

# Urban History Review Revue d'histoire urbaine

URBAN HISTORY REVIEW  
REVUE D'HISTOIRE URBAINE

## Correction

John C. Weaver

Volume 13, numéro 2, octobre 1984

URI : <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1018141ar>

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.7202/1018141ar>

[Aller au sommaire du numéro](#)

Éditeur(s)

Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine

ISSN

0703-0428 (imprimé)

1918-5138 (numérique)

[Découvrir la revue](#)

Citer ce document

Weaver, J. C. (1984). Correction. *Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine*, 13(2), 188–188. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1018141ar>

merchants. Apart from setting interesting problems for both contemporaries and historians about how to define a "bourgeois," the more breached than honoured edict witnessed councillorary careers which passed through all three designations and often held more than one transitionally. One of the main conclusions of the book argues that the Paris City Council was more open in the early part of the century than it was in the third quarter and than the French governing elite in general seems to have been in the seventeenth century. Since studies such as Michael Hayden's, of the French episcopacy, suggest, however, that the reign of Henry IV was more open to men of roturier background than were those of his successors, Diefendorf's perceived trend may well be found to suffer at least a brief interruption very soon after her study closes in 1575.

Each section of the book opens with a presentation of literary and legal expectations, and then examines how Diefendorf's ninety councillors and their families matched them. The study admirably survives the dangers which quantitative material bodes for works aspiring to fall within the canons of historical literature. The scholarship is soundly based in marriage contracts, wills and testaments, notorial records, and private papers; the organizational pattern is consistent without being tedious; and the prose is lucid and varied. In a field rapidly leaving behind the interest and easy comprehension not only of the lay reader, but also of the undergraduate, it is reassuring to find another book which can be confidently assigned to students majoring in history, urban or family studies, or government. It is the applied social scientist and the member of a liberal profession who most need to know about the past and who are often ignored in monographs aimed at graduate students and fellow scholars.

The position of city councillor in sixteenth-century Paris was more prestigious than either laborious or powerful. It served as a link between the business and government of Paris and the royal governing of France, and it was held by men who participated in the culture and social-welfare

agencies of the city. Diefendorf has served us well in her study, but we need to know more about the political views of this group, what the actual governing challenges of Paris were (Diefendorf gives us only glimpses into the problems of contemporary religious controversy and of resistance to royal financial demands), and how the Parisian base of such prominent royal officers as Chancellors Michel L'Hôpital contributed to the advice proffered the monarch on national questions. These are, however, the tasks of another book, not fairly a part of Diefendorf's, which has done well to establish the professional and financial bases of the families of the men who as city councillors presided over the politics of Paris.

Donald A. Bailey  
Department of History  
University of Winnipeg

---

### Correction

John C. Weaver, Book Review Editor, wishes to make a correction to the October 1983 issue (Volume XII, No. 2) of the *Review*.

"In Olaf Janzen's review of W.J. Reader's *Bowater: A History* an editorial insertion alleged that Bowater's was "significant . . . as the founding . . . agent in Corner Brook." In fact, the original mill came on stream in 1925 and was not purchased by Bowaters' until 1938. While Bowaters' has had an undeniable influence on the subsequent development of the area, the company's appearance was relatively recent.

The book review editor regrets the inaccuracy of the published remark and any embarrassment to Professor Janzen."

---