

THE PETUN AND THE PRINCESSE DE CONDÉ

Charles Garrad.

December 1996.

<><><><>

Abstract

In 1639, the Jesuits of New France commenced the Mission of the Apostles to the Khionontatehronnon (Petun) Indians, but suspended the Mission after two winters, resuming it again in 1646. In this article it is suggested that the cause of the suspension in 1641 and resumption in 1646 was the inability of the sponsor to provide the promised finances before the later date.

En 1639, les Jésuites de la Nouvelle France établirent la Mission des Apôtres parmi les Indigènes Khionontateronons (Petun), mais après deux hivers, ils la supprimèrent. Ils recommencèrent encore en 1646. Cet article vise à proposer qu'en a supprimé cette mission en 1641 et ne la recommença qu'en 1646 à cause de la manque des fonds promis et fournis par sa bienfaitrice avant cette dernière date.

<><><><>

Introduction

The following text is a mixture of known fact, speculation, supposition and probabilities which are compatible with the known facts, concerning the Princesse de Condé, and her sponsorship of the Jesuit "Mission of the Apostles" to the Petun (Khiontatehronnon-Ouendat) Indians of New France. As she was the only sponsor, the fortunes of the Mission were wholly dependent on the fortunes of the Princesse, and perhaps the known events in this history of the Mission reflected the various crises and events of her life.

Although the Mission started in 1639, it was not until 1647 that the Princesse was identified as its benefactrice. It is suggested that the lapse of eight years between these two dates is consistent with a long delay in the receipt of the promised funding, and that the delay may be explained by the events that occurred in the Princesse' life before and during this period.

An examination of those events allows the suggestion that the Princesse's good intentions were overtaken, and for the while frustrated, by other unexpected events, pressures and demands, particularly at the time the initial transfer of funds was due. One such event was a major family crisis of some four years duration concerning the marriage of her eldest son. Pressures probably resulted from her membership in France's highest social circle, where she was possibly expected by the other ladies of rank, including the Queen, to give priority to them in jointly supporting such projects as the Société de Notre Dame de Montréal. At the same time she had other local competing charitable commitments, some of long-standing. The improvement in the Princesse's fortunes resulting from the restoration to her of the confiscated Montmorency estates in 1642 may have been a principal reason she was finally able to provide the promised funding.

That the Princesse's charitable intentions developed a focus on New France is not surprising. She was

related by blood or marriage to all five successive Viceroys of New France (the title varied), 1610 the Comte de Soissons (husband's uncle); 1610-1619 the Prince of Condé (husband)(excluding the temporary vice-royalty of Thémis during Condé's imprisonment 1616-1619); 1619-1625 the Duc de Montmorency (brother); 1625-1627 the Duc de Ventadour (nephew); 1627-1642 Cardinal Richelieu (daughter-in-law's uncle 1641-1642).

The Princesse de Condé

Born in 1594 (D'Aumale 1872:201 says 1593), at Chantilly, the Montmorency family seat north of Paris, Charlotte-Marguerite de Montmorency (1594-1650), the future Princesse de Condé, and her brother Henri II de Montmorency (1595-1632), were the only children of Henri I, Marshall and Constable of France. When Henri I died a widower in 1614, Henri II, at nineteen years of age, found himself Grand Admiral of France, Governor of Languedoc, and master of Chantilly.

Henri de Montmorency's sister, Charlotte-Marguerite, had long since left home and had been married for five years. At the age of fifteen, and already noted for her beauty, she had appeared at the court of King Henri IV, and had become the subject of court intrigue. One result was that the King, himself enamoured with her, decreed that she would marry his own kinsman (grand-nephew) and First Prince of the Blood, Henri II de Bourbon (1588-1646), the third Prince de Condé, as a means of keeping her within the court and his reach. The betrothal took place at the Louvre in December 1608, and the marriage at the bride's family Château de Chantilly, in May (some sources say March) 1609. When the couple were not in hiding to escape the King's passion for the Princesse, their principal residence was the Condé château at Valery. The Prince was torn between obligations to his kinsman and King, and his wish to protect his wife and honour. The King was equally torn between duty and shame. Depending on the King's whim at any time, Condé was either praised and honoured, or condemned and hunted (D'Aumale 1872 et al).

These events occurred in times of political and religious change. The King and his ministers were concentrating power at the expense of the nobles and princes. The Roman Catholic Church was engaged in the Counter-Reformation, a movement initially intended to induce the seceded Protestants to return to the old faith, but which polarised into extremes beyond reconciliation the position of Roman Catholics and Protestants, and ensured religion would remain a political issue. In France the results included the notorious St. Bartholomew's Day massacre of Protestants beginning in 1572 days after the wedding of Henry of Navarre (1553-1610), a leading Protestant. Henry's life was spared on the condition he convert to Catholicism, and after becoming King of France (1589) and suppressing opposition, he did so (1593), attempting to preserve some lingering civil and religious liberties for his Protestant subjects by the Edict of Nantes 1598. This was not enough to prevent spasmodic uprisings by either the nobles or the Protestants, often, as in the case of the earlier Condés, one and the same.

In 1610 King Henri IV was assassinated. His nine-year old son became King Louis XIII (1601-1643), controlled by the queen dowager, Mary de Medici. On learning of King Henry IV's death, the Condés hurried back to France from Brussels, where they had been living to avoid his importunacies towards the Princesse, to consolidate their place in the new regime. That same year, the Princesse, her husband, and the Prince's younger brother and his wife, supported their first Mission to the natives of New France, as godparents to Indian children baptized by the Jesuit Father Pierre Biard at Port Royal in Acadia (JR2:154-5, 158-9).

In 1611, Samuel de Champlain, observing the unregulated competition between French trading ships on the St. Lawrence was being "ruined through the greed of gain", returned to France with a plan to benefit the trade through controls authorised by King. His persuasive argument was successful. The

new King, Louis XIII, appointed his uncle Charles de Bourbon, the Comte de Soissons, Lieutenant-General of the distant colony. He in turn appointed Champlain his Lieutenant in New France. Within weeks of these events, the Comte died, and his nephew, Henri de Bourbon, the third Prince de Condé, was appointed his successor. The Prince confirmed Champlain's appointment, "commended and approved" Champlain's plan to take Récollet Fathers to New France, and may have contributed toward the cost (Biggar 1937:86-88; Champlain 1925 II:241-245; 1929 III:15,20-21; 1932 IV:219,223; Lanctot 1963:107).

The Princesse's husband assumed the title Viceroy of New France (JR2:296n24), and it was during his viceroyalty, and hence with his authority, that Champlain first reached what is now southern Ontario, and in 1615-1616 visited the countries of the Huron and Petun (Wyandot) Indians. Champlain reported to both the King and the Prince (Champlain 1932 IV:220,350). Perhaps the Princesse first learned of the Petun, and the other Indian tribes that Champlain visited, from his reports to her husband. Champlain dedicated his book about his Fourth (1613) Voyage to the Prince (Champlain 1925 II:238-9).

In spite of his rank and numerous high offices, the Prince could not refrain from intrigue. In 1616 (Biggar H.P. 1937:103; Lanctot 1963:111, et al. Other sources say 1617) he was arrested and confined in the Bastille (Lanctot 1963:111,115; et al. Godley 1915:5 says Vincennes), and remained there three years. Thémynes, the officer who had arrested him, was rewarded during the period of the sentence with Condé's viceroyalty and its income (Champlain 1932 IV:340), but both reverted to Condé on his release in 1619. The Prince then donated part of his viceregal salary to the Récollet Fathers to build their seminary at Quebec (Lanctot 1963:115). Throughout all this time of difficulty, the Princesse remained with her husband in prison, bore him four children there, and undoubtedly often had occasion to reflect on matters of interest to the Condés, including the affairs of New France. Three of the four children born in prison, all boys, died in infancy. A fifth child, born in Paris after Condé's release, became his eldest son and heir. This was Louis II de Bourbon (1621-1687), the Duc d'Enghien (d'Anguien JR8:225, JR8:291n13, JR11:53), Monseigneur the Prince (JR32:137), future fourth Prince de Condé, to become known in history as "Le Grand Condé".

After his restoration, the Princesse's husband agreed to sell his viceregal post to the Admiral of France, Henri II, the Duc de Montmorency, the Princesse's brother, and for the next six years Chantilly could be regarded as the capital of New France. In 1625 the Duc sold the post to Henri de Lévis, Duc de Ventadour, a nephew of the Princesse. He was probably content to transfer the post, and receive compensation, to the Company of New France in 1628, because of Champlain's reports criticising the Montmorency Company, particularly its failure to bring settlers to Quebec. It is noted that one of the Jesuit priests who solicited Richelieu's intervention on behalf of New France was a Father Ragueneau (1597-?) (Lanctot 1963:129), presumably François, elder brother of Paul Ragueneau (1608-1680), and interested in the Canadian mission. He subsequently took ship for Quebec, but was captured and returned by the Kirke brothers. He then taught at Jesuit colleges in France, including Bourges, where he may have "conveyed his missionary ideal to his brother Paul" (Pouliot 1966:561).

The lack of political stability since Louis XIII had become king, of which Condé's intrigue is an example, both fostered and was curbed by the rise to power of Armand Jean Duplessis, the Cardinal Duc de Richelieu (1585-1642). In 1626 he was named Grand Master, Chief and General Superintendent of the Navigation and Commerce of France. In 1627 he suppressed Montmorency's title of Admiral, formed the Company of New France to assume the trade, acquired Ventadour's viceregal post and merged it with Grand Master (Biggar 1937:133-136).

Although the Cardinal was behind Condé's imprisonment in 1616, broke much of Condé's power in 1623 (JR2:296n24), deprived the Princesse's brother of his Admiralship in 1626 (Lanctot 1963:128), deprived

the Princesse's nephew Ventadour of his viceroyalty in 1628, disputed a property ownership with the Prince in 1631 (Bergin 1985:129,168), sanctioned the execution of the Princesse's brother for armed revolt against him in 1632, ignoring the pleas of the Princesse for mercy, and then purchased some of the dead man's property in 1633 (Bergin 1985:139), the Prince and the Cardinal found a sufficient mutual community of interests to cultivate each other. As early as 1633 the Prince proposed that his eldest son and heir, Louis II de Bourbon, the Duc d'Anguien and the future Grand Condé, then but twelve years of age, should marry the Cardinal's closest eligible female relative, a niece, then aged four. The contrary wishes of the contracted parties being of no concern to either the Cardinal or the Prince, the marriage took place in 1641 (Godley 1915:16). By this marriage, the Princesse acquired a daughter-in-law whose uncle was another *de facto* viceroy of New France.

The Cardinal, as had all his predecessors, confirmed Champlain as his Lieutenant and representative in New France. Champlain remained in the post until his death in 1635.

It was also in 1635 that Father Paul Le Jeune, Superior of the Jesuit Missions of New France, appealed in the "Relation" of that year to the wealthy and high-born of the mother country for the financial support of the Missions of New France (JR7:255-261). The Princesse's eldest son, the Duc d'Anguien, responded immediately in 1636 (JR8:225). The speed of the 15-year old Duc's response was probably because that year he was completing his final year of schooling at the Jesuit College of Ste. Marie at Bourges. One of his tutors for three of his six years at Bourges, Father Paul Ragueneau, (Pouliot 1966:561), was about to be sent to New France, and could take his pupil's response with him.

In 1637 both the Duc and his mother the Princesse responded to Le Jeune's continuing appeals (JR11:53). That same year the Princesse helped to baptise a Montagnais Indian child which had been brought to Paris, and later offered to be her guardian (JR11:99,53). Although her son had been educated by the Jesuits, she had developed a dislike for them, or at least those who had charge of her son. Her visits to Bourges were not encouraged, sometimes intentionally frustrated, and she and her daughter were shown "no consideration", on the instructions of her husband the Prince (Godley 1915:14-15). That the Princesse responded positively to support the Jesuits may be a tribute to her character, or simply because both the King and Queen (Wrong 1928:281), as well as her son, advocated it.

On one occasion in the autumn of 1632 when the young Prince was visited by both his sister and younger brother at Bourges, their mother was unable to be with them, being absent on "a desperate journey to beg mercy of Richelieu for her only brother, Henri de Montmorency .. under sentence of death. Her errand was in vain" (Godley 1915:6-7). A further blow had followed when, after her childless brother's execution, the family Château at Chantilly, and other family estates, were confiscated, and her inconsolable sister-in-law, Montmorency's Duchess, turned to religion, and entered a convent for the remainder of her days (Herard 1987:105-106; Noailles 1924:298). With no male heir to continue her family name, the Princesse's branch of the venerable Montmorency family was at an end.

If the Princesse was depressed by her brother's death, the loss of the family estates, and obstruction by her husband, she found comfort in the company of other gifted and exalted ladies, the inner circle of the court. These were the very ladies to whom Le Jeune had addressed his appeal, and some were already supporting missionary work in New France (Wrong 1928:282-284). The support of missions to the New World must have been a constant topic in this high-born circle, and perhaps it was here where the Princesse conceived the idea of a charity exclusively hers. Perhaps her son, with his association with the Jesuits, urged her in the direction she would take. From these possibilities, details of the Princesse's response in 1637 can be surmised. Earlier that year, in April, Father Charles Garnier, stationed in the Huron Indian country, undertook a visit to the Petun Indians which lasted fourteen days (JR14:35). The purpose of the visit published by Father Le Jeune, was "simply to visit the sick there",

but at the same time this visit would have provided the opportunity to prepare a feasibility study on which to base a proposal for the potential endowment of a resident Mission to the Petun. If not in 1637, then in 1638, the Princesse undertook to endow the necessary perpetual revenue to establish a Mission to the Petun, on the two conditions, as far as was published, that the Mission be called "the Mission of the Apostles" and that she be declared "the Mother and Foundress of the Mission called that of the Apostles" (JR32:137; Du Creux 1952(2)485-486).

The Mission of the Apostles to the Petun formally commenced in 1639, with two missionaries resident in the Petun territory through the winter of 1639-1640 (JR20:43-67). Two missionaries again wintered with the Petun 1640-1641, but although their efforts met with growing success in the second year (JR21:177-185), the Mission was then suspended, due partly to native resistance, and "especially in view of the small number of Laborers" (JR23:179-181). During 1642 the Jesuits at Ste. Marie only "made some journeys to the mission of the Apostles .. (to visit) .. the few Christians whom God has given us there" (JR23:179-183). The word "mission" in this context is clearly used to describe a geographic location rather than a "mission" in the sense of a winter-long residential evangelical effort such as was sustained through the two previous winters, terminating in the spring of 1641. From this time (1641) the Mission was suspended, and would so remain, to "await from Heaven the time and the moment for undertaking these journeys, and above all a reinforcement of Laborers" (JR23:183). The reader was given the clear message that the work of Heaven and production of more Christians required more labourers, and left to draw the conclusion that funds to support those labourers were sought. That the Princesse was not at this time declared "the Mother and Foundress of the Mission" as she requested, but instead the Mission was suspended, surely implies that funds expected from her had not appeared.

What had happened back in France to delay the Princesse from fulfilling her commitment can be surmised.

After leaving the Jesuit College at Bourges, the Princesse's son Louis, the Duc d'Anguien, enrolled at the Académie Royale, in Paris. There, at the age of sixteen, he was presented first to the King, and then to Cardinal Richelieu, at the height of his power. The Duc little knew that Richelieu was considering him as the future husband of his sister's daughter. When, at the age of seventeen (1638), the Duc was finally informed of the fate chosen for him, he was violently opposed to it. Richelieu was the most powerful man in Europe, but he was also responsible for the execution of the Duc's popular uncle, and the Duc, outwardly civil, disliked both Richelieu and his niece, the bride-elect. In his despair, rage and humiliation, the Duc even contemplated open military revolt against his father and the Cardinal, united in their insistence on the marriage, and an appeal to the King (Godley 1915:16-21). Yet the marriage took place (1641).

By what means the young Duc was coerced into a detested marriage can partly be guessed. His father, the Prince, had the greatest power over him, not only because of his political rank and as head of the family, but because he was the Duc's sole means of subsistence. The Cardinal had some indirect influence, by his control of the choice of the Duc's confessor (Godley 1915:16-18). It might be speculated that the Prince, who did not hesitate to frustrate his wife if it was to his advantage, might have withheld funding for her projected Mission to compel her to bring to bear on her reluctant son whatever maternal influences she could.

At the same time the Princesse found herself confronted with other unexpected and competing demands. With many of these is associated the names of Vincent de Paul, and Jean-Jacques Olier, her parish curé, both of whom had regularly solicited the Princesse's support of their various charitable endeavours towards the poor, orphans, the sick, the imprisoned and the hospitalized, since 1630 (Daveluy 1966:214; Herard 1987:118,120).

In 1639, when the funding for the Mission of the Apostles should have been paid, Olier and others founded the Société Notre-Dame de Montréal, to commence a settlement on Montreal Island in distant New France. The Princesse found herself expected to contribute both prayers and donations (Herard 1987:117) to the new venture. Jeanne Mance was another who in 1640 successfully solicited the Princesse and the other wealthy women of the high-born circle, including the Queen, for support in going to New France to undertake missionary work (Daveluy 1966:484, Wrong 1928:287-290). Olier's and Mance's intentions, initially independent and separate, merged when Jeanne Mance became a member of the Société, and in 1641 with other Associates she sailed to the New World and commenced a settlement at Montreal. The Princesse formally become an Associate of the Société in 1642, and the same year she attended the ceremony of consecration of the Island of Montreal, held at Notre-Dame Cathedral in Paris by the Abbé Olier. She continued her financial contributions, and pressured her husband the Prince to use his position to benefit the Société (Herard 1987:116-7).

At the same time the Princesse had the social obligations imposed by her rank. Coping with all these often conflicting demands, life for the Princesse was at this time described by one of her biographers as "*difficile*" (Herard 1987:123). It would be understandable if the Princesse, ranking the demands on her in order of priority, placed the distant Mission of the Apostles at the bottom of the list, eclipsed by more immediate and demanding priorities, and decided her commitment would have to be postponed.

Other factors may have influenced the postponement of her support for the Mission of the Apostles. For the various monies she had generously promised in excess of her personal income, the Princesse was dependent on her husband. The attitude of the Prince to her funding so many projects simultaneously is not known. If his reputation has been correctly reported, he probably was averse to expenditures unlikely to produce a profit or some benefit (Godley 1915:3). Perhaps also, having finally coerced his son into obedience, the Prince was now more concerned with funding the potentially financially advantageous future wedding of his son the Duc d'Anguien to Cardinal Richelieu's niece (1641), and securing her dowry to the Condé fortunes.

Hardly were these issues settled when new turmoil was produced by the death of the Cardinal Richelieu in December 1642. The huge size of his estate, and uncertainties as to the provisions and legality of his will, made litigation certain. The Cardinal's niece, now the Prince of Condé's new daughter-in-law, was wholly excluded as a beneficiary, presumably because of the dowry she had just received. The Prince and his son the Duc d'Enghien (d'Anguien) argued that as the Cardinal's estate was so huge, his dowry to his niece was not proportional, and plunged into litigation, as did other claimants for their own reasons. Although it not until 1674 that the difficulties were entirely settled, an agreement was reached in March 1643 between most of the various claimants. Then began the process of exchanging estates, titles, posts, gifts, legacies and incomes agreed upon, which must have dragged on for some years, consuming everyone's time and energy. The Prince of Condé separately pursued the matter of his daughter-in-law's share in Richelieu's estate through the courts up to the *parlement* of Paris in 1644, attending some of the hearings personally (Bergin 1985:264-270). The resulting level of stress and agitation within the Condé family and households, compounded further by the death of the King Louis XIII without an adult heir in 1643, may have left the Prince with little time, patience and sympathy for his wife's requests for money for her charities. Her own income was undoubtedly dedicated to the ones she saw as the most pressing. Presumably, those of lesser priority continued to wait, and in consequence the Mission of the Apostles remained suspended.

Then occurred an event that would further claim the Princesse's time, interest and money. Soon after the death of Louis XIII in 1643, the Princesse's eldest son, the Duc d'Enghien (d'Anguien), scored a military victory for France. The Queen Regent, Anne of Austria, long a friend of the Princesse and sympathetic towards her charitable endeavours, used the opportunity to restore to the Princesse

personally her confiscated home Château de Chantilly, and other Montmorency estates (Noailles 1924:298). This happy event could not have been unaccompanied by some emotional distraction, and possibly further unexpected expense in the next several years. The Condés moved to Chantilly as their principal residence. Now it was the Princesse's turn to be pre-occupied. Presumably the estates provided the additional income which soon enabled the Princesse to re-address some of her unfulfilled commitments. By 1644 her priority project in New France, the settlement at Montreal, was receiving the support of the King and the financial support of others (Daveluy 1996:217). It seems probable that her financial picture improved just as her more expensive commitments reduced.

In 1645 two distant events came together. In France, the Princesse was at last able to consider the financial arrangements she must make to endow Mission of the Apostles. In New France since 1636, and a missionary to the Huron Indians of Ontario since 1637, her son's former tutor at Bourges, Father Paul Ragueneau, was that same year (1645) appointed the Superior of the Huron Mission at Sainte Marie-among-the-Hurons. As Superior it would be he who advocated and planned the revival of the lapsed Mission of the Apostles in 1646, nominally at the request of the Petun themselves (JR33:143). Perhaps it was at his instigation that the Princesse now chose to act. Her agreement could have gone out to New France in 1645, or not later than with the ships that sailed in the spring of 1646, to reach Ragueneau at Ste. Marie when the annual canoe brigade arrived, because the Mission of the Apostles recommenced in October that year (Jones 1909:361).

While the foregoing is hypothetical, the fact that the Mission resumed in 1646 (Jones 1909:355,361), sufficiently funded to support two missionaries to permanently reside in two separate Petun towns (JR33:143), is surely evidence that this, or something very much like it, happened.

That the mission recommenced (1646) so soon after Father Paul Ragueneau's appointment as Superior at Sainte Marie-among-the-Hurons (1645) may be nothing more than a coincidence. The new resolve in the Princesse may have had some other cause. One possibility to consider was the effect in France, and especially among those interested in the New France missions, of the arrival in November 1644 of the mutilated Father François-Joseph (Francesco-Giuseppe) Bressani, released from his Iroquois captors by the generous ransom of the Dutch, and already asserting his wish to return to distant Huronia, as he did in 1645 (Tessier 1966:128; Jones 1909:346). Bressani's biographers gloss over the details of his stay in France, but surely while there he would have met some of the supporters of the missionaries of New France, prominent among which were the Queen, and her friend, the Princesse de Condé. If in France "the *Relations* were read as books of devotion describing the trials of God's saints" (Wrong 1928:280), the appearance of such a saint in person must have caused considerable excitement and offers of support. Bressani's story might well have induced a new resolve in the Princesse to fulfil her dream, and not impossibly, perhaps Bressani himself carried news of her new decision to Father Ragueneau in Huronia, where he arrived in the autumn of 1645.

None of the Princesse's several biographers mention the recommencement of the Mission of the Apostles in 1646, and the implied consequent commitment of monies by the Princesse. Perhaps, her husband's possible reaction to her charitable expenditures was still a factor necessitating discretion, and she kept her actions private.

The death of her husband the Prince in 1646 released the Princesse from this constraint. She "regained her liberty and inherited his large fortune" (Godley 1915:5). From her home and birthplace at the Château de Chantilly, she devoted herself to benevolence and good works for the remainder of her days (Herard 1987:118-119). Her pride in being the sole support of a Mission in New France no longer needed to be a secret. It was publicly announced in France the same year, and in New France as soon as the ships arrived in the spring of 1647. That at, or about this time, she may have made a further

payment above her original commitment is hinted by the fact that when the Mission of the Apostles recommenced in 1646, it supported two missionaries, but the Relation of 1650 mentions that "for some years past" there had been four (JR33:143; JR35:107).

After the Princesse's death in 1650, Chantilly became the home of her eldest son, the Grand Condé, who greatly enlarged it. The original Château, now called "Le Petit Château" still stands today much as it was when the Princesse lived there.

Conclusion and Summary

What is certainly known of the Mission of the Apostles is that it commenced in 1639 with considerable enthusiasm, was suspended in 1641, but in 1646 it was not only resumed, but soon supported four missionaries instead of the original two. It is a reasonable speculation that it was because of the Princesse's commitment in 1638 that the Jesuits went ahead and formally began the Mission of the Apostles to the Petun in 1639; that they had to suspend the Mission two years later because the promised financing failed to arrive; that they were able to resume the Mission in 1646 because the promised income had at last begun. The reasons publicly given for suspending the mission in 1641 and renewing it in 1646 probably had enough truth in them to be accepted, and served to protect the Princesse from embarrassment while she worked her way through her many problems. An improvement in her personal income following the restoration of her family estates to her in 1643, at a time of reduced competing financial and social pressures, enabled her to commence the Mission funding in 1645, and for the Mission to actively resume in 1646. The death of her husband in 1646 not only secured further funding but enabled the announcement of 1647 identifying the Princess as "the Mother and Foundress of the Mission called that `of the Apostles'". Her ambition in this regard was at last fulfilled.

The Mission continued until 1650, when the Petuns abandoned Ontario and the Jesuits were withdrawn to Quebec. Probably the Princesse never knew of this, as she died that same year.

Father Paul Ragueneau

The foregoing construction suggests the possibility that Father Paul Ragueneau, who, as the last Superior of the Huron Mission at Sainte Marie-among-the-Hurons (1645-1650) organized the commencement of the Mission of the Apostles to the Petun in 1646, may well have played a personal role in obtaining the necessary supporting finances from the Princesse de Condé in France, through his former connection with her son the Duc d'Enghien (d'Anguien), whom he tutored for three years. There is no known primary evidence for this suggestion. A multi-year long-distance search for any of his private correspondence on the subject, conducted from Canada by the writer, has not resulted in any being found in France to date. There is, however, surviving evidence of a continuing relationship with the Condés at a later date, in the form of a letter he wrote from Quebec (as Superior for all the Jesuit Missions in New France), in 1661, to his former pupil the Duc d'Anguien, by now the fourth Prince of Condé, at Chantilly (JR46:146-149). This evidence allows, if not supports, the possibility that Ragueneau had remained in touch with his former pupil in earlier years, and perhaps with his mother the Princesse until her death in 1650.

Father Paul Ragueneau returned to France in 1662, and succeeded his former Superior, Father Paul le Jeune, as "procureur" and representative of the Jesuit Missions in New France, based in Paris, never to return to Canada. He died in 1680 (Pouliot 1966:561-564). It would be highly relevant to the many suppositions made in this paper if it could be shown that during his time in Huronia he did correspond

with the Condé family. Even more so, the discovery of the actual contract document detailing the conditions of the endowment of the Mission of the Apostles to the Petun (Khiontatehronnon-Ouendat) Indians of New France by Charlotte-Marguerite de Montmorency, the Princesse de Condé, might yet occur, enabling the various hypotheses and suppositions presented in this paper to be confirmed or revised.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS and THANKS

As the nominal author I gratefully acknowledge and thank the following people who did much of the real work of assisting the compilation of the foregoing in a variety of different ways. It was great working with you all, and I ask your indulgence for any suppositions you don't agree with, and errors which are all mine: in France, Père Robert **Bonfils**, S.J., Archives Françaises de la Compagnie de Jésus, Vanves; Henri, Michèle and Catherine **Reichert**, Paris; Père Roger **Tandonnet**, S.J., Bibliothèque des Fontaines, Chantilly; and Frédéric **Vergne**, Conservateur de la Bibliothèque et des Archives Condé, Chantilly; in Ontario, Claudine **Bazin**, Ontario Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Recreation; Dr. Cornelius J. **Jaenen**, University of Ottawa; and Claire **Knapp**, Willowdale; in Quebec Réal **Ouellet** and Laurier **Turgeon**, Université Laval; and Robert **Toupin**, S.J., Archives de la Compagnie de Jésus, Saint-Jérôme, Quebec.

REFERENCES AND SOURCES CONSULTED

Bergin, Joseph

1985 Cardinal Richelieu Power and the Pursuit of Wealth
Yale University Press

Biggar, Henry P.

1937 The Early Trading Companies of New France
Clifton

Champlain, Samuel de

1922-1936 The Works of Samuel de Champlain 6 volumes
The Champlain Society, Toronto

D'Aumale, Le Duc de

1872 History of the Princes de Condé
London: Richard Bentley and Son

Daveluy, Marie-Claire

1958 Charlotte Marguerite de Montmorency, Princesse de Condé, 1594-1650
Revue d'Histoire de l'Amérique Française 1957-1958(11)300-304
1966 Paul de Chomedey de Maisonneuve;
Jean Mance
Dictionary of Canadian Biography I:212-222; 483-487
University of Toronto Press

Du Creux, François

1952 History of Canada or New France Volume 2
The Champlain Society, Toronto

Godley, Eveline

1915 The Great Condé
John Murray, London

Grolier Society Inc., The

Grolier Encyclopedia

Herard, Anne

1987 Charlotte-Marguerite de Montmorency, Princesse de Condé, Dame de Charité (1594-1650)
Memoire de Maitrise, Université de Paris-Sorbonne, Octobre 1987

JR = Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents

73 volumes, Thwaites edition, Cleveland

(The letter dated Quebec, October 12, 1661, from Father Paul Ragueneau to Henry II de Bourbon, fourth Prince of Condé, reproduced in JR46:146-149, 297-8, is copied from the original in Papiers de Condé, serie P, tome XXV, Condé Archives, Chantilly, France.)

Jones, Arthur Edward

1909 8endake Ehen or Old Huronia

Fifth Report Ontario Bureau of Archives, Toronto

(citing a letter by Charles Garnier dated April 25, 1648)

Lanctot, Gustave

1963 A History of Canada Volume 1

Clarke, Irwin & Company, Toronto

Noailles, Vicomte de

1924 La Mère du Grand Condé Charlotte-Marguerite de Montmorency, Princesse de Condé (1594-1650).

Paris

Pouliot, Léon

1966 Paul Ragueneau

Dictionary of Canadian Biography I:561-564

University of Toronto Press

Tessier, Albert

1966 François-Joseph Bressani

Dictionary of Canadian Biography I:128-129

University of Toronto Press

Wrong, George M.

1928 The Rise and Fall of New France Volume 1

The MacMillan Co. of Canada Ltd., Toronto

(top right)
Charlotte-Marguerite de Montmorency,
Princesse de Condé (1594-1650).
From the book
La Mère du Grand Condé,
by Vicomte de Noailles, Paris, 1924,
frontispiece.



(lower right)
Charlotte-Marguerite de Montmorency,
Princesse de Condé (1594-1650).
From the book
La Mère du Grand Condé,
by Vicomte de Noailles, Paris, 1924,
following page 334.

(below)
Henri II de Bourbon, Prince de Condé
(1588-1646), husband of
Charlotte-Marguerite de Montmorency.
From the book
The Works of Samuel de Champlain,
The Champlain Society, Toronto, 1925,
volume 2, following page 238.



*Qui de ce Prince icy voit l'Auguste aparence
Croies en le courage et l'Esprit si parfait
Que tout le mesme rang qu'il tient du sang de France
Au monde il le luy faut en ce qu'il dit et fait.*
L. Goussier del. 1621.

