse’s renowned series Histoire de France. Ribadeau does balance the two branches in his study of France’s ultimate conquest of Guyenne.

22Or so claims “Les Seigneurs de Landiras 2”. Communay (lxxii) makes no mention of this judicial position. Dast Le Vacher de Boisville, while confirming Richard de Lestonnac as becoming a conseiller (clerk), enrolled in the Parlement de Bordeaux on 1 June 1554 (41), has no mention of any Montferrand anywhere in the “Liste”.

---

[Note: The text contains citations and notes that are not translated here. The numbers in parentheses correspond to notes at the bottom of the page.]
Montaigne, had joined the new faith and made every effort to bring up her daughter in it. Jeanne Eyquem’s brother was Michel Eyquem de Montaigne (1533-1592), whose fame as essayist lay ahead of him. Both of the Eyquem parents were Roman Catholics, but the mother happened to be of Spanish-Jewish descent, and an attitude of religious forbearance appears to have pervaded the household. Although always a loyal Catholic despite his various philosophical doubts, Michel de Montaigne made many friends among the Protestants, including with the king of Navarre. Thus, the second basis of Montaigne’s historical reputation was his devotion to the practice of toleration and reconciliation, at a time when the majority of Europeans and their monarchs were fanatical adherents of their respective faiths and willing to kill or die for them.

Let us, therefore, examine Jeanne de Lestonnac’s background in more detail. Her maternal grandfather was determined that Jeanne Eyquem’s brother would excel in erudition and so ordered that no one was to speak in his presence anything but Latin until Michel Eyquem was six years old. It should not surprise us, then, that young Jeanne, our saint’s mother, also profitted from the family’s erudition. Contemporaries later extolled her command of both Greek and Latin. Michel eventually studied law, travelled extensively, and returned to become a magistrate in the important Parlement of Bordeaux (as a “lay counsellor”, inscribed in October 1557), (Dast Le Vacher de Boisville). Deciding that he preferred tranquility to engagement, however, he left his judicial office and returned to the family’s château. There, he read extensively, reflected deeply, and began to write the famous essays (Essais: from “essayer”—to test, to try out) that have influenced all subsequent literature throughout the world. Against his inclinations, Michel de Montaigne was also pulled out of his retreat to serve from 1581 to 1585 as the mayor of Bordeaux, less than ten years after Charles II de Montferrand (of the senior line) had been the city’s governor and mayor.

These two connections with the world of law and politics are also reflected in his sister’s marriage. For the husband of Jeanne Eyquem de Montaigne was to be Richard de Lestonnac, from 1554 or ’57 to 1571, a councillor (conseiller) in the Parlement of Bordeaux, where Michel Eyquem had also been a councillor. Like his brother-in-law, Lestonnac associated frequently with the city’s literary elite. Since he was a fervent Catholic, his Huguenot wife (Montaigne’s sister) sent their eldest of seven children to grow up and be taught in the home of the girl’s aunt and uncle (Thomas de Beauregard), both faithful Protestants. Uncle Michel alerted the father as to what was happening, and young Jeanne was brought back to the parental home, where her soul was fought over. Her eventual decision for Catholicism was to earn the lifelong enmity of her mother. At age 41, she had become a widow.

The fruits of her childhood religious struggles could now move from devoted and pious direction of a family to the service of her faith through prayer, celibacy and female education, though she did not abandon her young children before the eldest attained maturity. Only in 1603, did she enter the Feuillant convent at Toulouse. But the austerities imposed by this order undermined her health within three months and she wisely withdrew. She retired briefly to the château of La Mothe (one of her late husband’s seigneuries). The end of the year found her living in the Montferrand hôtel (substantial private mansion, usually in a city) in Bordeaux, where a severe plague broke out in 1604-1605. Devoting her energies to the sick and suffering, the dowager baroness of Landiras reached the conclusion that God intended her to work among the poor and, especially, to educate their girls. Jeanne de Lestonnac was about to make a significant contribution to what in France is called the Catholic Renaissance.

Jeanne had fallen under the influence of two priests of the Society of Jesus, the famous Counter- or Catholic-Reformation order that had been founded between 1534 and 1540 under the inspiration of St. Ignatius Loyola. Fathers Jean de Bordes and ?? (first name unknown) Raymond were teaching boys at the Collège de Madeleine, in Bordeaux, according to Jesuit principles. They were already dreaming of somehow establishing a comparable school for girls. They put Jeanne de Lestonnac and the two women already following her through the rigours of Loyola’s Spiritual Exercises (1548), and then helped them establish a school for girls and found a female order. In this enterprise, they were at first supported by Cardinal François d’Escoubleau de Sourdis (1574-1628), archbishop of Bordeaux from 1599. But he began to make difficulties after discovering that he could not persuade Jeanne and her disciples to attach themselves to his preferred Ursulines or otherwise control the new order. Indeed, he later fomented the conspiracy which led to Jeanne’s temporary discharge from the leadership of her own order.

Her new order has been variously called La Compagnie de Marie Notre-Dame, Les Soeurs de Notre-Dame de Bordeaux, and Les Filles de Notre-Dame (Communay: lxxiii, also suggests “Jésuites”, which underlines that order’s initiative in Jeanne’s enterprise). The work began and the initial drafts of
the rules were written as early as 1606. On 7 April 1607, Pope Paul V (1605-1621) officially approved the new order, and on 8 December 1610, the first five “female companions” (compan¬
gnées) took their vows. One of these companions had been a Protestant when Jeanne de Lestonnac’s personal magnetism first drew them together. Her background and Jeanne’s own childhood were reflected in the special attention the new order took to educate and convert Protestant girls.

The rapid popularity of the Company meant that they soon outgrew their original building, which still stands on the rue du Hâ. (Its chapel, in which Jeanne eventually died, started con¬
struction in 1616, and has served, ironically, as a Protestant chapel since the French Revolution.) Soon, Jeanne de Lestonnac was travelling to other cities to found new houses. The five original nuns had dedicated themselves to “a life neither uni¬quely active, nor purely contemplative, but [with] the two to¬gether and resembling that of the glorious Virgin Mary” (Boisse: 9). They wanted to penetrate Mary’s mystère (“spiritual secret”) and imitate her attitudes and actions, and they sought to find God in all things.

Jeanne de Lestonnac’s qualities of leadership are described by Benedictine historians as follows: “The mother superior was at the same time the friendly and the strong woman, endowed with great powers of persuasion, animated by a supernatural spirit, giving both the maxim and the example, [and] making of obedience the sap of life that invigorates” (Vies des saints: 54). Despite the archbishop’s later conspiracy against her, she car¬ried herself with humility and tenderness, eventually cleared her name, and returned to her post of leadership. In 1638, two years before her death, she wrote her final amendments of the Company’s Rules and Constitutions.

Mère Jeanne received into the order two of her daughters, Martine and Madeleine de Montferrand-Landiras (both of whom pre-deceased her), and even two granddaughters, Jeanne and Françoise de Chartres-d’Arpaillant. Jeanne de Lestonnac died on 2 February 1640, at the age of eighty-four. She was to be beatified in 1900 by the renowned, reforming Pope Leo XIII (1878-1903), with three healing miracles attributed to her dur¬ing the 19th century being “authenticated”. She was canonized on 15 May 1949 by Pius XII (1939-1958), with two more at¬tributed miracles accepted (Boisse: 25). Let us reiterate that she is the only saint who was born, lived and died in Bordeaux. Numerous statues have been erected in her memory, and so it is a little surprising that the one placed in her memory at the Châ¬teau de Landiras is in fact a representation of the Virgin.25

At the death of Jeanne de Lestonnac, there were thirty daughter houses already established in France and the Spanish Netherlands (now Belgium); today, approximately 2000 Daugh¬ters of Mary Our Lady work and pray in 120 convents scattered over five continents. Five nuns were to be massacred at the French Cape in South Africa in 1793, another guillotined dur¬ing the Revolution (in 1794), and more recently (1989) an¬other was murdered in Columbia (Boisse: 11). The nuns of the Company work in schools, parishes, Christian movements, and solidarity organizations, where they combat illiteracy and pro¬mote human dignity especially for young females (“Sainte¬Jeanne de Lestonnac”). A “Sainte Jeanne de Lestonnac School”, for example, may be found on Avenida Lestonnac, in Temecula, California.

Saint Jeanne de Lestonnac’s order preceded and may have partly inspired two other remarkable female enterprises in the early 17th century. In a close association with Saint Vincent de Paul (1581-1660), who was simultaneously founding the Congres¬sion of the Priests of the Mission in 1633, Saint Louise de Marillac (1591-1660) established the Filles de la Charité (Daughters of Charity). Like Jeanne de Lestonnac, Louise de Marillac paid special attention to the poor and outcast. This energetic visionary was beatified in 1919 (after Jeanne de Lestonnac) and canonized in 1934 (before Jeanne). Even earlier, at the other side of France, Saint Vincent’s friend and colleague, Saint François de Sâles, the so-called bishop of Geneva, had in¬spired Jeanne-Françoise Frémiot (1572-1641), since 1601 the widowed baroness de Chantal, to found the Order of the Visita¬tion Saint-Mary in 1610. Vincent de Paul, who also knew her directly, called her “one of the holiest people I have ever met on this earth” (Attwater, 1983: 180). She was canonized as early as 1767, almost two centuries before her contemporary saints.

For readers who combine their interest in religion with an interest in fine wines, Jeanne de Lestonnac has one other strik¬ing association. On 17 June 1540, Louis de Roustaing, seignior of La Tour, sold a small vineyard, known as Le Domaine de La Mission, to Arnaut de Lestonnac, a burgher and merchant of Bordeaux. The purchaser may have been Jeanne de Lestonnac’s grandfather, for the Olive de Lestonnac who leased the land on 30 March 1650 to the Lazarist Fathers26 was Jeanne’s cousin (“Château Haut-Brion”). Arnaut de Lestonnac had foreseen the great potential of the wines of Haut-Brion and had promoted their cultivation. His son, Pierre de Lestonnac, and his grand¬daughter, Olive de Lestonnac (married to Marc-Antoine de Gourgues, an illustrious premier président of the Parlement of Bordeaux), carried on his work. The lease of 1650 became an outright sale in 1664, effected by Olive de Lestonnac’s heiress, Catherine de Mullet. Over the next several centuries the Lazarist Fathers nurtured the viniculture of the Domaine of the Mis¬sion into one of the great wines of France: “Château La Mission Haut-Brion” (“Château Haut-Brion”).

The Montferrand-Landiras Maison at the End of the Ancien Régime

The “Ormée de Bordeaux” (1648-1654) was perhaps the most significant side-event of the Parisian and kingdom-wide rebel¬lion known as the Fronde. The well-known event was a chaos of resistance to the person and policies of Cardinal Mazarin, initiated by the Parlement de Paris and then picked up by the prince de Condé and other nobles. But the Ormée was a popular uprising that gave Bordeaux a distinctively republican munici¬pal government for half a decade. What the Montferrand family thought of it can be easily guessed, but I can’t find any of them in the narrative. However, Bernard de Nogaret de la Valette, duke d’Épernon (1592-1642-1661), the Governor of Guyenne and charged by Mazarin to restore order, installed himself in the château de Montferrand in 1649 (Grasset: 110); when in that year the revolt spread outside the city, the château de Montferrand was ravaged (Sarrazin, 1996: 31).

Through their son, François V, Gaston II and Jeanne de Lestonnac had only one grandchild. This Bernard de Montferrand-Landiras followed his father’s military career, but really served his dynasty in two other notable ways. In September

---

25The outstretched arms, the serpent entwining the feet, and her standing on a globe (representing the world) all suggest that it is a statue of Mary and not of Jeanne. It is the central focus of pilgrimages to the château.

26Members of Saint Vincent de Paul’s order are often called “Lazarists” because their initial residence had been the Saint Lazarus Priory in Paris.
In 1651, he obtained the erection of Landiras from a barony into a marquisate (Communay: lxxiv). And in 1660, he inherited the lands and titles of the senior branch of the house of Montferrand, from which Landiras had been separated since the death of Bertrand III around 1446, more than two centuries earlier. The house now once more combined in one branch both the first and the second baronies of Guyenne. The family’s destiny being only two more generations of direct male heirs, however, they would not long enjoy these reunited possessions.

The marriage of Bernard de Montferrand-Landiras to Marie-Delphine de Brassier (“Delphinnette”) de Pontac in 1646 or 1647 was the second time (the marriage to Jeanne de Lestonnac being the first) that our noble house had married into the Parlement de Bordeaux, where Marie-Delphine’s father, Geoffroy de Pontac, had been a president à mortier (senior judge). It was in fact common for noble families to marry their sons into judicial or commercial urban families, as the rich dowries accompanying such brides often restored financial liquidity to an aristocratic family’s estate. (The practice was rather cruelly referred to as “manuring one’s fields” and was of course preferred to the selling of portions of the estate that we have noted above and are about to see again below.) The two sons of Bernard and Marie-Delphine were in turn to inherit the lands and titles of the Girondin Montferrand family. During the second’s (Léon de Montferrand’s) tenure, by a decree of the Conseil d’État, on 21 April 1705, the charge of Grand Sénéchal de Guyenne was declared hereditary in the Montferrand-Landiras line.

Léon’s son, François-Armand de Montferrand-Landiras (1704-1761), sold the “Maison Noble de la Mote [sic]” in 1750 to the famous philosophe Montesquieu, le Baron de la Brède (“Les Seigneurs de Landiras 2”). Then, on 28 June 1751, for 60,000 pounds (livres), he sold the hôtel de Montferrand, on streets (rues) Porte-Dijaux and Margaux in Bordeaux. The proceeds of this sale allowed him to retire debts on the land of Landiras. He was to be the last male of the house, however, for on 2 October 1751, his only son was murdered on the Amboise Bridge by a seigneur de Matigny. This unfortunate son was Charles-Hyacinthe, captain of a royal regiment and Count (it is noted) of Montferrand.

The lands and titles of the house, by François-Armand de Montferrand-Landiras’s last testament, passed to his two nephews, sons of his sister Marie-Catherine de Montferrand, wife of Étienne François de Brassier, seigneur de La Marque, Beychevelle, etc., a conseiller in the Parlement de Bordeaux, and immensely prosperous producer of wine (Communay: lxvi; Figéac, 1996: 1, 75 & 122). But both of them died without heirs, and the lands and titles—le marquisat de Landiras, la baronnie de Montferrand, etc.—passed to the progeny of Delphine de Brassier, their sister. In 1745 she had married Michel-Joseph de La Roque (or Laroque), baron of Budos (d. 1770, at age 50). This Delphine de Brassier-La Roque, was a local socialite, famous for her gaming parties, especially “le brelan” (a card game involving three of a kind). Her 1787 will indicated her intention of bequeathing to her son her hôtel in Bordeaux and the terre of Beychevelle (Figéac, 1996: I, 284 & II, 68). To this son, François-Armand de La Roque, and Catherine de Ménoire de Barbe a daughter was born. By her marriage in 1814, Catherine Delphine de La Roque Budos (d. 1860) was to bring what was left of a formerly extensive inheritance to Léon de Brivazac, the son of Jean BaptisteGuillaume Léonard de Brivazac, a lawyer (avocat).

The French Revolution and After

In the fall of 1788, however, the crisis in royal finances had forced Louis XVI to summon the Estates-General, and every province in France had to hold local assemblies to elect deputies. In almost every province, the assemblies were divided into three sections, according to their “Ordre” (a term not quite equivalent to the modern idea of “social class”; it distinguished function, rather than ownership), with each Ordre, or Estate, meeting and voting separately. Prior to modern attempts to “rationalize” political institutions, it could be a woman who had the right to political participation and electoral recognition, if she were the person solely possessed of the property so enfranchised (the lady/dame where there was no lord/seigneur); but a male had to represent her in public assemblies. And so, in Guyenne, at the General Assembly of the Three Ordres in the winter of 1788-89, Delphine de Brassier, widow of Michel-Joseph de La Roque, baron de Budos, was represented by her son, François-Armand de La Roque, chevalier de Budos. As he was also baron de Montferrand and so first baron of Guyenne, he had his own right to participation. Not to lose the family’s second vote, he was represented in the assembly by his brother, Charles-François-Armand de La Roque (O’Givy, 1856: I, 205). The later meeting of the Estates-General in Versailles, 1790-1820) in the following paragraphs is obtained or confirmed by Bacque

32Interestingly, an O’Givy, as a member of a “Régiment irlandais”, is found in the Ordre de Saint-Michel, admitted in 1763, as a lieutenant at a captain’s rank (Colleville: 327).
very soon moved to Paris, did not develop to the taste of many aristocrats and clergy, and they began to leave the country. La Roque-Budos was to be one of these; in fact, he fled France for England as early as 1789.

Immediately after the events of the summer of 1789 (the fall of the Bastille, the law abolishing feudalism, the Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen, e.g.), many aristocrats fled France, usually going to Austria or England. These were the strident opponents of the Revolution, but over the next few years, nobles continued to flee, sometimes because they grew to dislike the unfolding of revolutionary events and sometimes because some little or large thing in their appearance, deportment, speech, actions, dress or friendships drew the attention or aroused the suspicions of neighbours or officials. The Terror from July 1793 to July 1794, in particular, justifiably frightened many. Lest Landiras seem far from Paris, let us remember that from July 1793 to July 1794, in particular, justifiably frightened many. Lest Landiras seem far from Paris, let us remember that

...33Indeed, see Stephen Auerbach, “Politics, Protest, and Violence in Revolutionary Bordeaux, 1789-1794”, in Proceedings of the Western Society for French History (Vol. 37, 2009), and the works he cites.

...34Note the presentation of his title. The next entry (#175) refers to “Larroque jeune, dit Larroque-La Tour”.

...35As many as 36.83% of the bordelaise nobility became émigrés, including four members of the La Roque-Budos family (Figéac: I, 381). And yet the barons de Brassier, along with the Foix-Candale, were among “le plus brillant parvenu” of the opening of the 19th century (Figéac: II, 611).

...36One source says that Landiras was confiscated and demolished early in the Revolution, its stones being used in essential other buildings (“Les Seigneurs de Landiras_2”). The Château de Budos was similarly torn down and left in ruins. So, balancing the assertion that so much Revolutionary dissipation was due to sans-culottes excesses, Figéac makes sure we notice what the great families did themselves (I, 449). Thus, the current château de Landiras dates from the early 19th century.

...37A completely new calendar was among the more sweeping changes inaugurated by the Revolution (metric measurement perhaps being the most notable and enduring). It chose the retroactive date of the adoption of the republican constitution (22 September 1792) as the start of “Year I” and eliminated the names of months honouring Roman gods and emperors in favour of beautiful names reflecting the seasons of the year; but the calendar was terminated at the end of our 1805.

...38A journal (pl. -aux) was the amount of land that could be worked in one day. (One of the inventories of the property was dated 6 Ventôse Year III o
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purchasing several sections, as did Joachim Chalup, among others. A hundred years later the best wine produced in the commune of Landiras is called “Château-Darricau”, whose owner was the count R. de Chalup! His produce amounted to 15 tonneaux (barrels) of red wine and 30 of white (Cocks & Féret, 7th éd., 1898: 338).\textsuperscript{40} Obviously, though at least part of the count’s property would include land from the ancient seigneurie de Landiras, he possessed neither the château itself nor the right to so name his wines.

Each parcel was numbered and described, as for example the following, bought by Amanieu: #26, “maison et 176 r. vigne”; #37, “maison, parc à brebis et 12 j., 25 r. terres, bois et taillis”; and #68, “maison (écroulée) et 2 j. 7 r. pins, taillis”. Thus, from these examples alone, we can see that Amanieu acquired three “houses” of which one was dilapidated, a sheepfold, a good bit of land and woods and thickets and pines, and 176 “r.,” of vineyard.\textsuperscript{41} Other parcels listed “two rooms”, “granges” (barns), and “chais”, this last being cool spaces where wine was fermented in barrels. Almost every parcel was described as having a “maison”, so one has to wonder what that term really meant? Were there that many domiciled peasant families on the seigneurie de Landiras? From another source, it appears that the actual “ruins of the château”, as part of a parcel containing 24 ares, 10 cent. (yielding a revenue of 7 francs, 35 centimes), along with other parcels, were bought by Édouard Louis Perey.\textsuperscript{42}

It is not surprising to find that Jeanne de Lestonnac’s “Religieuses de Notre Dame” suffered confiscations too. For February 1792, the Documents relatifs à la vente des Biens nationaux indicated that in Bordeaux itself the order owned three houses on rue des Étuvés, three houses and a convent on the rue du Hâ, and one house on each of the rue du Pas-St-George and rue Ste-Catherine, for a total worth of 116,601 livres.\textsuperscript{43} The scholar A. Communay writes that the barons of Brivacca came to enjoy the Montferrand-Landiras legacy, as, indeed, we have seen. The 1811 marriage of Léon de Brivacca, former émigré, to Catherine Delphine de La Roque-Budos, the daughter of émigré Charles-F.-A. La Roque, proved more fertile, with four children, than any recent marriage of male descendants (Communay: lxxvii; and O’Gilvy: I, 392). Does this mean that four children, than any recent marriage of male descendants?

Michel Figeeac’s statement that the family’s property was not restored even as late as 1831 only shows that he did not take heiresses into account (Figeeac: I, 465)? In any case, the uncertainties surrounding many details of medieval Landiras seem to return for its history in modern times.

**Terroir and Wines**

The remarkable work Bordeaux ses environs et ses vins classés par ordre de mérite [“The regions around Bordeaux and their wines classified in order of merit”] (sixteen editions between 1850 and 2001) fills in gaps after the middle of the 19th century, however. For each commune in the Bordelaise it lists the best wines in their order of merit and gives names of both wine and proprietor and the production volume. The first two editions do not mention “Château de Landiras”, but the editions from 1881 on do, and they estimate its quality of wine relative to its neighbours. Alphonse Bordes was the proprietor from at least 1874, when he possessed 86 hectares,\textsuperscript{44} into the early 20th century (Féret: II, 445). By 1929 the owner is François Borèse, which suggests single-family possession for over sixty years. In the same period, the nearby village of Landiras suffered a modest decrease in population, from 1735 to 1605 inhabitants.

We do not know when grapevines were first cultivated on the land adjacent to the château of Landiras, or when its seigneurs began to pay particular attention to the potential of the terroir for quality wine. Would it be in the 16th century, about the same time that Jeanne de Lestonnac’s grandfather began to take special care in the cultivation of his estates north of the Gironne—earlier, or later? The freezingly winter of 1956 destroyed all the vines in the Bordeaux region, and those of the Château de Landiras were only replanted in the 1980s by the renowned Danish wine connaisseur Peter Vinding-Diers. The property of the Château de Landiras today comprises 75 hectares, of which 26 hectares are under “Appellation d’Origine Contrôlée”.\textsuperscript{45}

We have very little information on the succession of owners in the mid-20th century. The 14th edition (1991) of Bordeaux... et ses vins does not mention the Château de Landiras at all. The 1995 edition, however, names Vinding-Diers as the proprietor, judges the quality of the wine seventh out of twenty-eight, prints a picture of the château, and offers the fullest history of the château of any edition (765).\textsuperscript{46} According to the 2001 edition, the wine has regained its second-place ranking and a picture of its label is printed. “S.C.A. Dne La Grave” replaces the name of a private proprietor, and the German Maison Sichel has the exclusive rights to market the wine (Boidron & Lemay, 2001, 16th éd.: 771-772 & 2274). The distinguished wine magazine Decanter, sampling the 1998 vintage, described the “excellent balance” of its red, to which it awarded four out of five stars, making it one of the best priced wines in its class (Decanter, 2002: 40). In late 2002, a short-lived Canadian-Swiss-French partnership acquired the Château de Landiras and undertook to improve the wine’s quality still more. In 2007, Michel Pélissié (co-head, with Jean Nouvel, of an architectural...
group), acquired the Château de Landiras. He had earlier, in 1997, purchased “Château Maison Noble”, at St-Martin-du-Puy in the Entre-Deux-Mers. With the assistance of François Puerta, Pélissié is continuing to restore the quality of the wine and its reputation.

Conclusion

The château de Landiras, though its wines, can easily echo its previous renown, so long as the property has continuing ownership, sufficient capitalization, and dedicated management. Its glorious history is doubtlessly a thing of the past, but what a legacy! Several archbishops of Bordeaux, perhaps a Crusading knight, feudal magnates rubbing shoulders with kings of two countries over several centuries, some marriages into families of magistrates in the Parlement de Bordeaux and at least one mayor of the city, marital associations with both English and French royalty and with the celebrated essayist Michel de Montaigne, and the direct presence for three decades of a devout wife and mother who went on to found a remarkable religious order and eventually to be recognized as a saint. At all these points, the barons of Landiras made a modest contribution to history. Less often noticed, however, is the significance of these points, the barons of Landiras-Landiras during the French Revolution? In all these ways, the Château de Landiras and its seigneurs have played significant roles throughout the High and Later Middle Ages and beyond. To combine all these associations with a quality wine is certainly not unique, but remains nonetheless rare.
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