

**From the holdings of the Department of Special Collections , Princeton University Library,  
Princeton, NJ**

These documents are either in the public domain, or can only be used for educational and research purposes (Fair use) as per U.S. Copyright law (text below). By accessing this file, all users agree that their use falls in the public domain or within fair use as defined by the copyright law. We do not charge any permission or usage fees for the publication of images of material in our collections, including those provided by Princeton University Library, via our website, catalog, or directly from staff. For more information regarding copyright, credit, and citation please review the information on the Copyright, Credit and Citation Guidelines page of our website.

<https://library.princeton.edu/special-collections/policies/copyright-credit-and-citation-guidelines>. If you have any questions, including how to order higher-quality images from the collection, contact Special Collections Public Services via our Ask Us! Form. <https://library.princeton.edu/special-collections/ask-us>

---

Doctoral Dissertations, 2011-2026

French and Italian

---

2012

# Authorial Personae, Ideal Readers, and Advertising for the Book in Lemaire, Marot, and Rabelais

Francis, Scott Michael

Princeton, NJ : Princeton University

---

<http://arks.princeton.edu/ark:/88435/dsp019593tv16n>

*U.S. Copyright law: The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, §108, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specified conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research. If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of fair use that user may be liable for copyright infringement. This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve a violation of copyright law. <https://www.copyright.gov/title17/title17.pdf>*

AUTHORIAL PERSONAE, IDEAL READERS AND ADVERTISING FOR THE BOOK IN  
LEMAIRE, MAROT AND RABELAIS

Scott Michael Francis

A DISSERTATION  
PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY  
OF PRINCETON UNIVERSITY  
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE  
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

RECOMMENDED FOR ACCEPTANCE  
BY THE DEPARTMENT OF  
FRENCH AND ITALIAN  
Adviser: François Rigolot

JUNE 2012

© Copyright by Scott Michael Francis, 2012. All rights reserved.

## ABSTRACT

The dissertation examines representations of the author, reader, and book in sixteenth-century printed editions of Jean Lemaire de Belges, Clément Marot, and François Rabelais. Considering both author and reader as literary constructs, I argue that authors and printer/booksellers, faced with a more indefinite readership after the advent of print, and hence with a possible discrepancy between supply and demand, have recourse to techniques similar to those of modern advertising in creating demand for their books and ensuring their favorable reception. I focus on two such techniques: the construction of the authorial persona and ideal readership. I compare authorial personae to the concept of prestige advertising, which seeks to allay fears of mass production and the profit motive by representing the printed book as an artisanal product and the author and printer/bookseller as concerned only with the reader's benefit. I also examine how editions construct an ideal reader, an idealized image of the reader that may be attained by reading and receiving the book in a certain way, much like ads present an image of the consumer to which the product can grant access. In so doing, I pursue a line of inquiry in which historical and philological approaches to authorship, readership, and book history inform our conception of how advertising functions, and vice versa.

Chapter One shows how Lemaire's *Illustrations de Gaule et Singularitez de Troye* and its accompanying publications are an attempt to convince the literate public that Lemaire's services are what France needs most in the midst of Louis XII's bitter and costly feud with the pope, Julius II. Chapter Two examines how Marot's authorial persona is manipulated in authorized and unauthorized editions, and how the 1538 *Œuvres* hint at the poet's misgivings with the flexibility of his persona and its use in attracting readers. Chapter Three shows how Marot's concerns are borne out in the works of Rabelais, who crafts an authorial persona increasingly

centered on gratifying and healing readers, but who accompanies this persona with an ideal readership which simultaneously ties advertising techniques to Renaissance theories of self-fashioning and reveals the parasitism of these techniques.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                                                                                                                                          |    |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Abstract .....                                                                                                                           | i  |
| Abbreviations .....                                                                                                                      | v  |
| Acknowledgments .....                                                                                                                    | vi |
| Author's Note .....                                                                                                                      | ix |
| Introduction                                                                                                                             |    |
| Rabelais's Wager .....                                                                                                                   | 1  |
| Advertising: A Rhetorical Approach to the Problem of Supply and Demand .....                                                             | 6  |
| <i>Captatio benevolentiae</i> , Prestige Advertising, and the Flexibility of the Authorial<br>Persona .....                              | 12 |
| Ideal Readers and Reading as Adjuvant .....                                                                                              | 19 |
| Authorial Personae, Ideal Readers, and Advertising for the Book in Lemaire,<br>Marot, and Rabelais .....                                 | 23 |
| Chapter One                                                                                                                              |    |
| "Ung petit tableau de mon industrie": Jean Lemaire de Belges and Gratitude<br>for Historiography .....                                   | 32 |
| Birds, Bees, and Olive Trees: The Paratext of the <i>Premier Livre des Illustrations<br/>    de Gaule et Singularitez de Troye</i> ..... | 36 |
| "Soubz ce noir marbre gist l'Amant Vert": The <i>Épîtres</i> and Lemaire's Historical<br>Turn .....                                      | 56 |
| Ungrateful Popes and Grateful Readers.....                                                                                               | 65 |
| History and Exemplarity in Desperate Times .....                                                                                         | 75 |
| <i>Malus Genius</i> : The Parasitic <i>Rhétoriqueur</i> .....                                                                            | 85 |

|                                                                                                                                   |     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| The Evolution of the <i>acteur</i> from Amant Vert to Labeur Historien and the Danger of Ingratitude .....                        | 95  |
| Lemaire and Marot: The Poet of Princes and the Prince of Poets .....                                                              | 104 |
| Chapter Two                                                                                                                       |     |
| “Quel bien par rime on a”: Marot’s Persona and the Prestige of the Book.....                                                      | 111 |
| From <i>Opuscles</i> to <i>Adolescence</i> .....                                                                                  | 115 |
| “Arres de ce mieulx”: <i>L’Adolescence clémentine</i> .....                                                                       | 118 |
| “Je n’en donne ung festu, pourveu qu’ayons son livre”: <i>La Suite de l’Adolescence clémentine</i> .....                          | 154 |
| “Ma Jeunesse abusée”: The <i>Adolescence</i> and <i>Suite</i> during Marot’s Exile .....                                          | 162 |
| “[A]ffin que les Lecteurs ne se plaignent”: The 1538 <i>Œuvres</i> as a Response to and Adaptation of Unauthorized Editions ..... | 168 |
| Chapter Three                                                                                                                     |     |
| Rabelais: Advertising Undone.....                                                                                                 | 189 |
| <i>Pantagruel</i> : Alcofrybas Nasier and the Book as <i>Adjuvant</i> .....                                                       | 193 |
| <i>Gargantua</i> : <i>Silenus Alcibiadis</i> or <i>silenus praeposterus</i> ?.....                                                | 217 |
| The <i>Tiers Livre</i> and Rabelais’s Turn to Prestige Advertising.....                                                           | 226 |
| The <i>Quart Livre</i> and <i>Cinquiesme Livre</i> : The Triumph of Medicine?.....                                                | 240 |
| Conclusion                                                                                                                        |     |
| The Ineluctability of Advertising.....                                                                                            | 252 |
| Bibliography .....                                                                                                                | 256 |

## ABBREVIATIONS

*BHR: Bibliothèque d'humanisme et Renaissance*

BL: British Library

BNF: Bibliothèque nationale de France

ENS: École Normale Supérieure, Paris

*ER: Études Rabelaisiennes*

*FF: French Forum*

*JEBS: Journal of the Early Book Society*

*LCL: Loeb Classical Library*

Mayer: Claude Mayer, *Bibliographie des éditions de Clément Marot publiées au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle*

(Paris: Nizet, 1975). Numbers are those assigned by Mayer.

*MLN: Modern Language Notes*

*NRB: Stephen Rawles and Michael Screech, A New Rabelais Bibliography* (Geneva: Droz, 1987).

*OC I-II: Clément Marot, Œuvres complètes*, ed. François Rigolot (Paris: Flammarion, 2007-09), vols. 1-2.

*OPC I-II: Clément Marot, Œuvres poétiques complètes*, ed. Gérard Defaux (Paris: Bordas, 1990-93), vols. 1-2.

PUL: Princeton University Library

*RHLF: Revue d'Histoire littéraire de la France*

*RHR: Réforme Humanisme Renaissance*

Stecher I-IV: Jean Lemaire de Belges, *Œuvres*, ed. J. Stecher (Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1969), vols. 1-4.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A principal aim of this dissertation has been to show that literary self-promotion, to say nothing of literary production, is less an individual, heroic effort than a collaborative process in which many parties have a stake. The same may be said for the dissertation itself, as I could never have written it, or even developed enough as a scholar and as a person to have been able to write it, without the benevolence and assistance of those closest to me, as well as all those with whom I've had the pleasure to work these past six years.

No one person has had a greater impact on my work or on my professional development than my adviser, François Rigolot, or my second reader, Sarah Kay. François has played Mercury to my Amant Vert since my arrival at Princeton in 2006 as an entirely green 22-year-old fresh out of college. I have been fortunate enough to be able to draw on his immense breadth of knowledge, his painstaking attention to even the smallest of details, and his keen sense of the practical matters of academia, but nothing has impressed me more than his patience, his promptness, and his willingness to go out of his way to provide me with opportunities that would not have been available otherwise. It was equally fortunate that my time at Princeton coincided with Sarah's. As a reader, she has been instrumental in getting me to ask and to answer the big questions, to approach the Middle Ages and the manuscript era on their own terms, and to speak more effectively to readers outside of my own specialization. I have especially benefited from her particular blend of generosity and candor, as she has always treated me as a colleague while at the same time making it clear when and how I had to make improvements.

I am equally indebted to François Cornilliat, who has graciously agreed to act as an external examiner. It was his course on failure in the French Renaissance in Fall 2008 that piqued my interest in Lemaire and helped to solidify the project that eventually became my

dissertation. My other examiner, Marina Brownlee, has been a constant source of encouragement, and the work I've been able to do with her in the Program in Renaissance Studies has provided me both with invaluable organizational experience and with a broader perspective on work being done on the early modern period at Princeton and elsewhere. I would also be remiss if I did not thank the many professors at Princeton whose seminars I have taken, who have advised me in their capacity as DGS or placement officer, or with whom I have been able to do extracurricular work. A special show of thanks goes to the staff of the Department of French and Italian for making everything run smoothly and for patiently answering my frequent questions or requests for supplies; their assistance has been as essential to me as it is to the entire department.

I am grateful for the generous financial support I have received, not only from the department and university, but from the Georges Lurcy Charitable and Educational Trust, whose fellowship afforded me the opportunity to do primary research in Europe in 2009-10, and the Whiting Foundation, whose fellowship has freed me to see the dissertation through to completion in 2011-12. My stay in Paris in 2009-10 was facilitated by the faculty, staff, and resources of the École Normale Supérieure, and my research was supported by the staff of the Bibliothèque Nationale de France, the Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes, the British Library, the Folger Shakespeare Library, and of course the Princeton University Library. I am particularly grateful to Mireille Huchon for inviting me to participate in her workshop at Paris IV, to Guillaume Berthon for allowing me to consult his considerable dissertation on Marot, and to Olivier Pédeflous for his conversation and suggestions on Rabelais. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the many scholars who have been willing to discuss my work with me over

the past few years, and particularly Bob Hudson, Peter Eubanks, Sarah Skrainka, Deborah McGrady, Leah Chang, Nigel Smith, and Russ Leo.

No set of acknowledgements is complete without a nod to one's origins. It is thanks to Kathleen Long and Bill Kennedy, in their capacity as my professors while I was an undergraduate at Cornell, that I decided to become a *seiziémiste* in the first place; their mastery of all aspects of the Renaissance, their singularly engaging presentation of them, and their encouragement were what led me to believe that it was worth it to devote my life to the study of the early modern period. Most importantly, I would not be the person that I am without the love and support of my parents, Keith and Patricia Francis, my brother, Todd, his wife, Amy, my nephew, Carter, my aunt and uncle, Joseph and Melanie Piacentino, and my grandparents, Raymond and Eileen Francis, Theresa Piacentino, and the late Michael Piacentino, whom I sorely miss. My parents always made it clear that their children's education was their top priority, and acted accordingly. I can never repay them, except by making the most of the opportunity I have been given.

Finally, I'd like to thank all those who've been there for me over the past few years, and especially Robert Wilson, Andrew Ng, Daniel Balson, and Elizabeth Melly. This dissertation is my child, one produced, as Montaigne would say, "de l'acointance des muses," though perhaps not "parfaitement bien formé." Whether you know it or not, you've all had a hand in raising it, and for this, as for everything else you've done for me and I've neglected to mention, I am profoundly and eternally grateful.

## AUTHOR'S NOTE

In citing sixteenth-century editions of Lemaire, Marot, and Rabelais, I have respected the original orthography and accentuation, with two exceptions. In keeping with modern usage, I have resolved abbreviations (“et” for “&,” “devant” for “devāt,” etc.) and distinguished between “i” and “j” and “u” and “v.” For the sake of clarity, I have also added modernized punctuation and capitalization where appropriate.

For editions with neither pagination nor foliation, I have based citations on quire signatures. In the original editions, the quire is designated by uppercase or lowercase letters, by symbols (e.g. “\*” or “+”), or by a combination of the two. Individual folios within quires are designated by Roman numerals, which I have replaced with Arabic numerals; numbering is extended to folios in which the signatures have been omitted by the printer. I have designated the recto and verso sides of a given folio by “r” and “v,” respectively. Thus, “K6v” designates the verso side of folio 6 in quire K.

I have not provided translations of quotations in the original French, though I do provide glosses of terms unfamiliar to speakers of modern French when necessary. Quotations in Latin and Italian have been provided with English translations from reference editions where applicable, and with my own translations in all other cases. Unless otherwise noted, all translations are my own.

## Introduction

### Rabelais's Wager

In the prologue to the 1546 *Tiers Livre*, François Rabelais, for the first time in the *geste pantagruéline*, introduces himself as “M. François Rabelais, Docteur en Medicine,” abandoning the pseudonym Alcofrybas Nasier. Though this substitution might be seen as a closer association of author with work or an assertion of authority on the part of Rabelais, the ensuing prologue centers on the author's anxiety as to how the book will be received by its readers. Rabelais's anxiety is emblematic of the risks faced by Renaissance authors who decide to make a foray into the world of print.

Rabelais worries that his book, a peculiar blend of philosophical inquiry and often crude comedy, will not be to his readers' liking. In explaining the nature of his concern, the French Lucian, so called by his adversaries for his supposed irreligion, first turns to an anecdote of his Samosatran namesake, “To One Who Said, ‘You're a Prometheus in Words.’”<sup>1</sup> In it, Lucian wonders whether the titular compliment for his originality is, in fact, backhanded. Prometheus's fashioning of humans from clay was original, and so too are Lucian's lectures in that they combine philosophical dialogue with comedy, but originality alone is not necessarily a good thing, since something original but ugly, as Prometheus's men turned out to be once beset by the evils released from Pandora's box, deserves to be destroyed. To this effect, he recounts how Ptolemy, Alexander the Great's general and ruler of Egypt from 323 to 283 BCE, tried to win over his Egyptian subjects by showing them two marvels he had won from conquest, a black

---

<sup>1</sup> For more on Rabelais as the “French Lucian,” see Febvre, pp. 64-78.

Bactrian camel and a slave who was white on one side of his body and black on the other.<sup>2</sup> Far from being impressed, Ptolemy's subjects were frightened and offended by the camel, and amused or appalled at the slave (423). Like Lucian, Rabelais worries that his book will backfire on him in the same way that Ptolemy's display did: "Cestuy exemple me faict entre espoir et craincte varier, doubtant que pour contentement propensé, je rencontre ce que je abhorre: mon thesaur soit charbons: pour Venus adviegne Barbet le chien: en lieu de les servir, je les fasche: en lieu de les esbaudir, je les offense: en lieu de leurs complaire, je desplaise" (351).

Rabelais evokes the broad possibilities and the daunting challenges presented to his works and to the works of all those who choose to distribute their books in print. The printing press, capable of producing books faster and in greater number than copyists, brings with it the hope ("espoir") of reaching and winning over more readers than previously possible, but also the fear ("craincte") that these readers, who have not commissioned the book and whose proclivities may only be guessed at by the author, will not be interested in the book, or will receive it less favorably than the author would hope. Having one's works printed is potentially a very profitable venture, less in terms of direct remuneration from sales (as these were almost universally reserved for the bookseller) than in terms of prestige and the ability to attract patrons. It is also an inherently risky proposition, and in hoping to strike gold, an author may end up with a lump of coal, in keeping with the Erasmian adage "Thesaurus carbones erant" ("The treasure consisted of coals").<sup>3</sup> Printing one's works for an unfamiliar readership is akin to playing at games of chance, as Rabelais indicates by way of an allusion to knucklebones: "Venus" is the highest possible score obtainable in any given throw, whereas the "Dog" is the lowest (Huchon

---

<sup>2</sup> Ptolemy's subjects were likely shocked not only at the camel's unusual color, but at its physiognomy: Bactrian camels are, of course, the two-humped variety, whereas Egyptians would have been accustomed to the one-humped Dromedary.

<sup>3</sup> *Adages*, ch. 1, cent. 9, adage 30.

1369, n. 3). By publishing the *Tiers Livre*, Rabelais hopes to throw a Venus, but risks throwing a Dog; to put it in analogous terms from craps, he hopes to roll Boxcars, but he may very well end up rolling Snake Eyes.

If printing is risky business for authors, it is no less risky for those who print and sell the books containing their works.<sup>4</sup> In 1538, eight years before the first printing of the *Tiers Livre*, the Lyonnais printer/bookseller François Juste, whose shop had brought out the *princeps* edition of Rabelais's *Gargantua* (1534/5), appends a letter to the edition of Jacques Colin's translation of Castiglione's *Corteggiano* prepared by Étienne Dolet. In this letter, addressed to Jean du Peyrat, the king's Lieutenant General in Lyons, Juste gives a dramatic account of how the book, *Le Courtisan de messire Baltazar de Castillon nouvellement reveu et corrige*, came to be.<sup>5</sup> Claiming that a translation of Castiglione has been sought for years by several of his "amys et congneuz," Juste tells of the considerable lengths to which he has had to go in convincing the reluctant Colin to hand over his translation for printing: "Ce que je n'ay peu facilement sans en desbourcer gros deniers, et oultre ce user des prieres et requestes de mes bons seigneurs et amys envers celluy, qui pour riens ne le vouloit laisser aller hors de sa main: ou, comme il disoit, le conservoit entier des calumnies envieuses" (P6v). Colin seems to share Rabelais's fear of unfavorable reception, and would rather not risk exposing his work to this sort of blame.

---

<sup>4</sup> Some printers sold the works they printed, whereas others made a living printing for booksellers on a contractual basis. To distinguish between these two categories, I refer to the latter simply as "printers" and to the former as "printer/booksellers."

<sup>5</sup> Richard Copley Christie, Dolet's biographer and apologist, suggests that Dolet might have authored the letter rather than Juste, as it is "in Dolet's style"; see *Étienne Dolet: The Martyr of the Renaissance* (London: MacMillan, 1880), p. 282.

However, Juste learns that he has been beaten to the punch not once, but twice, as Colin's translation has already been printed first in Paris, and then in Lyons.<sup>6</sup> Worse still, these editions contain faulty translations, not due to any mistakes on the part of Colin, but due to the carelessness of their printers. At this point, Juste launches into a diatribe on how a few bad apples are spoiling the entire printerly barrel:

Et pource ja long temps a nous autres imprimeurs, par l'avarice d'aulcuns meuz plustost du gaing que de l'honneur, qui doibt estre et veritablement est le plus asseure et permanent loyer de bien faire, en sommes en tresmauvaise reputation: de maniere que si n'estoit qu'on ne se peult bonnement passer de noz ouvrages, seroient laisses en noz boutiques les livres pour estre ronges des teignes, et soris (P7r).

Juste's remark underscores some of the conditions inherent to the business of printing and bookselling. A printer/bookseller's ability to convince authors to have him print and sell their works, as well as his ability to sell these works to an exacting clientele, hinges upon his reputation for accuracy and craftsmanship. It is no surprise, then, that Juste refers to the books he and his colleagues print and sell as "noz ouvrages"; they are as much their product as that of the authors who write them. And while they are likelier to derive monetary gain from their sale than these authors, they are also likelier to incur a direct loss if they fail to sell, which is why Juste concludes his diatribe with the image of his wares being left to rot and be gnawed at by moths and mice.

Yet, this image is presented as a conditional rather than a statement of fact: it is what would happen to his books, were it not for the fact that people simply cannot do without them. Juste is fortunate enough to have a clientele with a pressing need for what it is he has to sell – or he has succeeded in convincing them that they need it. Juste's letter, while indicating that

---

<sup>6</sup> *Le Courtisan, nouvellement traduit de langue ytalique en françoys* (Paris: Jean Longis, 1537), and *Les quatre livres du courtisan du conte Baltazar de Castillon, reduyct de langue ytalique en françoys* (Lyons: Denis de Harsy, 1537).

printing and selling a book is every bit as much a gamble as writing one with the hopes that it will be read and enjoyed, also suggests how to make the process less aleatory, how to load the dice, as it were, by producing something that corresponds to preexisting needs or by creating a need for the product in its potential consumers.

My aim in the present study is to consider several examples of how printed books from the French Renaissance can create this sort of need. I will consider how they work to turn a potential buyer into an actual buyer, as well as how they work to turn this buyer into the sort of reader the author envisions for the book. In so doing, I will base my examination upon the concept of advertising, a domain of cultural production usually thought to have been born with the Industrial Revolution. In spite of this assumption, the principles of advertising may fruitfully be applied to the situation of Renaissance printer/booksellers and authors; as Elizabeth Eisenstein explains, printed books are unique in that they are inventions capable of advertising for themselves (*Divine Art* 10).

Scholars who have previously devoted studies to the comparison of advertising with literature have, not surprisingly, focused on the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, which saw the rise of the advertising industry.<sup>7</sup> However, this comparison may successfully be applied to premodern works, as Andrew Cowell does in his account of scenes of advertising (specifically wine crying) in two medieval French plays, the *Jeu de Saint Nicolas* and *Courtois d'Arras*. In order to situate this same comparison in the context of the French Renaissance and the advent of the printing press, we must first determine how the concept of advertising accurately describes the situation with which authors and printer/booksellers were faced. We must then determine

---

<sup>7</sup> For example, see Jennifer Wicke, *Advertising Fictions: Literature, Advertisement, and Social Reading* (New York: Columbia UP, 1988), Sara Thornton, *Advertising, Subjectivity and the Nineteenth-Century Novel* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), and Urs Meyer, *Poetik der Werbung* (Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 2010).

which specific aspects of critical discourse on advertising can account for how authors and readers are represented in sixteenth-century printed books.

### **Advertising: A Rhetorical Approach to the Problem of Supply and Demand**

First of all, what are we to understand by the term “advertising”? Etymologically, it derives from the Latin *adverto*, which means “to turn toward,” “to direct,” or “to steer,” and can be used to convey either physical motion or attention and consideration (Lewis and Short 49). In this most basic sense, “advertising” is something that draws attention for one purpose or another, much like its French cognate “*avertissement*.” In the context of commerce, this form of “advertising” is not specific to any one historical period, and tavern signs or *si quis* (the ancestor of the classified ad) may be described as premodern advertising (Presbrey 9-18). In this vein, Eisenstein points to the origin of the term “*avertissement*” in the colophons of books copied in the medieval scriptoria of the Low Countries during holy days to indicate that these books were not for sale (*Agent of Change* 59). However, it is equally clear that these forms of communication are more informative than persuasive, and the same may be said of early advertisements in the book trade, which, much like the *si quis*, predominantly indicate at which shop or stall a certain book may be purchased (Pettegree 75).

Consequently, cultural critics who attempt to trace the history of advertising make a point of distinguishing between “advertising” in its general acception and “advertising” in its modern acception, which Raymond Williams defines as “an institutionalized system of commercial information and persuasion” (321). For Williams, modern advertising is born with the mass production of goods in the Industrial Revolution, and fully develops with the rise of monopoly capitalism between 1880 and 1930 (328-29). Bernard Cathélat adopts a similar view, clarifying

that advertising is linked to the necessity to sell brought on by mass production and its ability to generate large supplies of goods (49-50). This ability is a double-edged sword, as it can potentially lead to situations where supply vastly outpaces demand. Advertising addresses such discrepancies by creating demand for the product, turning potential consumers into actual consumers by persuading them to buy the product.

But is Williams's distinction between modern advertising and its predecessors justified? If advertising is defined as the application of persuasive techniques to the discrepancy between supply and demand, why can the term not be applied to premodern commerce? Indeed, Williams's own account casts doubt on the rigidity of his definitions, as he claims that as early as the eighteenth century, sophisticated advertising techniques are used to sell goods such as pills, soaps, hats, and sensational literature (328). Even more strikingly, he admits that there is an "obvious continuity between the methods used to sell pills and washballs in the eighteenth century and the methods used in the twentieth century to sell anything from a drink to a political party"; what distinguishes advertising before 1914 from advertising after 1914, he claims, is its "comparative crudeness," which should be "immediately evident" to all those who look at it (329). Williams's argument seems to be that twentieth-century advertising techniques must be more sophisticated simply because they arose after industrialization and mass media. I intend to show not only that the economic situation for printed books necessitates advertising, but that the persuasive techniques employed in them are anything but crude when approached on their own terms. I do not, of course, pretend that there are no differences between persuasive techniques from different eras with different technologies, or between techniques designed to sell different goods or services. I simply contend that advertising, as defined by Williams and Cathélat, may be used to understand how some Renaissance printed books are promoted and sold.

In discussing the advent of print, it can be tempting to draw upon common assumptions about how print culture differs from manuscript culture. One of the most widespread of these assumptions is that printed books necessarily had a wider circulation than manuscript works. As with all generalizations, this one does not hold up to close scrutiny, as it is apparent that in both eras, different works circulated differently. Many manuscript works, such as those of Petrarch, were meant to circulate widely, and did, whereas certain printed books, such as those printed on high-quality parchment, were destined for influential people and their entourages, much like presentation manuscripts. Therefore, I do not intend to make any sweeping statements about printed books in general, but rather about printed books that are clearly meant to be distributed widely, as indicated by addresses to a generic reader or by indications that the book is meant for the French nation.<sup>8</sup> A book's distribution can also be reflected in its print history; multiple editions, especially within a brief timespan, are evidence that a book sold well, and if a work is printed in several different cities or even countries, it may safely be assumed that this distribution matches a widespread interest in the book. More specifically, my focus is on works that we would now refer to as "literature," though such a term is anachronistic. It designates works that do not serve some sort of instrumental purpose, as do liturgical references or artisans' manuals, and which, *ipso facto*, represent just the kind of gamble discussed by Rabelais and Juste.

Printing, especially in its early years, was a very expensive venture from a material standpoint alone, to say nothing of the cost of labor and transportation. To give an idea of how expensive it could be to print a book, Rudolf Hirsch, based on his study of paper prices in

---

<sup>8</sup> George Hoffmann ties the redefinition of the book's audience as the generic reader to the rise of the commercial notion of a buying public, and ultimately to both "the dawn of modern business practices per se" and "the moment at which commercialism became intertwined with culture" (88). Though Hoffmann focuses on Montaigne and situates these developments in the late Renaissance, I contend that they may be found in the first half of the sixteenth century, as well.

Frankfurt from 1401 to 1536, estimates that for a 250-page book (*in folio*), produced in a rather limited run of 100 copies, the paper alone would cost almost as much as six tons of wheat in the late fifteenth century (36). While paper quality and format size tended to decrease as the sixteenth century progressed, resulting in books that were cheaper to produce and more affordable, a work of literature or history was still a considerable purchase for all but the wealthiest buyers; according to Natalie Zemon Davis, in the 1540's, a history of France could cost as much as a day's wages for a journeyman (212).<sup>9</sup> Given that such works were so expensive, albeit not unaffordable, it is easy to understand why Juste would worry about his books being consumed by vermin instead of potential customers. As such, the majority of printers, in France as elsewhere in Europe, relied upon books or printed materials for which there was a known and steady demand, such as liturgical manuals or ephemera required by municipal or ecclesiastical authorities, as cash cows. Vernacular "literary" works accounted for a very small proportion of their production, and they were more likely to favor texts inherited from the past that were still popular, like prose adaptations of *chansons de geste* or romances, than vernacular works by new authors, especially in the first quarter of the sixteenth century (Elizabeth Armstrong 182). If they were willing to print a work by an unestablished author, as Rabelais was at the beginning of his career, it was a calculated risk, a risk which hinged on the danger of ending up with more supply than demand.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Consequently, artisans who did own books did not tend to own more than one or a few, and these tended to be either technical works related to their craft, Books of Hours, or occasionally a vernacular Bible (Davis 211).

<sup>10</sup> The element of risk inherent to printing any work is apparent in what we know of print runs at the time. As Lucien Febvre and Henri-Jean Martin point out, runs of a given edition tend to be rather small, even for smashing successes; only 1,800 copies were printed of a 1515 Froben edition of Erasmus's *Praise of Folly*, and the initial printing of Luther's Bible ran at 4,000 copies (310). Consequently, the only reliable gauges of a work's success and diffusion are the number of different editions of it and the geographical and chronological distribution of these editions.

Of course, authors who decide to distribute their works in print worry that there will be insufficient demand for them, and Rabelais is hardly the first or the last to do so. In fact, nearly 1500 years prior to the publication of the *Tiers Livre*, the Roman poet Martial, concerned that his stinging epigrams will not sit well with readers, advises his book to find a patron, lest it end up being used to wrap incense, pepper, or tuna (p. 200, bk. 3, ep. 2, ll. 2-5).<sup>11</sup> Martial demonstrates the particularity of the author's situation *vis-à-vis* supply and demand; in his vision, the reader has, in a sense, gotten his money's worth, as he is able to put the material to use. However, that use has nothing to do with reading what is on the papyrus, and it is Martial's reputation that suffers most of all. Reputation is ultimately what is at stake for an author who publishes his works in print, as writers could not generally rely on revenues from publication for a living.<sup>12</sup> Successful publication might not immediately line an author's pockets with gold, but it could potentially attract patrons by reinforcing the perception of a writer's ability to promote and even immortalize himself and his subjects. While it is certainly in an author's best interests for his works to sell well, it is above all the aim of the printer/bookseller to turn the customer into a buyer who spends his money on the book. The author's aim is to turn this buyer into a reader who spends his time and effort reading the book.<sup>13</sup> These aims are not necessarily inimical to one another; on the contrary, they go hand-in-hand in authorized editions, which are produced as the result of collaboration between author and printer/bookseller.

---

<sup>11</sup> Martial refers to the practice of using unwanted sheets of papyrus to wrap groceries; cf. Catullus 95, ll. 7-8 and Horace, *Epistles*, bk. 2, ep. 1, ll. 269-70.

<sup>12</sup> In fact, as the case of Clément Marot demonstrates quite clearly, an author might find the runaway success of editions of his work to be harmful to his reputation, as bestsellers, *qua* surefire sources of revenue, were likely to be pirated in an era where the only legal protection against intellectual theft, privileges, were granted for short periods of time in all but a few exceptional cases, and tended to lack teeth, especially outside the area of their jurisdiction.

<sup>13</sup> "Car si pour l'imprimeur et le libraire l'acheteur suffit, pour l'auteur le véritable consommateur est bien le lecteur. La vente étant déjà assurée, il ne reste pas moins à transformer l'acheteur en lecteur" (Desan, *Imaginaire économique* 208).

A privileged area where this attempt to transform perusers into buyers and buyers into readers is the paratext, notably title pages and prefaces, which saw a dramatic rise in prevalence during the Renaissance, an “explosion préfacielle,” as Philippe Desan puts it (*Imaginaire économique* 202). The separation of paratext and text, as well as the increasing emphasis on the paratext at the volume’s front, marks a departure from manuscript culture in that where scribal colophons came last, printers put the promotion of themselves and the authors they printed at the front of the volume (Desan, *Imaginaire économique* 204; Eisenstein, *Agent of Change* 59).<sup>14</sup> Paratext serves a definite commercial purpose, as books were sold unbound at the time; title pages served the same purpose as the modern covers by which people inevitably judge books, despite the proverbial warning to the contrary. It also serves as a set of instructions on how the author and printer are to be perceived, on what purpose the book is meant to serve, and on how the book is to be read. The paratext thus shows how the seller/buyer relationship can orient the author/reader relationship, as it is a space where the two are elaborated at the same time and often in similar terms (Rigolot, “Prolégomènes” 10).

In all, printed books have to make a case for themselves in order to create demand, to make the book into something “[dont] on ne se peult bonnement passer,” to borrow Juste’s phrase. As Eisenstein says, printed books can, and indeed must, advertise for themselves. Fundamentally, advertising fosters a desire for a product through the image it creates of both producer and consumer. In terms of the printed book, the image of the producer corresponds to

---

<sup>14</sup> Gérard Genette first introduces the concept of paratext in *Introduction à l’architexte* (Paris: Seuil, 1979) and takes it up again in *Palimpsestes* (Paris: Seuil, 1982), but develops it most fully in *Seuils*. He defines the paratext as everything that makes a text into a book and presents it as such to its public (7-8). More specifically, he divides the paratext into *péritexte* and *épitexte*, with the basic distinction that the former is attached to the volume while the latter, such as reviews or correspondences, is not. This study focuses on the *péritexte*, and in particular on title pages, prefaces, prologues, epigraphs, and dedications, but for the sake of usage will refer to all such components as paratext.

that of the author, as well as that of the others involved in producing the book, from editors to printers to booksellers. The image of the consumer corresponds to that of readers both as they are before reading the book and how they will be after reading it in a certain way. Several techniques for creating and conveying these images, as described by critics of modern advertising, articulate with the persuasive techniques found in rhetorical treatises known to Renaissance authors, as well as with certain common aspects of printed editions.

### ***Captatio benevolentiae*, Prestige Advertising, and the Flexibility of the Authorial Persona**

Advertising is rhetorical in nature, as it is concerned with persuading people to purchase a certain product or to endorse a person or concept. It achieves this end through the manipulation of images, beginning with the image of the producer and ending with the image of the consumer. An equivalent of this form of manipulation may be found in oratory rhetoric, which is concerned not only with how best to construct and present an argument, but with how to make one's audience receptive to an argument in the first place. This manipulation of the audience is traditionally referred to as *captatio benevolentiae* (securing good will), though rhetorical treatises are concerned with more than just the good will of listeners. Classical rhetorical treatises, such as those of Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian, who had been "rediscovered" by Poggio Bracciolini at St. Gallen in 1416, were well-known and widely available, and were printed and reprinted numerous times beginning in the late fifteenth century.<sup>15</sup> Vernacular translations and adaptations were also available, such as Pierre Fabri's *Le*

---

<sup>15</sup> Poggio did not rediscover Quintilian entirely, but rather a complete manuscript of the *Institutio oratoria*. For a list of Renaissance editions of Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian, see Lawrence D. Green and James J. Murphy, *Renaissance Rhetoric Short-Title Catalogue, 1460-1700* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003). For more on the rise of Aristotle's, Cicero's, and Quintilian rhetorical treatises in the Renaissance, see Rigolot, "Prolégomènes," pp. 8-9.

*grand et vrai art de pleine rhétorique* (1521), whose first part closely follows the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* traditionally attributed to Cicero, though of uncertain authorship.<sup>16</sup> Thus, sixteenth-century authors versed in the classics had access to a set of references on how to put one's audience in a propitious state of mind for reception; as Fabri describes it, *captatio* "[...] n'est aultre chose que d'appareiller les courages des auditeurs a croire ou a faire ce que on veult, et soy mettre en leur grace" (55). A closer look at these sources reveals how they portray oration as a continual process of image adjustment.

The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* situates *captatio benevolentiae* within *inventio*, as it is concerned with finding the best way to make an initial appeal to listeners. Its definition of what *captatio* is and how to achieve it reveals that the orator should aim to secure more than just the listener's good will: the listener is not only supposed to be well-disposed (*benivolus*) toward the orator and his cause, but attentive (*adtentus*) and, most significantly, receptive (*docilis*), which is more properly rendered as "teachable" or "willing to learn," as it derives from the verb *doceo*, "to teach" (bk. 1, ch. 4, §7).<sup>17</sup> Willingness to learn goes hand-in-hand with attentiveness; Aristotle's *Rhetoric* mentions only good will and attentiveness (bk. 3, §14, p. 2259; 1415a1).<sup>18</sup> The *Rhetorica ad Herennium*'s further distinction between attentiveness and willingness to learn is reiterated by Cicero in *De inventione* (bk. 1, ch. 16, §23) and adopted by Quintilian (bk. 4, ch. 1, §5). This attentiveness and willingness to learn may be achieved by promising to tell of something important and useful to the audience, whereas good will toward the orator and his

---

<sup>16</sup> For more on the authorship question, see Caplan's introduction, pp. vii-xiv.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Lewis and Short, p. 605.

<sup>18</sup> In citations of Aristotle, the second set of numbers is the Bekker reference, which refers to Immanuel Bekker's standard 1831 Greek edition of Aristotle. These references designate the page, column, and line from the Bekker edition, and are commonly included in citations of Aristotle.

cause may be achieved by praising oneself or one's audience, as well as by blaming one's opponents (*Rhetorica ad Herennium* 1.4.7; *De inventione* 1.16.22).<sup>19</sup>

If he wishes to secure the good will of his listeners, the orator must shape himself, or rather the way in which his listeners perceive him, according to their opinions and preferences: “Semper oratorum eloquentiae moderatrix fuit auditorum prudentia. Omnes enim qui probari volunt voluntatem eorum qui audiunt intuentur ad eamque et ad eorum arbitrium et nutum totos se fingunt et accommodant” (“The eloquence of orators has always been controlled by the good sense of the audience, since all who desire to win approval have regard to the goodwill of their auditors, and shape and adapt themselves completely according to this and to their opinion and approval”; *Orator*, ch. 8, §24; trans. Hubbell, p. 323). While this process involves making reference to one's own record and character, it nevertheless reveals the orator to be a creature of perception, tailored to the desires of his audience. The orator is as much an actor as a speaker, and *captatio* is the way in which he fashions a persona, which, in Latin, denotes an actor's mask, as can the equivalent Middle French terms “personne” and “personnage.”<sup>20</sup> These are, in fact, the very terms that the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* and Fabri use in describing how the orator should present himself to the audience (*Rhetorica ad Herennium* 1.5.8; Fabri 59).

If orators adopt such personae before their audiences, authors adopt personae both in the text and in the paratext of the printed book. The authorial persona is not inherently a question of intentionality, as it is not necessarily a reflection of the historical author. In that it is a fiction, in the sense of something that is fashioned, the authorial persona can be pieced together from textual and contextual evidence where the historical author often cannot be. As a result, the story of Clément Marot as we know it today is perhaps more the story of Clément Marot's authorial

---

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1.6.2165, 1362a1, and Fabri, p. 58.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Lewis and Short, p. 1355, and Huguet, vol. 7, pp. 739-40.

persona, the mask he adopted or was made to adopt in the publication of his works, than of Clément Marot, the son of a court poet who was born in Cahors, became the royal poet of Francis I, went into exile twice, and died a broken man in Turin.

This persona, furthermore, becomes particularly prevalent in printed books meant for broad distribution, which present the unique challenge of acquainting new readers with the producer of the material they are about to read. In these circumstances, the majority of the book's potential readers are unknown to both author and printer/bookseller, which means that these readers must be trained to desire a book that they have not personally commissioned (Pettegree 53).<sup>21</sup> Yet, as with any form of commerce, the exchange between bookseller and book buyer, as well as the exchange between author and reader, depends upon the integrity of those involved in the exchange (Losse, *Sampling* 62). In this way, these exchanges bear a similarity to the exchange between an orator and his audience, in which the orator must adopt a persona capable of reassuring his listeners that he is not pursuing his case out of ambition or malice, but out of concern for the truth and the nation. The authorial persona lends credibility and integrity to the book by reassuring readers of the author's good intentions in writing the book and in having it printed and sold, and is often accompanied by what I would call the printerly persona, which reassures readers that the printer/bookseller is more dedicated to his craft and to the advancement of knowledge than to the pursuit of profit, to the point where he will sacrifice profit

---

<sup>21</sup> There are precedents of this dilemma to be found in both the early and late Middle Ages, as well. In *Love for Sale*, William Burgwinkle details how the thirteenth-century Quercinois troubadour Uc de Saint Circ asserts his power as an agent who controls reputation and prestige, thereby making it clear to nobles why it is in their best interest to support him (39). For studies of how late medieval authors deal with broadening and, in some cases, potentially hostile readership, see Deborah McGrady, *Controlling Readers: Guillaume de Machaut and His Late Medieval Audience* (Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2006), and Daniel Hobbins, *Authorship and Publicity Before Print: Jean Gerson and the Transformation of Late Medieval Learning* (Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2009).

if he must. This is clearly the case in Juste's letter, where he portrays himself as willing to part with "gros deniers" to preserve "[...] l'honneur et diligence mienne, et de ceulx, des presses desquelz yssent plus propres, et nets ouvrages" (P7r).

The omnipresent emphasis on authorial and printerly craftsmanship and benevolence toward the reading public may be elucidated by two parallel concepts from advertising theory. In *The Language of Advertising*, Torben Vestergaard and Kim Schrøder refer to a specific sort of advertising, which they term "prestige advertising" or "goodwill advertising." This form of advertising does not advertise a product or service so much as a name or an image; producers seek to foster a favorable image of their product and insist on the care and expertise that go into making it.<sup>22</sup> Such an image addresses concerns over the incompatibility, real or perceived, between mass production and quality by portraying the product as artisanal, and allays distrust of the profit motive by portraying the producer as charitable toward the consumer (132-133). Jean Baudrillard develops a similar concept in *Le système des objets*, which he refers to as "la logique du Père Noël." He explains that whereas the rhetorical and informative aspects of advertising might not have a decisive effect on the consumer, their "thématique latente de protection et de gratification" does (198). To give a clearer idea of this theme of protection and gratification, Baudrillard compares it to the Santa Claus myth acted out by parents and children each Christmas. Children do not actually believe that Santa Claus comes down the chimney all dressed in red, leaves presents in their stockings, eats the milk and cookies they have left for him as tribute, then climbs back up the chimney and into a sleigh drawn by eight flying reindeer, but agree to play along because they are gratified by the lengths to which their parents go to please

---

<sup>22</sup> In this sense, "prestige advertising" is very close to publicity, which functions similarly to advertising, though it does not aim at a sale. The proximity of advertising to publicity is apparent in French, which uses one word (*publicité*) to denote both concepts.

them by perpetuating the myth. Similarly, although consumers do not really believe that choosing a certain brand of peanut butter makes them better mothers, or that smoking a certain brand of cigarette makes them more like cowboys, they are not motivated to buy the product by belief in the myth, but rather by their recognition of the fact that the producer would put so much effort into elaborating this myth in order to win their business.

Authorial and printerly personae correspond to these concepts in that they stress the artisanal qualities of the printed book, often through comparison of a standard copy to a presentation copy, so as to allay misgivings about the inaccuracies and human error inherent to all but the most painstaking printing jobs. In discussing Erasmus's representation of Aldus Manutius in the adage "Festina lente" (2.1.1), Leah Chang contends that the Dutch humanist creates "[...] a fiction of good printing, in which the ideal printer is elevated above the economic concerns of the market and imbued with the values that the scholar holds" (36).<sup>23</sup> Of course, a printer concerned only with *bonae litterae* and not with profit (much like how Juste presents himself) is every bit as fictional as Santa Claus. Nevertheless, authorial and printerly personae are designed to perpetuate these myths by stressing conscientious production and an overriding concern for the reader's entertainment and edification, and by appearing to be exactly what the reader wants or needs.

But how can personae be tailored to the desires of an unknown reader? When considered in relation to classical rhetoric, this dilemma points to a simple, yet defining feature of rhetorical strategies: they are meant for speeches made in person before audiences. *Captatio* is predicated on the immediacy of oratory, on the speaker's ability to know who is in the audience and how

---

<sup>23</sup> On the other hand, Eisenstein details how Erasmus's optimism in the 1508 edition of the *Adages* gives way to disillusionment in successive versions, to the point where the praise of Aldus is more or less eclipsed by complaints about a glut of new books leading to the neglect of old authors (*Divine Art* 25).

they are disposed toward his case before he even takes the floor; as Aristotle explains, “[w]e shall secure their goodwill if we first consider what is in fact their attitude towards us, whether they are well or ill disposed or whether they are indifferent” (*Rhetoric to Alexander* §28, p. 2297; 1436b1). Authors, as well as printer/booksellers, do not enjoy this luxury, as Floyd Gray relates in discussing the prologue of Rabelais’s *Pantagruel*: “Classical rhetorical conventions prescribed certain topoi along with a proper oratorical style for addressing a large assembly in a public forum or for pleading a case in a courtroom, but it provided no rules for speaking to a large group of people widely scattered in time and place” (“Readers” 26).<sup>24</sup>

To resolve this problem, we may turn to what Susan Suleiman calls the “rhetorical” strain of reception theory, which describes forms of communication where the sender attempts to govern the receiver’s behavior by compelling the receiver to follow certain instructions or inhabit a certain role; the critic’s task is to show how the rhetorical strategies of a given work invite this identification (9).<sup>25</sup> Suleiman’s choice of the term “rhetorical” is quite apt, as classical rhetoric is not only concerned with influencing the audience’s behavior, but with inviting the audience to conform to an ideal of the orator’s design. In terms of printed books, these concerns are borne out in what I will refer to as the ideal reader, a concept that may be more fully understood in relation to theoretical accounts of how advertising acts upon the consumer. In other words, if rhetorical skill “provides the meeting ground between text and reader,” as William Kennedy puts it, it aims to ensure that this ground is of the producer’s choosing (5).

---

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Eisenstein: “Unlike the preacher, the printer could only guess at the nature of the audience to which his work appealed” (*Agent of Change* 63).

<sup>25</sup> Michel Jeanneret assigns this role to prologues: “Le prologue ne s’intéresse à la réception que pour l’organiser, la contrôler, la subordonner à un projet qui ne concède au lecteur qu’une tâche d’exécutant. La lecture n’est pas éprouvée comme un problème; on lui assigne une finalité précise, on l’assimile à une technique” (“Lecture en question” 281).

### **Ideal Readers and Reading as *Adjuvant***

It would be a gross exaggeration, even on a theoretical level, to imply that those who write and assemble books have no idea what their potential readers expect. On the contrary, the strand of reception theory associated with the Constance School is devoted to showing the extent to which literary production accounts for the reader. Hans Robert Jauss's concept of the horizon of expectation (*Erwartungshorizont*) describes how a literary work is not produced in an informational vacuum, but in relation to objectifiable expectations for genre, form, theme, and language characteristic of its historical period (22-23). Though a work can surpass these expectations, and indeed must in order to achieve greatness according to Jauss, it must conform to them to some extent in order to be received well by its contemporary readers. However, Jauss's horizon of expectation raises another crucial question: when we speak of a text's readers, of whom do we speak?

In the case of Jauss, who is primarily concerned with literary history, one ultimately arrives at an idea of a text's readers in a given historical period. These readers may be inferred from contemporary reactions to a literary work, such as reviews or annotated copies, or from historical and literary references and sociological codes in the text itself. The other main theorist of the Constance School, Wolfgang Iser, is more painstaking in distinguishing between different kinds of reader.<sup>26</sup> He begins by separating real readers from hypothetical readers: the former are readers whose reactions and interpretations have been documented, whereas the latter must be inferred by the critic. The hypothetical reader is then divided into the ideal reader and the contemporary reader. For Iser, the ideal reader is a deliberately vague concept that can be summoned up to answer nearly any problem, a reader who would be capable of exhausting all

---

<sup>26</sup> For more on the categorization of readers in reception theory, see Link, pp. 23-25 and 41-43, and Segers, p. 17.

the meaning in a text, or of reading a book in the way its author intends it to be read.<sup>27</sup> The limitations of such a definition are fairly obvious: who could possibly read this way, who can determine what “all” the meaning of a text is, and why should authors have the final say in how their works should be read? Consequently, Iser turns to the contemporary reader, who may be defined according to social and historical knowledge of the time, not unlike Jauss’s horizon of expectation, or according to “the role of the reader, which is definable in terms of textual structure and structured acts” (*Act of Reading* 38). This aspect of the contemporary reader corresponds to Iser’s implied reader (*implizite Leser*).

Iser adopts the concept of the implied reader in order to address what he perceives to be the shortcomings of the ideal reader: the implied reader, while still hypothetical, is textually verifiable, and does not make the claims to omniscience, finality, and intentionality that plague the ideal reader. However, in the context of the present study, ideal readership may, in fact, be seen as a component of implied readership. In providing instructions for or indications of how the book is to be read, texts and paratexts attempt to orient the reader’s reception, and in so doing, they hold up an idealized image of the reader that may be attained by reading and receiving the book in a certain way. In this sense, the term “ideal reader” may be understood as ideal in the sense of a paragon, an ideal toward which the real reader is encouraged to strive, much like Lowry Nelson’s concept of the “optimum reader” whose responses, not unlike Iser’s implied reader, are written into the literary work itself and become normative for any individual performance. This “optimum reader” is capable of influencing how the real reader reads or

---

<sup>27</sup> The term “ideal reader” is not unique to Iser, and has been used by a number of authors to mean a variety of different things; for more on the use of the term in Joyce, Valéry, and Hofmannstahl, see J. Kammerbeek, Jr., “Le concept du ‘lecteur idéal,’” *Neophilologus* 61.1 (Jan. 1977), pp. 2-7. A similar concept may be found in Erwin Wolff’s “Der intendierte Leser,” *Poetica* 4.2 (1971), pp. 141-66.

prepares to read the book: readers are given the tasks of being or of making themselves optimum (175-77). Wayne Booth ties this identification to the distinction between the author and the authorial persona which the author adopts in the text. In adopting this persona, the author asks the reader to interact with it by becoming the kind of reader that will complement it: “The author creates, in short, an image of himself and another image of his reader; he makes his reader, as he makes his second self, and the most successful reading is one in which the created selves, author and reader, can find complete agreement” (138).<sup>28</sup>

Additionally, the ideal reader as a model for reception may be traced to classical rhetoric, and specifically to *captatio*. The rhetorical concept of the ideal audience is precisely an ideal to which the orator is instructed to make his real audience conform. An ideal listener is one who is attentive, well-disposed, and willing to learn right from the start, and the orator could dispense entirely with *captatio* if addressing such an ideal listener, as Aristotle succinctly explains in his account of introductions. The strategies of *captatio* have nothing to do with the speech itself, but with “[...] the weak-minded tendency of the hearer to listen to what is beside the point. Where this tendency is absent, no introduction is wanted beyond a summary statement of your subject, to put a sort of head on the main body of your speech” (*Rhetoric* 3.14.2260; 1415b1). The problem is that this “weak-minded tendency” is omnipresent, and the orator is forced to develop *captatio* as a strategy for making the audience to whom he speaks more like the audience to whom he would ideally like to speak: “It is plain that such introductions are addressed not to

---

<sup>28</sup> Roger Chartier approaches the same problem from a different angle, that of histories of the book and of reading. Rather than distinguishing between real and ideal readers, Chartier opposes the book’s attempt to impose a given order upon the reader with the reader’s ultimately irrepressible freedom: “Toujours, le livre vise à instaurer un ordre, que ce soit l’ordre de son déchiffrement, l’ordre dans lequel il doit être compris, ou bien l’ordre voulu par l’autorité qui l’a commandé ou permis. Cependant cet ordre, aux multiples figures, n’a pas la toute-puissance d’annuler la liberté des lecteurs. Même bornée par les compétences et les conventions, cette liberté sait comment détourner et reformuler les significations qui devaient la réduire” (8).

ideal hearers, but to hearers as we find them” (*Rhetoric* 3.14.2260; 1415b1). Introductions and the *captatio* they entail are meant to bring “hearers as we find them” closer to “ideal hearers” in the same way that a book’s indications on how it should be read are meant to bring readers “as we find them” closer to the book’s ideal reader. In the words of Guy Demerson, “l’écrivain, comme l’orateur, n’accepte pas de préjugé que favorable à sa cause” (238).

The ideal reader, then, is how authors and printer/publishers address the problem of the unknown reader’s desires. To the extent that they cannot tailor a book to desires of which they are uncertain, they seek to teach the reader how and what to desire by positing an idealized image of the reader that may be attained by following the book’s instructions on how it should be received. To better understand how this process works, we may turn once again to theoretical accounts of how advertising acts upon the consumer, as ideal readership, insofar as it attempts to direct the reader’s attention to certain aspects of the book, is advertisement in the purest etymological sense of the word. According to John Berger, advertising “[...] is never a celebration of a pleasure-in-itself [...] but is always about the future buyer. It offers him an image of himself made glamorous by the product or opportunity it is trying to sell” (132). The product or opportunity is not the goal in and of itself, but rather something that supposedly will help the consumer resemble the idealized image presented in the ad. Vestergaard and Schrøder compare this role of the product to that of the *adjuvant*, or helper, in A.-J. Greimas’s actantial model (29). The actantial model, based largely on Vladimir Propp’s *Morphology of the Folktale* and Étienne Souriau’s *Situations dramatiques*, is a structural approach to narrative which posits that the characters in any given narrative may be divided into categories of actors: “Sujet/objet,”

“Destinateur/destinataire,” and “Adjuvant/opposant.”<sup>29</sup> The narrative is propelled by the subject’s desire for the object, and this desire is aided by the *adjuvant* and impeded by the *opposant* (176-79). This structure may, in turn, be applied to ideal readership: the book and the manner of reading promoted in it, as well as the authorial and printerly personae, are less objects than *adjuvants*, as they help the real reader come to resemble the ideal reader. As such, advertising accounts for a method of accomplishing one of the primary aims of *captatio*, a method that is not described in rhetorical treatises, but which is employed in Renaissance printed books.

### **Authorial Personae, Ideal Readers, and Advertising for the Book in Lemaire, Marot, and Rabelais**

My aim in this study, then, is to examine how authorial personae and ideal readers are crafted in sixteenth-century printed editions of vernacular literary works, and how they may be understood as forms of advertising. Given that a comprehensive account of a decade, let alone a quarter- or half-century, exceeds the scope of this project, I have chosen to focus on editions of three authors: Jean Lemaire de Belges, Clément Marot, and François Rabelais. I have selected them not only for their importance to the French Renaissance literary tradition and for the fact that a filiation exists between them, but because they and their publication histories bear intriguing similarities. Though each approached the enterprise with a distinct background and distinct aims, each was heavily invested in elaborating a certain authorial persona (or personae) and with convincing readers why their work or a certain edition of their work was important or useful. Furthermore, some of the most considerable recent work on authorship has tended to

---

<sup>29</sup> Greimas borrows the term “adjuvant” from Guy Michaud, and the term “opposant” from Souriau.

focus on female authorship as a literary construct. In addition to Mireille Huchon's famous (or infamous, according to some) thesis that Louise Labé was a hoax perpetrated by a group of male poets from Lyons, Chang's *Into Print*, a study of editions of Helisenne de Crenne, Louise Labé, Catherine des Roches and Marie de Gournay, shows that the female author in sixteenth-century France, if not necessarily the "créature de papier" that Huchon would have her to be, is a textual and material construct who reflects not only the book's writer, but its printer and reader, as well (22). It is my aim to show that this construction of authorship and readership is applicable to male authors of the French Renaissance, as well, even to figures as central as Lemaire, Marot and Rabelais. Most importantly, however, each of these three figures exhibits a tendency to reveal how their advertising strategies function, and thereby to indicate how they can be used or are being used at the expense of patrons, readers, or even religious convictions. It is through this self-reflexivity that they underscore the dependence of literature on advertising techniques, but also its ability to subvert them from within.

For better or for worse, the generation of French poets known as the *Rhétoriciens*, with whom Jean Lemaire de Belges (1473-1524?) is grouped, cannot easily be dissociated from its relationship with patronage.<sup>30</sup> Many of the more influential critics to study the *Rhétoriciens*

---

<sup>30</sup> The *Rhétoriciens* date from approximately 1460 to 1520, and are generally divided into twelve "grands rhétoriciens" (Georges Chastellain, Octovien de Saint-Gelays, Jean Robertet, Jean Meschinot, Jean Molinet, Jean Lemaire de Belges, André de La Vigne, Guillaume Cretin, Jean Marot, Jean d'Auton, Pierre Gringore, and Jean Bouchet) and several secondary authors. Though they have been grouped together by literary history, they differ from one another not only in that they belong to different generations, but in that they differ in their political loyalties: Burgundian *Rhétoriciens* like Molinet are effectively the enemies of French *Rhétoriciens* like Cretin or Marot (Rigolot, "Rhétoriciens" 1015). In fact, as Pierre Jodogne has shown, the appellation of *Rhétoricien* is erroneous, as the poets to whom it is applied never described themselves as such. The term, Jodogne argues, stems from Charles d'Héricault's reading of a line from Guillaume Coquillart's *Droits nouveaux* (1481) out of context ("Les 'rhétoriciens' et l'humanisme" 153-54). Nevertheless, the term has stuck, and Jodogne's suggestion to abandon it has gone unheeded.

have portrayed them as entirely dependent upon their patrons for a relatively modest livelihood, and hence as more or less reluctant *poètes à gages* serving hard time in the prison of circumstantial poetry. Henry Guy expresses this view succinctly: “Il y avait entre eux une sorte de contrat tacite: les uns payaient, les autres flattaient” (61). Guy finds this unspoken agreement so distasteful that he chooses to focus on Rhétoriqueur works describing historical events at the expense of praise poems, “ces monuments du parasitisme” (62). Henri Weber echoes Guy’s sentiment, claiming that the consequences of such total dependence on patronage are “l’excès et la pesanteur de la flatterie qui se manifestent particulièrement dans les complaintes funèbres où les vertus du protecteur défunt ou des membres de sa famille sont célébrées à grand renfort d’allégories et d’abstractions” (vol. 1, p. 66).<sup>31</sup> Even Paul Zumthor, whose *Le masque et la lumière* is credited with rehabilitating the tarnished image of the *Rhétoriqueurs* and renewing scholarly interest in them, bases his study on the notion of patronage as a necessary evil, arguing that the *Rhétoriqueurs* used poetic language itself to attain freedom within the confinement of their situation as court poets (54). It is not my aim to point out that the positions held by some of these poets, such as *indiciaire* at the court of Burgundy or historiographer at the French court, carried a great deal more significance and influence than the aforementioned critics imply.<sup>32</sup> Nor is it my aim to defend these poets on formal grounds, a task accomplished by François Cornilliat in his landmark *Or ne mens*, which demonstrates that in this generation, rhetorical ornamentation and flourishes are not a form of futile embellishment or auto-referential escapism, but an attempt to impose necessity upon a disorderly and contingent world through a perfect union of language

---

<sup>31</sup> In a similar manner, Françoise Joukovsky claims that the entirety of the *Rhetoriqueurs*’ art revolves around making something out of nothing, of celebrating power and victory in war rather than virtue: “les Rhétoriqueurs partent de la gloriole, ce presque rien” (133).

<sup>32</sup> For more on the position of *indiciaire* and the duties and prestige it entailed, as well as for a comparison with the position of French royal chronicler, see Armstrong and Kay, pp. 51-54.

and subject, an attempt which gives rise to profound metadiscursive reflection. Rather, I intend to reconsider the relationship between poet and patron in light of the impact of print, which includes the reading public in this relationship and enhances metadiscursive justifications of the author's work. In so doing, I will focus on Lemaire, who stands out from other *Rhétoriqueurs* not only in terms of how he has been viewed in a favorable light by literary historians, but in terms of his eagerness to have his works printed.

Lemaire's change of career from Margaret of Austria's *indiciaire* to Anne of Brittany's historiographer coincides with both the publication of his mythico-historical magnum opus, the *Illustrations de Gaule et Singularitez de Troye* (1511), and the escalation of hostilities between the French king, Louis XII, and the pope, Julius II. As such, the *Illustrations* and the works published to accompany it reflect Lemaire's concern with presenting himself as loyal to France and the French cause, and as a man destined to reveal to France the truth of its illustrious origins. They also constitute an effort to convince the literate public that historical exemplarity is what France needs the most in a particularly dire moment in its history, as it is the only thing that can, in effect, save France by convincing the French people of the justness of the king's cause and encouraging them to desire greatness achieved by fighting on their sovereign's behalf. Lemaire's publication history illustrates, to use a term straight from the horse's mouth, how an approach to books as advertising can situate a published work more firmly in its historical and political context. At the same time, Lemaire's *Concorde des deux langages* (first printed 1513) contains a seed of doubt, as it suggests that the very same abilities so prominently advertised to the king and the French nation may be used to profit at their expense.

Clément Marot (1496-1544) is a study in contrasts. The royal poet of Francis I, he earned unequalled success and recognition, but constantly fell afoul of the authorities, twice going into

exile and dying in Turin, far from home. He produced both bawdy celebrations of sex and sincere devotional poetry, including translations of the Psalms that would be sung by French-speaking Protestants for centuries. He became one of the most vocal proponents of an author's right to exercise control over the publication of his works, only to see dozens of unauthorized editions of his works spring up like so many weeds in his meticulously-tended poetic garden. Marot's dizzyingly contrasting nature has prompted François Rigolot to describe the poet, in keeping with the famous metaphor from Pico della Mirandola's *On the Dignity of Man*, as a chameleon who cannot be made to stay the same color (*OC* I.7). Historically, critics have tried to pin down Marot's identity by focusing on certain aspects of his production, such as his indebtedness to or independence from the *Rhétoriciens*,<sup>33</sup> his role as a court poet, the humanistic or religious strains in his poetry,<sup>34</sup> and his defense of the emerging concept of authorship. Rather than attempt to force Marot to conform to a given mold, I propose to show that his publication history itself reflects an attempt to impose a fixed meaning upon a vast and varied body of work through the manipulation of the author's persona, especially when the

---

<sup>33</sup> See Jean Frappier, "Sur quelques emprunts de Clément Marot à Jean Lemaire de Belges," pp. 161-76 in *Mélanges offerts à Edmond Huguet* (Paris: Boivin, 1940), Claude Thiry, "La jeunesse littéraire de Clément Marot," *Revue des langues vivantes* 34.5 (1968), pp. 436-460 and 34.6 (1968), pp. 567-578, Annette Tomarken, "Clément Marot and the Grands Rhétoriciens," *Symposium* 32 (1978), pp. 41-55, and Annwyl Williams, *Clément Marot: Figure, Text and Intertext*. (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen, 1990). See also Cornilliat, *Or ne mens*.

<sup>34</sup> For a study particularly indicative of this opposition, similar to that which pitted Leo Spitzer against the "rabelaisants," see Anne Lake Prescott, "Musical Strains: Marot's Double Role as Psalmist and Courtier," pp. 42-68 in *Contending Kingdoms: Historical, Psychological, and Feminist Approaches to the Literature of Sixteenth-Century England and France*, ed. M. R. Logan and P. L. Rudnytsky (Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1991). A number of prominent *marotistes*, especially Gérard Defaux, have focused on the evangelical Marot nearly to the exclusion of all else, while others, like Christine Scollen-Jimack, have opted to focus on Marot's role as a court entertainer who employs a "rhetoric of misfortune" to poke fun at his private life (real or imagined) for the amusement of his patrons ("Court Jester" 140; "Rhetoric of Misfortune" 29).

question of authorship and authority is expanded beyond the text to account for the roles of the printer/publisher and editor, as well as of the reader.

By the time Marot decides to have his poetic works collected and printed in the *Adolescence clémentine* (1532), he has been a *valet du chambre du Roy* under Francis I for five years, and has already achieved enough renown to prompt the unauthorized publication of some of his works in cheaply-made *plaquettes*. The poet conceives of the *Adolescence* as a response to these editions, and as a superior product that the reader must be trained to prefer. He also connects the organization of the collection with the authorial persona in such a way as to suggest that the collection tells the story of his life and career. Yet, what makes his publication history especially interesting is the continued proliferation of unauthorized editions which themselves manipulate the authorial persona through the collection's organization, often to impart a religious or specifically evangelical flavor upon Marot.<sup>35</sup> Marot's print history may thus be described as an advertising arms race centered on Marot's continually evolving persona. At the culmination of this race, the 1538 *Œuvres*, regarded by most modern critics as the definitive contemporary edition of Marot, adopts the strategies of the editions it seeks to obviate, all while hinting strongly at the poet's serious misgivings with the increasing flexibility of his persona and its use in attracting readers.

---

<sup>35</sup> Michael Screech provides a concise definition of the term "evangelical," which, *grosso modo*, is used to distinguish schismatics like Luther and Calvin from those who shared many of their views, but remained Catholic. Evangelicals "[...] advocated or practiced a religion which was guided by a direct understanding of the Bible and its Good News which led them towards a theology anchored in the Gospels and the Pauline Epistles. Their 'Evangelism' brought them close to many of the Reformers and even to Dissidents who did not flinch at schism. The leading Evangelicals were all Humanists swayed by a desire to return to the pure sources of Christianity: to good Greek and Latin texts; to the early Church; often to Paul rather than to an enthroned Peter; and above all to Christ as they discovered him in their Bibles" (*Challenge* 7). In sixteenth-century France, some of the most prominent Evangelicals, aside from Marot and Rabelais, were Marguerite de Navarre, Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples, Guillaume Briçonnet, and the brothers Jean and Guillaume Du Bellay. See also Bowen, p. 69.

François Rabelais (1483?-1553) is every bit as chameleonic a figure as Marot, combining serious reflections on questions of education, interpretation, law, medicine, theology, and ethics with the burlesque representations of eating, drinking, and performing bodily functions for which he is known today, and which have given us the adjective “rabelaisian.” Like Marot, he tended to rely on influential patrons to protect him from the authorities of whom he often ran afoul, notably the Sorbonne, which censured all four books of the *geste pantagruéline* published in Rabelais’s lifetime. Though he is best remembered for being a medical doctor as well as a writer, he was also, at one time or another, a member of both the Franciscan and Benedictine orders, a lay priest, and a corrector for the famed humanist printer Sebastien Gryphe (Gryphius) in Lyons.<sup>36</sup> As such, he surely had a deeper knowledge of all sides of the process of printing and selling books than did Lemaire or Marot, and he displays a consistent concern, as is evident in the passage from the prologue of the *Tiers Livre* alluded to earlier, not only with how his works will be received, but with what kind of an effect his works can have on those who read them.

Before the *Tiers Livre*, Rabelais was known as a scholarly, humanist editor of classical texts, notably Hippocrates’s *Aphorisms* and Galen’s *Ars medicinalis*, both published by Gryphe in 1532. His first two vernacular works, *Pantagruel* (1531/2) and *Gargantua* are not attributed to François Rabelais, but to Alcofrybas Nasier and the “abstracteur de quinte essence,” narrators who must be distinguished from Rabelais the author. As Rabelais’s publication history progresses, and he comes to sign his own name to the *geste pantagruéline*, he opts for an authorial persona ever more centered on gratifying and indeed healing his readers, and this persona persists even in such posthumous works of dubious authenticity as the *Cinquiesme Livre* and the *Songes drolatiques de Pantagruel*. At the same time, he strives to ensure the favorable

---

<sup>36</sup> For more on Rabelais’s stint in Juste’s shop, see Kline, pp. 7-10, and Huchon, *Rabelais*, pp. 117-19.

reception of his books by developing an ideal readership for the *geste* firmly ensconced in contemporary reformist discourse on Christian liberty and the offense it can cause, as well as in the concepts of self-fashioning and mutability so prevalent in the humanism of the early Renaissance.<sup>37</sup> This development, much like that of Marot's authorial persona, ultimately betrays Rabelais's anxiety with advertising techniques, revealing them to be deceptive, manipulative, and parasitic, and training the reader to be wary of them.

Though it may appear that my approach is author-centered, I have made it a point to consider non-authorial contributions in each case, as they are essential to a full understanding of how each author's works were disseminated and received. Strategies can change not only from work to work, but from edition to edition, and this includes editions with which the author was not involved or of which he did not approve; in fact, for authors as successful as Marot or Rabelais, it can be argued that unauthorized editions are as or perhaps even more significant than the authorized ones they vastly outnumber. In brief, I have adopted what Adrian Armstrong, borrowing a term from Pierre Bourdieu's *Esquisse d'une théorie de la pratique*, calls a "praxeological" approach, which dictates that literature cannot adequately be studied in terms of texts, as it is through books that texts are transmitted and perceived. Such an approach entails the study not only of textual structures, but of their manifestations in the practice of textual production and transmission (*Technique and Technology* 221).<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> For more on ideas and sources of self-fashioning in the Renaissance, see, *inter alia*, Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning*, Thomas Greene, "The Flexibility of the Self in Renaissance Literature," and Jeanneret, *Perpetuum mobile*.

<sup>38</sup> Chartier also argues that texts cannot be understood independently of their particular material manifestations: "Contre la représentation, élaborée par la littérature elle-même et reprise par la plus quantitative des histoires du livre, selon laquelle le texte existe en lui-même, séparé de toute matérialité, on doit rappeler qu'il n'est pas de texte hors le support qui le donne à lire (ou à entendre), partant qu'il n'est pas de compréhension d'un écrit, quel qu'il soit, qui ne dépende pour une part des formes dans lesquelles il atteint son lecteur" (21).

In all, this study is a two-way street when considered in the context of the often troubled relationship between historical/philological and theoretical approaches. Advertising constitutes a line of inquiry in which these two approaches, far from being mutually exclusive, inform and augment one another. Through the lens of advertising, historical and philological approaches to authorship, readership, and book history can teach us about how advertising functions, and vice versa. More to the point, if advertising can provide us with a fresh perspective on Lemaire, Marot, and Rabelais, then it is equally true that Lemaire, Marot, and Rabelais can provide us with a fresh perspective on the uses and abuses of advertising.

## Chapter One

### “Ung petit tableau de mon industrie”: Jean Lemaire de Belges and Gratitude for Historiography<sup>39</sup>

Lemaire has always enjoyed a privileged status among the poets of his generation, as critics have tended to see an anticipation of Renaissance evangelical humanism in his engagement with classical authors and his scathing denunciations of the abuses of the Roman Church, often pointing to the fact that Rabelais and Marot both acknowledge his influence.<sup>40</sup> Even Guy, whose sweeping disdain for the *Rhétoriqueurs* should be manifest to even the least attentive of readers, calls Lemaire their “coryphée” (44). But Lemaire truly stands apart from his peers when considered as evidence of how poet/patron relations were altered by the printing press, as Cynthia Brown has done. Brown explains that in the early years of the Italian Wars (1494-1559), patrons on both sides began to rely on the ability of writers to justify their policies to the public, an ability significantly bolstered by printing. A writer’s literary power became inextricably linked with the political power of his protector (*Shaping* 150). Lemaire was no stranger to producing works in both verse and prose to justify the policies of current and potential patrons: the *Concorde du genre humain* praises Margaret of Austria, the Duchess of Savoy and Governor of the Netherlands, for her role in negotiating the League of Cambrai against Venice in December 1508, the *Légende des Vénitiens* justifies France’s participation in the ensuing war against Venice, and the *Traicté de la différence des schismes et des conciles de*

---

<sup>39</sup> Parts of this chapter were given as a talk entitled “‘Ung petit tableau de mon industrie’: *La Concorde des deux langages* and Gratitude for Historiography’ at the Annual Meeting of the Renaissance Society of America in Washington, D.C., March 22-24, 2012.

<sup>40</sup> Lemaire also enjoyed a degree of international renown. The *Traicté de la différence des schismes et des conciles de l’église* was translated and published in England as *The abbrevyacyon of all generall counsellys* (London: John Gough, 1539) as part of the propaganda campaign to justify Henry VIII’s break with the Roman Church.

*l'Eglise* justifies the Council of Pisa, convened by Louis XII in May 1511 with the aim of deposing his nemesis, Julius II, the pope from 1503 to 1513.

What is perhaps less obvious than Lemaire's eagerness to participate in such propaganda campaigns is the extent to which he justifies his participation by insisting on his capacity as a writer of history. Michael Sherman hints at this metadiscursive element in Lemaire by pointing out how the *Légende des Vénitiens* "is written to demonstrate the usefulness of history and of historians for explaining and publicizing the actions of kings to the wider world outside the court" (105).<sup>41</sup> To be sure, metadiscursive reflection on historiography is a common trait across the generations of *Rhétoriqueurs*, especially in Georges Chastelain and Jean Molinet, who preceded Lemaire as *indiciaire* at the Burgundian court; the duty of *indiciaires* was not only to record events, but to employ their particular expertise in discerning their significance for the past as well as for the present and future (Armstrong and Kay 52). However, Cornilliat points to a key difference between how Lemaire conceives of history and how his predecessors conceive of it. Focusing on Lemaire's account of the Judgment of Paris in chapters 30-33 of Book One of the *Illustrations de Gaule et Singularitez de Troye*, Cornilliat claims that what distinguishes Lemaire from other *Rhétoriqueurs* is his acceptance of historical contingency and his ensuing choice of historiography over poetry. This contingency places the onus on the patron to behave as a ruler worthy of inheriting the kingdom of Troy (*Or ne mens* 844-45).

The aforementioned critical perspectives invite a description of the literary representation of Lemaire's career as a form of advertising. Advertising operates by evoking a need or a desire in the consumer that the product can fulfill, and Lemaire's penchant for self-referentiality serves

---

<sup>41</sup> For more on the engagement of various writers in the many propaganda campaigns during the Italian Wars, see Sherman's "The Selling of Louis XII: Propaganda and Popular Culture in Renaissance France, 1499-1514" (Diss., U of Chicago, 1974).

the very same purpose by demonstrating that the writing of accurate and truthful history is necessary to the well-being of his patrons, whose claims to cultural supremacy he supports and whose policies he justifies to subjects, and to the well-being of these selfsame subjects, who might fall into idleness or dissolution without the exhortation to virtue provided by historical exemplarity. Furthermore, such conventions of print as the paratext play a crucial role in this sort of publicity, serving to unite a vast and varied body of work through the presence of the author (Rosenthal 190). Brown points to Lemaire's manipulation of his image through the paratext as evidence of the author's realization that "he had to sell 'himself' – his genius or his vision – as a way of selling his work, that he had to satisfy a public (and not simply a patron) by guiding its reading" (*Poets* 57). Similarly, Armstrong holds up Lemaire as an example of how the shift from manuscript to print culture leads to a shift from formal virtuosity to metadiscourse, and shows how Lemaire uses the paratext to make his own work known to the reader (*Technique* 9, "Paratexte" 82). It is in print that Lemaire and those involved with the publication of his works advertise for the usefulness of his services, and by making this case before the reading public, they simultaneously make it before the patron who depends upon Lemaire for justification in the eyes of this public.

In demonstrating these points, I will focus on the *princeps* editions of the *Illustrations de Gaule et Singularitez de Troye*, which traces the lineage of French and Burgundian rulers back through the mythical Trojans all the way to Noah, and of the *Epistre du Roy a Hector de Troye*, *et aucunes aultres oeuvres assez dignes de veoir*, a collection containing Lemaire's most commented-upon work, the *Concorde des deux langages*.<sup>42</sup> Lemaire's publication history is

---

<sup>42</sup> From this point on, I will refer to the *Illustrations de Gaule et Singularitez de Troye* simply as the *Illustrations*, to the *Épîtres de l'Amant Vert* as the *Épîtres*, to the *Traicté de la différence des schismes et des conciles de l'église* as the *Traicté*, and to the *Epistre du Roy a Hector de Troye*,

exceedingly complicated, given that the three books of the *Illustrations* were printed separately, but meant to be bound together, and that the recueil-*Epistre*, much like editions of the *Traicté de la différence des schismes et des conciles de l'Eglise* and the *Légende des Vénitiens*, was meant to accompany the *Illustrations*.<sup>43</sup> I contend that it is necessary to the comprehension of both works that they be read alongside one another, not only because they were meant to be bound in the same volume, and indeed are in most surviving copies, but because the recueil-*Epistre*, as a whole, advertises for the *Illustrations* by proving that they are essential to the good of a French monarchy and a French nation engaged in a bitter and increasingly desperate struggle against the pope and his allies. By reading the recueil-*Epistre*, and especially the *Concorde*, in the context of print, politics, and historiography, we may arrive at a clearer understanding of their function and their effect on the reader, which is to demonstrate France's need for historiography and make the *Illustrations* and the author who has produced them appear to be the perfect fulfillment of this need. In this vein, Tom Conley has claimed that Lemaire is an effect of his own writing, and that it falls to readers to decipher this creative personality who will accompany them as they read (82). I would add that Lemaire is an effect not only of his own writing, but of the way in which he is represented in print, and I would describe this representation not as a personality, but as a persona, a mask or guise in which the author appears to the reading public.

---

*et aucunes aultres oeuvres assez dignes de veoir* as the recueil-*Epistre* in keeping with the term used in Armstrong and Britnell's edition. I will refer to the *Concorde des deux langages* simply as the *Concorde*, and for the sake of differentiation, I will continue to refer to the *Concorde du genre humain* by its full title.

<sup>43</sup> The prologue of Book One describes the *Illustrations* as "trois livres faisant un volume" (Stecher I.5). Jacques Abélard explains that from 1511 to 1524, all three books were printed separately, without exception, whereas from 1524 to 1549 (with the exception of 1528-29 editions printed by Ambroise Girault), the books were all printed together in editions that also included the *Traicté* and the recueil-*Epistre* (15). See also Armstrong and Britnell, pp. XLVII and 71, n. 2.

I will begin by detailing how Lemaire's persona is developed in the paratext of each of the three books of the *Illustrations*, as well as how this paratext grounds the *Illustrations* in the context of the Italian Wars and criticism of the papacy of Julius II. This persona is governed by the concept of prestige advertising, as it is designed around proving Lemaire's loyalty to France and his willingness and ability to serve the crown and the nation through the writing of history. I will then demonstrate that the protagonist of the *Epitres de l'Amant Vert*, a set of two humorous epistles written from the perspective of Margaret of Austria's forlorn pet parrot and appended to the end of Book One of the *Illustrations*, mirrors Lemaire's persona. Finally, I will consider the *recueil-Epistre* and the *Concorde* as companion pieces for the *Illustrations* which seek to inspire gratitude in the reader for the service that Lemaire has provided by composing the *Illustrations*, but which also raise suspicions about the prestige advertising inherent to Lemaire's self-representation by way of the ambiguous figure of Genius.

### **Birds, Bees, and Olive Trees: The Paratext of the *Premier Livre des Illustrations de Gaule et Singularitez de Troye***

The *princeps* edition of Book One of the *Illustrations* (Abélard A1/Munn 8) was printed in Lyons by Étienne Baland, most likely in early May 1511, and sold by Baland and Jean Richier.<sup>44</sup> Directly below its title is the first paratextual contribution of the Dominican preacher Petrus Lavinius (Pierre de La Vigne), a distich addressed to the reader: "Ingeniosa legas Marii

---

<sup>44</sup> Little is known of Étienne Baland, except that he seems to have been an expert printer to whom other printer/booksellers entrusted contracts on a number of occasions (Baudrier, vol. 11, p. 2). Baland does seem to have had a predilection for printing editions of and commentaries on classical authors, which might account for his interest in the *Illustrations*. Abélard places more emphasis on Richier, an orator charged with composing circumstantial works and panegyrics, and with organizing royal entries into Lyons. Based on the fact that Lemaire was himself invited to help organize such an entry in June 1509, Abélard hypothesizes that he must have had an excellent relationship with Richier (58).

monumenta Joannis. / Gallorum regum que sit origo docent” (“You should read the ingenious chronicles of Jean Lemaire. They teach what the origin of the Gallic kings is”; aa1r). The distich simultaneously presents the book as a work on history meant to instruct (“docent”) and a literary work that will stand the test of time: the plural “monumenta” means “annals” or “chronicles,” all while echoing the Horatian “exegi monumentum.”<sup>45</sup> It is also the first instance in the edition of the *Illustrations* of what I would call the vocabulary of genius which underpins Lemaire’s persona.<sup>46</sup> Lemaire’s makeup (*ingenium*) is perfectly suited to the kind of historical work that will occupy a permanent place in the consciousness of the French-speaking nations.<sup>47</sup>

Below the distich is Lemaire’s coat of arms (Fig. 1). Though Abélard finds it to be “de très médiocre facture,” it reflects Lemaire’s reorientation of his project, which he originally called the *Singularitez de Troye et de Turquie*, toward the Gallic myth, as well as the work that goes into producing the *Illustrations* (64). The arms are comprised of a trophy occupying the center with a hand holding a wreath extending from the top of it, and a banner above it which reads “Si non utile est quod facimus, stulta est gloria” (“If what we accomplish is not useful, our

---

<sup>45</sup> Cf. Lewis and Short, p. 1163. See also the entry “Annales” in Robert Estienne’s *Dictionnaire François-Latin* (1549). Conley, though he makes no reference to Lavinius’s distich, or to the fact that *monumentum* can refer to a burial monument or tombstone, stresses how the edition represents Lemaire as famous after his death: “En sa complétude idéale – lorsque, mort, l’auteur s’est déposé et encrypté en son gîte sépulcral – l’œuvre serait le tombeau attestant les travaux de celui qui l’avait réalisé” (84).

<sup>46</sup> This vocabulary stems from variants on two distinct, yet etymologically related Latin words, *ingenium* (skill, cleverness, or trickery, as in the French *engin*) and *genius* (the Latin equivalent of the Greek *daimôn*, meaning “spirit”). As I will show, both these connotations come into play.

<sup>47</sup> The term “French-speaking nations” is meant to distinguish France from Burgundy. Though the Duchy of Burgundy was absorbed by the French crown in 1477, its rulers remained inimical to France and more closely allied with the Habsburgs, who claimed the Burgundian possessions in the Low Countries. Lemaire, a native of the latter and a servant of Margaret of Austria, the daughter of Holy Roman Emperor Maximilian I and Mary of Burgundy, was acutely aware of the fine political line he was treading in courting the French crown, and thus had recourse to the politically and linguistically neutral term “Gaul” so as to avoid alienating either his current or his future patrons (Rothstein 598).

glory is foolish”).<sup>48</sup> Below the trophy is Lemaire’s motto, “De peu assez,” which first appeared in the 1504 edition of the *Temple d’Honneur et de Vertus*. To the left of the motto is a rooster with a banner that reads “Gallis aeternum decus” (“Everlasting glory to the Gauls”), and to the right is a beehive surrounded by a swarm of bees upon which a parrot perches, with a banner reading “Favus distillans labia mea” (“Honeycomb dripping from my lips”). Each of these elements frames the *Illustrations* and the *Épîtres* within the context of Lemaire’s mastery of history and *seconde rhétorique*.

As Jodogne and Abélard have noted, “Si non utile est quod facimus, stulta est gloria” is a citation of Phaedrus, and first appeared at the end of the 1509 edition of the *Concorde du genre humain*, directly preceded by Lemaire’s signature, “Jo. Marianus, apis belga, subdiaconus, fecit” (“By Jean Lemaire, Belgian bee and subdeacon”; 80). The line is taken from the fable “Arbores in deorum tutela” (“Trees under the Protection of the Gods”):

Olim, quas vellent esse in tutela sua,  
divi legerunt arbores. quercus Jovi,  
at myrtus Veneri placuit, Phoebus laurea,  
pinus Cybebae, populus celsa Herculi.  
Minerva admirans quare sterilis sumerent  
interrogavit. Causam dixit Juppiter:  
"Honorem fructu ne videamur vendere."  
"At mehercules narrabit quod quis volverit,  
oliva nobis propter fructum est gratior."  
tum sic deorum genitor atque hominum sator:  
"O nata, merito sapiens dicere omnibus.  
nisi utile est quod facimus, stulta est gloria."  
Nihil agere quod non prosit fabella admonet. (Bk. 3, fable 17).

Long ago, the gods chose the trees that they wanted to be under their protection. Jove picked the oak, Venus the myrtle, Apollo the laurel, Cybele the pine, and Hercules the tall poplar. Minerva, marveling at this, asked them why they were choosing trees that bore no fruit. Jupiter told her why: “So that we do not appear to be selling honor in

---

<sup>48</sup> I would raise the possibility that the wreath is of olive rather than of laurel, given both the context of the motto directly beneath it and the description of Pallas’s helmet in the *Illustrations*; see below, p. 54.

**L**epistre du Roy a Hector de Troye. Et au-  
cunes aultres oeuvres Allez dignes de veoir.



Fig. 1: Lemaire's coat of arms, from the *princeps* edition of the *recueil-Epistre* (Armstrong and Britnell A/Munn 12e), Folger 234-555q, title page (A1r). By permission of the Folger Shakespeare Library.

exchange for fruit.”<sup>49</sup> “By Hercules, people will say whatever they want to say, but I find the olive tree more pleasing on account of its fruit.” Then, the father of the gods and the progenitor of men said: “O my daughter, you are rightfully called wise by all. If what we accomplish is not useful, our glory is foolish.” This fable instructs us to do nothing which is not profitable.

The irony of Phaedrus’s fable is that Minerva, a virgin goddess, vouches for fruit-bearing trees, and goes on to adopt the olive. Even more striking than the fable’s humorous irony, though, is the fact that it also serves as a commentary on Phaedrus’s *Fables* themselves: just as trees which bear no fruit are useless, so too are any endeavors, including literary ones, which are enjoyable without being profitable. The *Fables* avoid this fate, as they instruct the reader through the content of the fables and the morals appended to them. In adopting a citation of this fable as a motto, Lemaire insists upon the utility of the *Illustrations* and the entirety of his work in the same way that Lavinius’s distich does. By implication, Lemaire also adopts Minerva as his patron goddess, and she will continue to be associated with the image of his work from the *Illustrations* to the *Concorde*.<sup>50</sup>

The modern Gauls for whose benefit the *Illustrations* were written are referenced by the rooster (*gallus*) and the phrase “Gallis aeternum decus,” which reinforces the Horatian intertext of Lavinius’s distich; as Armstrong explains, it could be read as “an everlasting source of glory to the Gauls” (*Technique* 148).<sup>51</sup> The poetic implications of this intertext are made even clearer

---

<sup>49</sup> Phaedrus plays on the polysemy of the term *fructus*, which literally means “fruit,” but figuratively denotes enjoyment or profit.

<sup>50</sup> Later in the century, Lyonnais printers’ journeymen adopted Minerva as their patron goddess, making her the central figure in a festival they organized (Davis 5). Eisenstein seems to claim that all printers’ journeymen worked under the aegis of Minerva, though she offers no specific examples (*Divine Art* 18).

<sup>51</sup> The rooster, herald of the new day, was also associated with Mercury (Rothstein 604). As such, the rooster anticipates the prologues of the three books of the *Illustrations*, each written through the persona of Mercury. The connection between Mercury and the rooster is made even clearer on the engraving representing Anne of Brittany as Juno that accompanies the third book; here, Mercury is depicted with a rooster perched on his head in keeping with the etymological

by the remaining elements of the coat of arms. McGrady has suggested that the hand holding the laurel wreath is a reference to Guillaume Cretin's laudatory epigraph in the *Temple d'Honneur et de Vertus*, in which Cretin declares to Lemaire that "Tu dois porter couronne de laurier / Par bruyt exquis [...]," which reflects her view that the arms are an "author portrait" produced by both the author himself and members of his audience (McGrady 108; *Temple*, p. 46, ll. 19-20). If the point of the laurel wreath is to represent Lemaire as a divinely-inspired poet rather than as a *rimeur*, then it should be added to McGrady's remark that the bees play an essential role in this representation.<sup>52</sup> While they might be a transposition of the aforementioned "apis belga" at the conclusion of the *Concorde du genre humain*, as Armstrong suggests, the phrase on the banner above them grounds them all the more firmly in the context of poetic inspiration (*Technique* 148). According to a well-known anecdote, Pindar was said to have been assailed by a swarm of bees as a young child. The bees coated his lips with either wax or honey, whence he derived his ability to produce mellifluous odes.<sup>53</sup> Whether or not the bees and laurel are indeed a reference to Cretin's epigraph, they serve to ground Lemaire's poetic capabilities within the context of his service to Burgundy and eventually to France.<sup>54</sup> As Abélard and Armstrong have pointed out,

---

similarity between *gallus* (rooster) and *galerum* (Mercury's feathered cap). Cf. *Illustrations*, Bk. 1, ch. 28 (Stecher I.204) and Fulgentius I.18.

<sup>52</sup> For more on the shift in Lemaire's perception of his role, especially in the *Épîtres*, see Rigolot, *Le Texte de la Renaissance*, pp. 82-86, and "'Rhetorique' et 'Poésie' à l'aube du XVIe siècle: La double postulation de l'*Amant Vert*," *Romance Philology* 33 (1980), pp. 523-35.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. Pausanias, *Description of Greece* IX.23.2, or Philostratus, *Imagines* II.12. Cretin, incidentally, refers in the same epigraph cited by McGrady to "le doux *myel* que ta plume distille" (46.11; emphasis mine).

<sup>54</sup> Lemaire's shift of allegiance from Margaret of Austria to Louis XII and Anne of Brittany, which coincided with the publication of the first book of the *Illustrations* and culminated with Lemaire abruptly leaving the Netherlands in late 1511 or early 1512 and becoming Anne's *indiciaire* soon after, is both well-documented and reflected in the editions of the *Illustrations*. See Becker, pp. 194-212, Jodogne pp. 110-131, and Abélard 21-29. In the same vein, McGrady points out that the bees are, in fact, gathering nectar from a daisy (*marguerite*) and a *fleur de lis*, which would constitute another instance of how the paratext reflects Lemaire's shared loyalties

the bees also represent Lemaire's scholarly labors (Abélard 64; Armstrong, *Technique* 148).

Their remarks are substantiated by the fact that Lemaire cites Lucretius's famous apian simile at the conclusion of the first book of the *Illustrations*: "Or clorrons nous nostredit premier livre de deux vers Lucretiens: 'Floriferis ut apes in saltibus omnia libant, / Omnia nos itidem decerpsimus aurea dicta'" ("Just as flower-bearing bees drink from all things by leaps and bounds, / So have I culled all these golden sayings"; Stecher I.343, Lucretius bk. 3, ll. 11-12). In other words, the same image that associates Lemaire with the concept of the divinely-inspired poet associates him with the concept of the poet as *acteur*, or laborious gatherer (*ago*) of material, which is reinforced by the list of authors cited in the first book which appears directly after the citation of Lucretius (K6v).<sup>55</sup> The hive might convey Lemaire's allegiance to the French crown, as well. After Louis XII's suppression of a revolt in Genoa, under French dominion at the time, in April 1507, a number of works celebrating the king's clemency toward the city were produced, the most notable of which is Jean Marot's *Voyage de Gênes*. In a manuscript containing Marot's work (BNF ms. fr. 5091), one of the illustrations depicts Louis riding out from Alessandria to approach Genoa (f. 15v). Louis's jerkin and his horse's caparison are adorned with an emblem of bees swarming around a hive with the motto "Non utitur aculeo rex cui paremus" ("The King, to whom we are subject, does not use his stinger").<sup>56</sup> It is unclear whether Louis actually donned this outfit, and it is equally uncertain that Lemaire or his printers knew of this illustration, but the fact remains that the hive was a commonly used as an image of the ideal monarchical state (Scheller 40; Baumgartner 187). As such, the adoption of this image

---

(108). However, neither Margaret nor Anne could be described as Lemaire's muse, as his projects always go beyond the scope of a particular patron's interests (Bozard 40).

<sup>55</sup> The apian image recurs in the description of the Temple of Minerva in the *Concorde*: "Et dessus l'ouverture aux flourettes barbues / Les mouschettes ot on par doulce noise bruyre / Qui cueillent la saveur pour cire et miel construire" (40.50-52).

<sup>56</sup> At the time, it was not known that hives are ruled by female queens. See also Quilliet, p. 379.

in Lemaire's coat of arms reinforces Lemaire's willingness to serve the monarchy, and hints at his ability to sting its enemies with such polemical tracts as the *Légende des Vénitiens* or the *Traicté*.

The verso of the title page contains Lavinius's second paratextual contribution, a letter in Latin to François de Rohan, the Archbishop of Lyons. Containing the same arguments as the prologue and first chapter of the *Illustrations*, Lavinius's letter is specifically addressed to ecclesiastical and/or learned readers, as implied by the fact that it is written in Latin by a Dominican preacher to an Archbishop, and by a specific turn of phrase describing the lacuna that Lemaire's *Illustrations* will fill:

Historia siquidem Gallica (ut Troianam omittam) patrio sermone hactenus edita, ita corrupta et mendosa extiterat, ut illustrissima Gallorum gentis origo plerosque viros *etiam doctos* variis scriptorum figmentis delusos lateret, et galli praeclarissimi generis antiquitate philosophiae multarumque aliarum disciplinarum et literarum, quibus nunc utuntur Graeci, inventione fraudarentur, ab externis gentibus probris insectarentur, barbari denique et ignari, ab his qui a Gallis et disciplinas et disciplinarum elementa acceperant, vocarentur (Stecher IV.433-34).

If any histories of Gaul (to say nothing of histories of Troy) have come out in our nation's tongue, they have shown themselves to be incorrect and faulty, so much so that the most illustrious origin of the Gallic race lay hidden to most men, *even learned ones*, as they have been deceived by various inventions of writers, defrauded of the ancientness of the most excellent Gallic lineage, the invention of philosophy and many other disciplines and letters (which are now attributed to the Greeks), harried by shameful foreign peoples, and called barbaric and ignorant by those who received the disciplines and even the elements of the disciplines from the Gauls (emphasis mine).

The *Illustrations* will restore to the French-speaking peoples their rightful claim to cultural supremacy, a task which no other work has been able to accomplish. What distinguishes the *Illustrations* from these other works is that it tells the truth, according to Lavinius, who drives the point home by employing the noun *veritas* or the superlative adjective *verissimus* three times throughout the letter ("veritate," "verissimam," "veritatem"). Lavinius advertises for the *Illustrations* by demonstrating that readers, even those who believe themselves to be more

learned and hence better-informed than others, must have access to this truth to become fully aware of the superiority of the Gauls to the Greeks and Romans. Indeed, the use of the term “barbari” specifically grounds the letter and the *Illustrations* within the context of the Italian Wars and the competing claims to cultural supremacy that accompanied the constant and exceedingly bloody fighting. As Richard Cooper states in his account of Franco-Italian relations during the Wars, Italian writers were united in their tendency to draw an opposition between the civilized, humane Italians and the brutal, barbaric French invaders (276).<sup>57</sup> The *Illustrations*, Lavinius explains, redress the grievous application of this term to the French-speaking peoples by proving that it was in fact the Greeks and Romans who inherited the disciplines from the Gauls, not vice versa.<sup>58</sup> Lemaire’s work as a historiographer, then, should be regarded as a scholarly complement to Louis XII’s military actions against France’s enemies in Italy. To wit, this is the very simile which Lavinius applies to the *Illustrations* in his quatrain to Lemaire, which, along with a valedictory quatrain to Rohan, follows the epistle:

Bellica magnanimi lituo resonante per orbem  
 Ut galli vastum signa tulere duces,  
 Sic tua quaesitos variis authoribus ortus  
 Veridicis gallos, undique scripta ferent (Stecher IV.435).

Just as the noble leaders of the Gauls gave the signal to break camp with a clarion call resonating through the wide world, so do your writings bring tidings everywhere of the true origins of the Gauls that you have sought out in various authorities.

---

<sup>57</sup> To say nothing of Julius II’s apocryphal exclamation of “Fuori i barbari” (“Out with the Barbarians”), I would point to a passage from Guiccardini’s *Storia d’Italia* which relates Charles VIII’s entry into Asti in September 1494, and which typifies the use of the term. Guicciardini explains that ever since Charles undertook his Italian campaign, “[...] hanno avuto facoltà altre nazioni straniere e eserciti barbari di conculcarla miserabilmente e devastarla” (“[...] other foreign nations and barbarian armies have been able to trample upon [Italy] wretchedly and devastate her”; vol. 1, bk. 1, ch. 9, p. 86). See also Jodogne, *Jean Lemaire de Belges*, pp. 66-67.

<sup>58</sup> A similar description of the book’s purpose is found in Chapter One: “Cestasavoir esclarcir en ce langage François, que les Italiens par leur mesprisance acoustumee appellent Barbare (mais non est) la tresvenerable antiquité du sang de nosdits Princes de Gaule tant Belgique, comme Celtique” (Stecher I.11).

The military vocabulary of the quatrain presents Lemaire's book, and specifically the publication of his book, as a contribution to the Italian Wars: the expansion of France into Italy is mirrored by the diffusion of the *Illustrations* "per orbem" through printing.

It should also be noted that Lavinius's epistle describes Lemaire's publication of the *Illustrations* not as a commercial venture or a sale, but rather as a gift to the nation: "Eas Gallorum praeclaras illustrationes, pro nostre gentis ornameto editas nobis legendas Marius noster dedit" ("Our Lemaire gave us an edition of his most excellent Illustrations of the Gauls to read for the distinction of our race"; Stecher IV.434).<sup>59</sup> Advertising, in keeping with Baudrillard's "logique du Père Noël," is offered freely to all, whereas the product is sold (202). This is to make the producer seem benevolent or even charitable toward the consumer, and to make the product seem as if it has been created with the consumer in mind. Lavinius's epistle portrays Lemaire's *Illustrations* in exactly this way, all while expanding the intended audience of readers/consumers beyond Margaret (and later, Louis and Anne).<sup>60</sup>

After the quatrain comes Lavinius's final contribution, a longer poem in praise of Lemaire and his work. It reinforces the martial overtones of the quatrain by virtue of its dactylic hexameter, the meter of classical epics, which anticipates the Virgilian intertext of the prologue and first chapter of the *Illustrations*. It also summarizes the contents of the first book, and instructs the reader on how to receive it. Its account of the Judgment of Paris not only grounds Lemaire's account within a moralizing framework, but refers back to Lemaire's coat of arms:

---

<sup>59</sup> For more on gift economies in Renaissance France, see Davis, *The Gift in Sixteenth-Century France* (Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 2000).

<sup>60</sup> Cf. Mercury's description of the *Illustrations* in the prologue of Book One: "Laquelle oeuvre universelle, en sa totalité (pource que maintes choses autresfois obscures, y sont clèrement interpretees) pourra estre appropriée à moymesmes, et à tous ceux de mon influence: cestadire à tous nobles et clers entendemens de l'un et de l'autre sexe, qui sont de la bende Mercurienne, et ayment la lecture des bonnes choses" (5).

[...] memorat quam sit damnosa voluptas  
 Judicio: Voluit demens praeferre pudori  
 Qui vitium; spernens foelicia dona Minervae,  
 Ac Junonis opes, Veneris fugienda sequutus (Stecher IV.436-37).

It tells of how harmful pleasure was to judgment: how a senseless man wished to put vice before propriety, spurning the fruitful gifts of Minerva and the riches of Juno, and followed Venus, who is to be avoided.<sup>61</sup>

Paris's choice is represented not only as a choice of vice over propriety, but as a rejection of the very same fruitfulness represented by Minerva in Lemaire's coat of arms and its citation of Phaedrus. The poem thus guides the reader's reception of the Judgment of Paris in the *Illustrations* while establishing a parallel between the Judgment of Paris and Lemaire's persona. Lemaire is presented as an anti-Paris in that by choosing to pursue the writing of truthful history, he has chosen Minerva over Venus.

The Latin paratext, then, focuses on convincing readers that they need what the *Illustrations* have to offer, while solidifying the image of Lemaire as a disciple of Minerva in the service of the French-speaking peoples, and hence as concerned with the pursuit of truth rather than the pursuit of profit. The prologue of the first book takes an even more self-referential turn by describing the origins of Lemaire's project through the figure of Mercury, the narrator of the prologues of all three books of the *Illustrations*, and by setting up the Judgment of Paris, the central episode of Book One, in such a way as to encourage the reader to compare it with the figure of the author.

Mercury's salutation to Margaret of Austria recalls the title page's insistence on Lemaire's eloquence and diligence. The deity introduces himself as "Mercure, jadis réputé Dieu d'eloquence, ingeniosité et bonne invention, herault et truchemant des dieux" (Stecher I.3). As

---

<sup>61</sup> "Felix" most properly means "fruit-bearing," "fruitful" or "fertile," though it is commonly used to mean "fortunate" or "happy," the sense which survives in the modern word "felicity" (Lewis and Short 733).

the patron deity of eloquence and “bonne invention” (*inventio*), Mercury may be said to govern Lemaire’s rhetorical activity. The affinity between Mercury and Lemaire is made even clearer by the fact that the deity is also the patron god of “ingeniosité,” which echoes the “ingeniosa monumenta” of Lavinius’s distich.<sup>62</sup> The Mercury of this prologue is Mercury at his most salutary, as Lemaire cleverly chooses between the accounts of Mercury in his main mythographic sources, Fulgentius’s *Mythologies* and Boccaccio’s *Genealogia deorum gentilium*, opting to privilege the latter.<sup>63</sup> In Fulgentius, Mercury is the god of commerce, go-betweens and thieves (bk. 1, § 18, p. 29). Boccaccio, though he acknowledges that there are many different conceptions of Mercury, prefers the conception of Mercury as the divine messenger and god of eloquence (bk. 12, § 62, pp. 1228-30).<sup>64</sup> By placing the *Illustrations* under the tutelage of the latter Mercury, Lemaire avoids presenting the book as an object of commerce, a good to be haggled over and ultimately sold for profit. Like Lavinius’s epistle, the salutary Mercury of the prologue reveals Lemaire to be motivated not by gain, but by a calling to perform a necessary service.

Boccaccio is also the source for Lemaire’s description of Mercury’s appearance in Chapter 28, which makes the connection between Mercury and writing, and indeed between Mercury and printing, even clearer. Lemaire, in keeping with Boccaccio, focuses on Mercury’s three attributes: his hat, his winged sandals, and his caduceus. The hat, or “Galere” (*galerum*), signifies that eloquence serves as a strong defense against one’s enemies (Stecher I.204;

---

<sup>62</sup> This is not the first time that Lemaire associates his *ingenium* with Mercury. In the *Concorde du genre humain*, he traces the origin of “ceste mienne euvre rudelette” to Calliope, the muse of epic, inspiring “mon petit esperit familier, nommé Genius, filz de Mercure” (63).

<sup>63</sup> Both works are listed among the “noms des acteurs alleguez en ce premier livre” (K6v).

<sup>64</sup> Mercury does introduce himself as “Dieu d’eloquence, d’engin et de bonne invention” in the prologue of Book Two (Stecher II.1). Unsettling though the term “engin” may be, it is clear that Lemaire prefers Boccaccio’s account to that of Fulgentius in associating Mercury with the narrative of his career as a historiographer.

Boccaccio 12.62.1230).<sup>65</sup> As suggested by the bees in Lemaire's coat of arms, eloquence allows a writer to defend his sovereign's interests, as well as the interests of an entire people, as the *Illustrations* claim to do by defending the French-speaking nations against the charge of barbarism. Lemaire, however, adds a detail not found in Boccaccio, namely that the hat is "garnie de belles plumes," which makes the link with writerly activity all the more explicit. In the same vein, Mercury's winged heels, which allow him to fly, are equated with "la grande vitesse de la parole, qui va legerement en diverses regions loingtaines" (Stecher I.204). This comparison is also found in Boccaccio, and is likely based on the classical notion of winged words, but Boccaccio specifically refers to the speed of spoken words, whereas Lemaire, I would argue, extends the comparison to written, and indeed to printed words by speaking of "diverses regions loingtaines," which suggests the broad geographic distribution of printed books through trade or fairs. Finally, the caduceus and the snakes entwined around it are equated with prudence, which reinforces the notion that eloquence is a valid form of defense, "[c]ar prudence et beau parler humain endort les plus rusez" in the same way that Mercury defeats the watchful Argus (Stecher I.204; Boccaccio 12.62.1232). "Prudence" also suggests an affiliation between Mercury and Pallas, an affiliation which is made even clearer through Mercury's role in the narrative of Lemaire's career.

Mercury draws a parallel between Aeneas, who restores Troy by founding Rome, and Lemaire, who restores Troy by revealing to the Gauls that they are its rightful heirs. He opens with a citation from Book One of the *Aeneid*: "Quis genus Iliadum, quis Troiae nesciat urbem?" (bk. 1, l. 565). The citation is followed by a deliberately amplified translation: "Qui ne congnoit

---

<sup>65</sup> Boccaccio equates this defense with *captatio benevolentiae*, explaining that it is nothing other than the "gratia, quam eloquens a benevolis meretur auditoribus" ("favor that an eloquent man deserves from his benevolent listeners"; 12.62.1230).

le noble sang de Troye, / Et la cité, qui des Grecs fut la proye?” (Stecher I.3).<sup>66</sup> By making mention of the Greeks, Mercury harkens back to Lavinius’s epistle and its claim that the Greeks have usurped the Gauls’ claim to the invention of the disciplines in the same way that they overthrew Troy. Lemaire’s quest thus mirrors that of Aeneas, and the fact that it is Dido who pronounces these lines in the *Aeneid* suggests that Mercury plays the same role in both. In Book Four of the *Aeneid*, it is Mercury who prompts the suddenly “uxorious” Aeneas to stop helping Dido rebuild Carthage and get back to finding the spot on which to found his city (1.238-78). Similarly, it is Mercury who impels Lemaire to undertake the great labor of writing the *Illustrations*, and he relates the circumstances with precision: “[...] je stimulai et enhardis l’entendement du tien tresadonné serviteur volontaire, Secretaire, Indiciaire et Historiographe Jean le Maire de Belges, environ l’an XXVII. de son aage, qui fut l’an de grace Mil cinq cens, à ce qu’il osast entreprendre ce labeur” (Stecher I.4).<sup>67</sup> Lemaire, like Aeneas, chooses hard-won glory (for the French-speaking nations as well as himself and his patrons) over pleasure by electing as a young man to dedicate himself to the *Illustrations* for the better part of a decade.

The choice of glory over pleasure is then compared to the Judgment of Paris, the central episode of Book One and the framework for the dedications of the three books.<sup>68</sup> Mercury offers Paris’s virtuous youth, during which he lives under Minerva’s tutelage, as a mirror for the education of the young Archduke Charles, whom Mercury will guide in his capacity as “[...] un

---

<sup>66</sup>The corresponding line in the *Aeneid* reads “virtutes virosque, aut tanti incendia belli” (“its great deeds and heroes, and the fires of so great a war”; I.566). Modern editions of the *Aeneid* also give “Aeneadum” rather than “Iliadum.”

<sup>67</sup> Though Lemaire makes no mention of the work until 1508, Jodogne seems to accept the date of 1500 as accurate (*Jean Lemaire de Belges* 404-05). Marian Rothstein, however, points out that 1500 was also the year in which Archduke Charles (the future Charles V) was born, and suggests that the year was chosen to pay homage to Charles and his aunt, Margaret of Austria (600).

<sup>68</sup> Book One is dedicated to Minerva (Margaret of Austria), Book Two to Venus (Claude of France), and Book Three to Juno (Anne of Brittany).

cler entendement Angelique, de noble et divine nature, que les Philosophes appellent Bonus genius” (Stecher I.6). This “Bonus genius,” the equivalent of the Greek *daimôn*, is a sort of personal guardian deity that presides over an individual’s destiny (Bergweiler 96; Cottrell 295; Lecointe 714).<sup>69</sup> When Charles reaches maturity, Mercury, who presided over the Judgment of Paris, will present the young prince with a similar choice: “[...] alors je luy presenteray la pomme d’or, cestadire, son propre franc arbitre: Et le feray Juge de la beauté des trois Deesses: cestasavoir Prudence, Plaisance, et Puissance. Lequel (comme sage) choisira la meilleure et plus belle” (Stecher I.6-7). By choosing between Prudence, Pleasure and Power, Charles chooses between Minerva, Venus, and Juno. Though Mercury is certain that Charles, “comme sage,” will make the right choice, he does not say what that choice is.

To better understand this omission, we must turn first to Fulgentius and Boccaccio. Fulgentius equates the Judgment of Paris with the choice between the contemplative life, the active life, and the life of pleasure (2.1.36-37). He characterizes the active life as the blind pursuit of wealth or power, distinguishing it from the life of pleasure and its pursuit of carnal delights, making it clear that the contemplative life is the only acceptable choice. Boccaccio, though not as openly condemnatory of the active life as Fulgentius, agrees with his predecessor’s interpretation, and points to Aristotle as a philosophical source for this choice between the three kinds of life (6.22.654).<sup>70</sup> Lemaire, for his part, is clearly unable to apply this conception of the Judgment to Charles, who, as a future ruler, is obligated to live an active life with significant wealth and power at his disposal. In giving his own descriptions of Juno’s and then Pallas’s

---

<sup>69</sup> Cf. Lemaire’s description of Genius as his “esprit familier” in the *Concorde du genre humain* (see above, p. 47, n. 62). Ulrike Bergweiler equates “entendement Angelique” with either Augustine’s *anima rationalis* (*De civitate Dei* 8.13) or Ficino’s *intellectus*, which, as opposed to *ratio*, is a divine quality (98-99).

<sup>70</sup> Cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, bk. 1, § 5, p. 1731 (1095b1).

accoutrements, he aims less at a sweeping distinction between two kinds of life than at a single method of ruling correctly, in keeping with the project of a mirror for princes. Pallas and Juno represent “Prudence” and “Puissance” respectively, rather than the contemplative and active lives. Both are concerned with princely duties; the difference lies in the approaches to power that they represent.

In keeping with Fulgentius, Lemaire insists on Juno as the embodiment of wealth, enumerating the costly fabrics, precious metals, and rare jewels that constitute her outfit: “Brief, tout son accoustrement estoit riche et pompeux oultre mesure, pour denoter qu’elle est Deesse de toute richesse et opulence” (Stecher I.232). Though he does not denounce the pursuit of wealth in as clear of terms as Fulgentius, Lemaire hints at the excessiveness of Juno’s pomp, describing it as “oultre mesure.” Moreover, Lemaire explains that Juno’s chariot and the many colors of her lady-in-waiting, Iris (the rainbow), denote that Fortune, “[...] combien qu’elle soit aornee pour un temps, de grand resplendeur, et speciosité, neantmoins elle est legerement fugitive, et tost anichilee” (Stecher I.232). Margaret Ehrhart claims that Lemaire’s Juno represents “a life of inner and outer nobility – a life rather like the lives of the noble patrons for whom Lemaire wrote” (200). In my view, Juno represents outer nobility alone: all of the signs and trappings of power that are unstable and impermanent *qua* subject to the mutable Fortune of the Boethian tradition. I would go so far, in fact, as to compare her with Jean de Meun’s account of the House of Fortune, which has walls of gold, silver, and precious jewels on one side, but thin walls of mud and thatch on the other (pp. 344-46, ll. 6095-6014). To choose Juno, then, would be to choose to pursue power and wealth as their own ends, without cultivating the qualities needed to endure the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune; a prince who makes such a choice, though he may enjoy the fruits of his station “pour un temps,” will eventually find that his good fortune is

“fugitive, et tost anichilee.” A mirror for princes, on the other hand, is meant to train a future ruler how to maintain control in the face of adverse fortune; this is, incidentally, the guiding principle that Machiavelli would later adopt in *The Prince*.<sup>71</sup> To this end, Lemaire holds up Pallas, “Deesse de prudence et de fortitude,” who embodies the qualities not only of an ideal prince, but of an ideal historiographer, as well (Stecher I.236).

As with Juno, Lemaire draws primarily on Fulgentius for his account of Pallas’s garb (2.1.37-38).<sup>72</sup> He insists that the gifts of the virgin goddess are necessary to successful rule in both war and peace:

Sans lesquelles vertuz, mon frere le Dieu Mars ne sauroit conduire ses batailles, ainçois appeteroit pour neant, la sublimité des regnes, la subjugation des puissans, et la vengeance de ses ennemis. Car il ne fait exploit digne de mémoire, si moy mesmes ne regis son chariot. Ny aussi la communauté politique des humains en temps de paix ne peult consister en valeur, sans mon adherence (Stecher I.239).

Lemaire draws here on an important distinction between Pallas and Mars, both of whom may be described as gods of war. Whereas Mars represents the ferocity, chaos, and indiscriminating carnage of battle, Pallas represents military strategy (“l’ordre des batailles”). Moreover, whereas Mars represents war for war’s sake, Pallas, also known by the epithet Bellona, represents just war undertaken to preserve the peace signified by the olive branch: “L’olive est consacree à ladite Deesse Pallas, à cause que paix qui est entendu par l’olive quise par armes” (Stecher I.237). What Pallas offers is not the contemplative life, but the life of a soldier-prince (Ehrhart 202). As such, the choice of Pallas/Prudence is not exclusive of Juno/Power, or even of

---

<sup>71</sup> Donald Stone, in discussing the Temple of Minerva in the *Concorde*, offers a similar conception of the goddess as “the intelligence that allows man to respond to unforeseen events” and “moral strength and intelligent preparation for life’s demanding challenges” (71).

<sup>72</sup> Boccaccio’s account is significantly less detailed than Fulgentius’s, mentioning only Pallas’s trifold vest and owl (2.3.196).

Venus/Pleasure.<sup>73</sup> On the contrary, Lemaire acknowledges that power and pleasure are indissociable from the life of a prince. A prince must not, however, pursue them as ends in and of themselves, for both are mutable, and will ultimately betray a prince who does not have recourse to prudence, without whose benefits “[...] les sceptres des Princes sont facilement brisez, leurs couronnes demolies, et leurs affaires obombrez d’ignavité, seuffrent detriment irreparable, ne leurs delices voluptueux ne sont point asseurez de placide oisiveté” (Stecher I.239).<sup>74</sup>

If Pallas and her prudence are the best choice available to a future ruler, the fact remains that Pallas’s attributes also echo those of Mercury, whose caduceus, it will be remembered, is taken as a symbol of prudence. These similarities suggest that prudence and eloquence serve similar purposes, and that, consequently, a ruler’s choice of prudence applies not only to his own conduct, but to the writers he chooses to keep in his employ, as well. Just as Mercury’s cap demonstrates that eloquence serves as a stout defense against one’s enemies, Pallas is armed “pour designer que prudence est tousjours bien garnie de deffense contre ses malvueillans”

---

<sup>73</sup> Indeed, “Chasteté en delices” is listed among Pallas’s soldiers (Stecher I.238). This is in keeping with Lemaire’s distinction between the Venus of erotic, passionate love and the Venus of chaste and matrimonial love that figures so prominently in the prologue of Book Two, which addresses Claude of France as the latter manifestation of Venus (Stecher II.2-3). This distinction also figures in Lemaire’s description of Venus’s girdle, or “Ceston,” which determines which way she behaves based on whether she wears it or not (Stecher I.242).

<sup>74</sup> In his analysis of the Judgment of Paris in the *Illustrations*, Cornilliat equates Pallas and Prudence, symbolized by the compass needle, with Lemaire’s penchant for metadiscourse, as she presents wisdom as both the means and the end: “Bien naviguer, c’est une fois encore, par le fait même, choisir la Prudence, laquelle est non seulement le but du voyage, mais la maîtresse des savoirs et des instruments qui le rendent possible [...] Pallas ne s’offre à Pâris comme ce qu’il obtiendra s’il juge bien, mais comme *le fait même de bien juger*” (*Or ne mens* 803-04). Cornilliat also suggests that this is why Pallas’s argument proves unconvincing to Paris: metadiscourse might be of the utmost importance to Lemaire and his fellow *Rhétoriciens*, but patrons might not find it as useful.

(Stecher I.236).<sup>75</sup> The individual components of the goddess's equipment resonate even more strongly with Lemaire's persona. The first is her "riche salade crestee et lambequinee richement: Tymbrée d'une Chouette, et couronnée d'une branche d'olive. En signifiante que l'entendement d'une sage personne, doit estre noblement muny et aorné de plusieurs et diverses choses"

(Stecher I.236). The helmet recalls that of Lemaire's own coat of arms, itself surrounded by lambrequins, or mantling, and crowned with a wreath of what may actually be olive rather than laurel, given the intertext of Phaedrus's fable. Lemaire also gives Pallas winged arms and heels; this singular attribute of the virgin goddess is not found in either Fulgentius or Boccaccio (Stecher I.237). It has been added, I would argue, to strengthen the connection between Pallas and Mercury, as does the description of her lance, "[...] dont le bois estoit de grand longueur: pour denoter que la parole d'une sage personne fiert de loing" (Stecher I.237). An orator or a writer, in this conception, plays a significant role in national defense. While he does not meet the enemy face-to-face in close combat, he strikes from afar with his words, as Lemaire does in the *Traicté*, for example. Through their resonance with Lemaire's guiding spirit, Mercury, Pallas's arms and armaments reveal that a prince should regard Lemaire's services as essential.

Indeed, the list of Pallas's soldiers is comprised of a number of qualities more proper to a historiographer than to a prince:

Sobre plenté, *Eloquence non vaine*, *Congnoissance historique*, Vivacité de sens,  
 Estimation de valeur, Chasteté en delices, Riche suffisance, Meditation possible,  
 Vertueux exercice, Studiosité humaine, *Inquisition de verité*, Notice de raison, Licite  
 entreprise, Juste querelle, Hautesse de cœur, *Hardiesse d'entreprendre*, Conseil industrieux,

---

<sup>75</sup> Pallas's aegis and shield serve a similar purpose: "Et en sa cuirasse que les poètes appellent Egide (qui est l'armature des corps celestes seulement) estoit imprimee l'horrible teste Gorgone, pour donner crainte et frayeur à ses ennemis. Elle avoit un escu crystallin qui est ferme, cler et transparent. En signifiante que le prudent homme peult faire deux choses ensemble: C'estasavoir se deffendre, et regarder aussi par quel moyen il pourra mieux grever son adversaire en l'assaillant" (Stecher I.237).

Discipline militaire, Effect de justice, Armature de prudence, Conduite louable,  
Deduction prospere, et Glorieuse achevissance” (Stecher I.238-39; emphasis mine).

“Eloquence non vaine” is, as we have seen, the crux of Lemaire’s persona in the paratext of the *Illustrations*, which aims to prove not only that Lemaire is a master of both first and second rhetoric, but that his mastery serves a useful purpose. That purpose is manifested in the *Illustrations* themselves, which, as stressed in Lavinius’s epistle, bear witness to their author’s “Congnoissance historique” and “Inquisition de verité.” Even the “Hardiesse d’entreprendre” recalls the origin story of the *Illustrations*, in which Mercury visits Lemaire and encourages him “à ce qu’il osast *entreprendre* ce labeur.” To return to the question of why Mercury does not explicitly state what the correct choice for Charles to make is, it is because the answer is given in the account of the Judgment of Paris, which reveals not only that Pallas is clearly the correct choice, but also that the very book which raises the question is, in fact, the answer. To choose Pallas is to choose both prudence and eloquence used for proper ends, and by reading the *Illustrations*, Charles, as well as the whole of Lemaire’s readership, has already chosen wisely.

As we have seen, the paratext of Book One of the *Illustrations*, when read in conjunction with Lemaire’s account of the Judgment of Paris, paints an elaborate portrait of the author, his motivation, his work, and his allegiances. It reveals the necessity of Lemaire’s services to both rulers and subjects, illustrates why the French-speaking world is in need of a historiographer capable of confirming its cultural supremacy, and presents Lemaire as the answer to this world’s prayers, an amalgam of the inspired poet and the scrupulous scholar concerned only with producing a book both truthful and useful. In this context, truthfulness is ultimately what is at stake in the *Épîtres*, which are presented as an integral part of the *Illustrations* on the title page. Not only does a parrot figure prominently in Lemaire’s coat of arms, but the phrase “Avec les deux epistres de L’amant vert” appears directly after Lavinius’s distich. By calling attention to

the *Épîtres* in this fashion, the title page encourages the reader to approach the *Épîtres* within the context of the *Illustrations* by seeing in the Amant Vert a double of the author.

### **“Soubz ce noir marbre gist l’Amant Vert”: The *Épîtres* and Lemaire’s Historical Turn**

A humorous imitation of Ovid’s *Heroides* and the vernacular tradition of letters from abandoned lovers, the two *Épîtres* are narrated by Margaret of Austria’s pet parrot, the titular Amant Vert, abandoned by her in the castle at Pont d’Ain while she goes to meet with her father, the Emperor. In the first epistle, the parrot grows despondent and resolves to commit suicide by throwing himself into the jaws of a hungry mastiff. In the second epistle, which draws primarily on Book Six of the *Aeneid* and Dante’s *Divine Comedy*,<sup>76</sup> the spirit of the Amant Vert is met by Mercury, who guides him through Hell and then leads him to the Elysian Fields, where he is welcomed by another parrot, the Esprit Vermeil, often taken to be a double of Jean Molinet. The delightful and often bold humor of the *Épîtres*, which describe at one point how the Amant Vert has witnessed Marguerite *in flagrante delicto* with her successive husbands, accounts for their popularity both today and in their own time, when they may have even inspired a vogue for pet parrots and parakeets among the French royalty (McKinley 7). Modern critics have been particularly drawn to the obvious parallels between the Amant Vert and Lemaire himself, though they have drawn different conclusions from these parallels.<sup>77</sup> Yet, what unites these critics is their tendency to consider the *Épîtres* in isolation rather than as a complementary piece for the *Illustrations*. To be sure, the *Épîtres* did originally circulate in manuscripts, and still survive in

---

<sup>76</sup> Frappier makes the case for Dante (*Introduction* XXXIII), whereas Jodogne argues in favor of Virgil (*Jean Lemaire de Belges* 262-68). For my part, I see no reason why the two should be seen as mutually exclusive.

<sup>77</sup> See Rigolot, *Poésie et Renaissance*, pp. 89-91.

several.<sup>78</sup> However, it did not appear in print independently of the *Illustrations* until the 1535 *Triumphe de l'Amant Vert* (Munn 34). I propose to address this oversight by considering the Amant Vert as a reflection of the authorial persona constructed in the paratext of the *Illustrations*.

The *Épîtres* are preceded by a dedicatory letter from Lemaire to the royal painter of Louis XII, Jean Perréal, the author's longtime friend and advocate.<sup>79</sup> It requests that Perréal give to Queen Anne on behalf of Lemaire “ung petit et humble present de la lecture du tout,” since she so enjoyed the first epistle (3-4). The queen's enjoyment, in fact, prompts Lemaire to conclude that “ce ne seroit point choise malséant ne desagréable aux lecteurs de aussi faire imprimer ladicté epistre,” as well as the second epistle, along with the *Illustrations* (3). McGrady has noted how Anne and Perréal act as ideal readers in terms of the role they play in the reception and dissemination of the work, a role into which the book's general readership is consequently encouraged to step (108). What has not been noted, however, is that this dedication also encourages the reader to approach the *Épîtres* as a narrative of Lemaire's career. The first phrase of the salutation establishes this parallel by introducing the author as “Jan Le Maire de Belges, treshumble disciple et loingtain imitateur des meilleurs indiciaires et historiographes” (3). The fact that Lemaire is introduced as an “imitateur” of the greatest *indiciaires* and historiographers associates the image of the parrot with Lemaire's historical work, and suggests that the ensuing parrot poems are to be read as a confirmation of the latter, as proof that Lemaire is up to the task he has undertaken.

---

<sup>78</sup> BNF ms. fr. 24038, ff. 105r – 124r; Österreichische Nationalbibliothek Cod. 2612 and Cod. 3391, ff. 578v – 581v. Cod. 3391 contains only the first 264 lines of the first epistle.

<sup>79</sup> For more on Lemaire's relationship with Perréal, see Jodogne, *Jean Lemaire de Belges*, pp. 123-25.

Lemaire's talents are, in fact, evoked on several occasions in the first epistle in such a way as to invite a comparison between Margaret of Austria's relationship with her *indiciaire* and her relationship with a pet parrot.<sup>80</sup> Lemaire plays on the double meaning of "secretaire" as "confidant" and "secretary" by having the Amant Vert, who enjoys an enviable level of intimacy with Margaret, refer to himself as her "humble secretaire" (p. 6, l. 40). The similarities become even clearer in the story of the parrot's life as told by a shepherdess to those who pass by his tomb:

[...] Sa langue malheureuse  
 Laboura tant à son futur dommaige  
 Qu'elle oubliâ son langaige ramaige  
 Pour sçavoir faire ou sermon ou harengue,  
 Tant en françois comme en langue flamengue,  
 En castillan et en latin aussi,  
 Dont à l'apprendre il souffrit maint soucy.  
 Or estoit il ung parfaict truchemant,  
 Et ne restoit fors sçavoir l'alemant [...] (12-13.240-48).

Mary McKinley, aware that language is what most prominently connects parrots with poets, argues that the need for both to suppress their natural speech and adopt the language of the court reflects the linguistic alienation of the court poet (5). However, the fact that the Amant Vert has had to adapt to new languages may be less important than the purposes for which he uses them. According to the shepherdess, he has learned them so as to be able to produce "ou sermon ou harengue," two terms that most properly belong to rhetoric. In the parrot's own lamentations, he equates something much closer to a parrot's natural vocalizations with songs sung simply to please his lady: "Las! se je parle et ciffle et me degoise, / Et qu'en chantant je maine doulce noise, / Ce n'est pour moy, mais pour toy resjouyr" (8.91-93). In other words, the Amant Vert's

---

<sup>80</sup> Rigolot points to the numerous instances in which the poet's and parrot's identities are confused with one another as opportunities to "saisir le texte en flagrant délit d'intentionnalité" ("Intentionnalité" 207, *Texte* 75).

adaptation of strange tongues for the purposes of persuasive speech is celebrated after his death, while the natural tongue from which he is “alienated” does not keep him from failing in his effort to provide the mourning Margaret with lyrical consolation.<sup>81</sup>

It is in this context that we should consider the Amant Vert’s tomb, as well. Critics have hinted that the tomb is none other than the very epistle which describes it, and which concludes with the Amant Vert’s epitaph: Rigolot notes the homophony between “L’Amant Vert” and “Lame en vers,” and Lawrence Kritzman argues that the epitaph draws attention to the mediation of the poet’s voice in the materiality of writing (Rigolot, *Texte* 82; Kritzman 39).<sup>82</sup> While I agree that the epistle calls attention to the text’s capability to act as a burial monument, I would add that several key details of the tomb reflect the description of Lemaire as an “imitateur.” The first is found in the Amant Vert’s request that he be buried not at Pont d’Ain, but in a proper tomb in “quelque lieu joly,” as such was the honor conferred upon a certain bird by the Roman people (11.202-04). He refers to an anecdote in Pliny’s *Natural History*, which relates how a raven was so esteemed by the Romans that when a cobbler killed it, he was put to death and the bird was given an elaborate funeral (bk. 10, ch. 60, § 121-123).<sup>83</sup> What makes this raven so special is not only that it talks, but that it develops the habit of perching on the rostrum facing the Forum every morning and saluting Tiberius, Germanicus and Drusus Caesar, and the Roman people as they pass. To put it another way, this raven is not just a talking bird, but the avian equivalent of an

---

<sup>81</sup> Cf. Mercury’s account of Orpheus’s descent into Hades in the second epistle: Orpheus may have sung “chansons piteuses” to win back Eurydice, but “[...] tout cela lui servit de bien peu” (23.145-47).

<sup>82</sup> I would also suggest that the parrot’s wish for the “vert gay” of his plumage to be replaced with a “noir livrée” invites an approximation of the book with the tomb and its “noir marbre” (7.79-82; 12.222).

<sup>83</sup> Pliny’s account is perhaps more an indictment of the Romans’ poor treatment of their illustrious dead than a panegyric of the raven, as he laments the fact that a clever bird was given a funeral procession in a city where many leading men had no obsequies at all and the death of Scipio Aemilianus went unavenged (10.60.123).

orator capable of addressing both powerful political figures and the general populace, not unlike what Lemaire claims to do in the *Illustrations*. The Amant Vert, having unsuccessfully wished that his “[...] corps assez beau / Fust transformé, pour ceste heure, en corbeau” to reflect Margaret’s mourning, now wishes that his funeral proceedings imitate those of the orator-raven (7.65-66). The Amant Vert imitates the raven in the same way that Lemaire imitates authorities like Pliny, from whom he derives the anecdote.

Lemaire’s imitation is referenced again in an oft-neglected component of the paratext that appears after the end of the first epistle and before the start of the second. It is composed of a quatrain addressed by Madame (Margaret) to the author, and a Latin passage on the tradition of poems lamenting dead parrots. The quatrain and the Latin passage are present in every edition of the *Illustrations*, save one, up through the 1549 edition published by Jean de Tournes (Abélard S, Munn 47), which contains only the quatrain.<sup>84</sup> Though the attribution of the quatrain to Marguerite is not contested, the authorship of the Latin passage has not been established.<sup>85</sup> Not only is there a lack of any clear indication of authorship, but most critics do not even mention the passage at all; Frappier’s edition does not even reproduce it in a note.

Margaret’s quatrain, as McGrady points out, encourages the reader to conflate the fictional Margaret (responsible for the Amant Vert’s epitaph) with the historical Margaret, thus promoting the poet more so than the patron (106). However, close scrutiny of the quatrain’s

---

<sup>84</sup> The one exception is the 1531 Galliot du Pré edition (Abélard O, Munn 30), which contains only the three books of the *Illustrations*. It is truly a black sheep in the tradition, thanks to its smaller format and to paratext which is not only unique to this edition, but presented as if it had been included by Lemaire, who had been dead for at least seven years when the edition appeared. See below, pp. 107-08.

<sup>85</sup> I would argue that the most likely candidate, aside from Lemaire himself, is Lavinius, given his extensive involvement in the other Latin paratext of the *Illustrations*. We should not rule out Humbert Fournier or Jean Régis/Le Roy, either, as the former’s letter to Symphorien Champier and the latter’s “De laudibus lingue gallicane” are appended to the end of the *Illustrations*.

language reveals that Margaret's praise is not so much directed at Lemaire, or even at the first epistle, as at his body of work:

Ton escriptoire a si bonne practique  
 Que, si m'en crois, sera bien estimée.  
 Parquoy concludz: Ensuyz sa Rhetoricque,  
 Car tu scez bien que par moy est aymée (51, n. 43).

It is Lemaire's "escriptoire" that will win him esteem, and the "Rhetoricque" characteristic of this writing that Margaret loves. If the quatrain blurs the distinction between Margaret the owner of the Amant Vert and Margaret the patron of Lemaire, it also blurs the distinction between Lemaire and the Amant Vert, whose burial marks a turn toward first rhetoric. Moreover, the use of the verb "ensuivre" recalls the proximity of Lemaire to the Amant Vert as an imitator; according to Cotgrave and Huguet, "ensuivre" not only means "to follow" or "to act accordingly with," but also "to imitate."

The Latin passage following Margaret's quatrain begins with a brief explanation of how Statius imitates Ovid's poem about a dead parrot: "Psitacum Corinne mortuum deflevit Ovidius. Statius Papinius Atedii Melioris psitacum mortuum ita ornat, ut non tantum cum Ovidio contendere quam eum precessisse videatur" ("Ovid lamented the death of Corinna's parrot, and thus Statius Papinius honors the death of Atedius Melior's parrot, so that he would seem not so much to compete with Ovid as to surpass him"; Stecher III.16, n. 3). Ovid's *Amores* and Statius's *Silvae* are intertexts for the first epistle in terms of both content and structure. Notably, Ovid's lamentation of Corinna's parrot concludes with an epitaph similar to that of the first epistle: "Colligor ex ipso dominae placuisse sepulcro. / Ora fuere mihi plus ave docta loqui" ("You may judge from my very monument my mistress loved me well. / I had a mouth that was skilled in speech beyond a bird"; bk. 2, poem 6, ll. 61-62; trans. Showerman 403). In attempting to explain this passage, Yvonne LeBlanc claims that it reduces the majestic scale of the *Amores*

and *Silvae* to the “humble level of the animal kingdom,” which amounts to a self-effacing gesture on the part of Lemaire (“Death and Remembrance” 117). LeBlanc’s claim, in my estimation, fails to account for the context of Ovid’s and Statius’s parrot poems and of the *Illustrations*. The former are quite deliberately humorous, and if they are written in a heightened style proper to elegy, it is precisely to heighten the humor. In fact, Statius, in his salutation to his friend and patron Atedius Melior, the owner of the parrot in question, compares his “leves libellos” (“trifling items”) on Melior’s tree and parrot to epigrams (100; trans. Bailey 101). Far from reducing the scale of these poems, the passage inscribes them within the tradition of *translatio studii*, implying that just as Statius imitated and surpassed Ovid, so too does Lemaire imitate and surpass both Roman poets (Armstrong, “Ex-Parrot” 326-27).

The explanation is followed by a selection from Statius’s poem that serves as a reminder of the emphasis on imitation and the Amant Vert’s emulation of Pliny’s orator-raven:

Psitace, dux volucrum domini facunda voluptas,  
 Humane solers imitator psitace lingue,  
 Quis tua tam subito preclisit munera fato?  
 Psitacus ille plage viridis regnator Eoe  
 Ille saluator regum nomenque loquutus  
 Cesareum etc. (Stecher III.16, n. 3; Statius, bk. 2, poem 4, ll. 1-3, 25, 29-30).

Parrot, chief of birds, your master’s eloquent delight, Parrot, skilled mimic of human tongue: who cut short your murmurs by so sudden a fate? [...] Parrot, green sovereign of the eastern clime [...] He, saluter of kings that spoke Caesar’s name [...] (Trans. Bailey 143-45).

Like Pliny’s raven, Melior’s parrot is distinguished not only by his mimicry of human speech, but by his ability to speak Caesar’s name. The Amant Vert displays the very same ability at the beginning of the first epistle, addressing Margaret as “fille au hault empereur, / Fille à Cesar, ce puissant conquereur” (5.1-2). The role of this Latin paratext, then, as well as of Margaret’s quatrain, is to underscore a reading of the Amant Vert’s death and burial as a turn away from

love poetry and toward rhetoric in the service of sovereigns. In fact, the narrative of the two epistles, which recount the parrot's despair, planned demise and interment, and finally the journey of his spirit through Hell and the Elysian Fields, confirms this abandonment of love poetry for rhetoric based on truth. The tomb acts as a memorial not only of the parrot-lover, but of love poetry, as the Amant Vert stresses that the site will be sacred to Venus (11.211). In this context, the epitaph's emphasis on confinement and servitude convey the limitations of love poetry: "Soubz ce tumbel, qui est ung dur conclave, / Git l'Amant Vert et le tresnoble esclave" (17.377-78). The tomb, and by extension, the first epistle and the tradition of the *Heroides* and *Amores* it represents, becomes as much a formal prison ("conclave") as a physical one, and the description of the Amant Vert as an "esclave" reflects not only the commonplace of the lover as the lady's *serviteur*, but also the notion of enslavement to love as seen, for example, in Petrarch's *Trionfi*. In the second epistle, the parrot/poet bids farewell to his former self and to his former poetic inclinations, undergoing a process of purification that resonates distinctly with Mercury's intervention in Lemaire's career.<sup>86</sup>

The second epistle begins with the Amant Vert's reflections on the reception of the first epistle, which, not unlike Pliny's raven, has attracted the attention of "royz, princes et ducz" as well as "mainte princesse noble" (18.19-21). The Amant Vert encourages the reader to associate

---

<sup>86</sup> In this sense, I differ with Rigolot, who also interprets the shift from the first to the second epistle within the context of Lemaire's reflections on his career. Rigolot principally sees Lemaire as moving away from a conception of the poet as a *rimeur* and toward the conception of the divinely-inspired poet more commonly associated with the Pléiade. Though I do think that the description of the Amant Vert in the epitaph as "de vraye amour pure yvre" (17.379), as well as the association with Pindar in Lemaire's coat of arms, corroborates Rigolot's argument, I would argue that the *Épîtres*, at least in their printed form, cannot be read as a lamentation of Lemaire's obligation to continue serving as a chronicler and panegyrist despite his wish to compose "vraie poésie" (*Texte* 82).

the narrative of the *Épîtres* with the persona of Lemaire through what I would argue is a specific reference to the coat of arms:

Si m'est ma mort plus belle et specieuse  
 Que ne fut oncq la vië gracieuse,  
 Veu que *mon nom, mes armes et mon tiltre*  
 Sont ennobliz par celle triste epistre  
 Que j'escriviz quand la mort me pressoit  
 Et le plaisir de vivre descroissoit (19.23-28; emphasis mine).

The second epistle marks the parrot's death in the first epistle as a turning point similar to the one which marks the inception of the *Illustrations* in the prologue. Sure enough, it is Mercury, in keeping with his traditional role as usher of dead souls, who takes the Amant Vert's soul under his wing the very instant it leaves the parrot's body. Having left his devotion to Venus dead and buried with his physical body, the Amant Vert, like Lemaire, turns toward Pallas and spiritual pursuits, as shown in his ascent to the Elysian Fields.

Mercury, having shown the Amant Vert through Hell, brings him before Minos for judgment. Minos, in keeping with the earlier description of the parrot's soul as "tout innocent et vierge," judges him to be worthy of the Elysian Fields on the basis of his innocence and virginity (20.60; 27.261-2). Mercury then guides him there through a path that closely resembles both the commonplace of the virtuous path as a straight and narrow one (*per angusta ad augusta*) and Hesiod's account of the Mountain of Virtue: "Et tousjours fuz mon Mercure suivant / Qui me mena par une voye estroite, / Forte à monter, tresdifficile et droite" (27.276-78).<sup>87</sup> When they reach the entrance to the Fields, they encounter a rather peculiar gate: "La porte estoit de corne transparente, / Qui fut ouverte, et l'entrée apparente" (27.291-92). The gates of horn are found in both the *Odyssey* and the *Aeneid*, where it is explained that there are two sets of gates, one of

---

<sup>87</sup> Cf. *Works and Days*, ll. 286-92. Hesiod is also the most likely source for the description of the Temple of Minerva and Palais d'Honneur in the *Concorde*, both of which sit atop a high mountain.

ivory and the other of horn, through which dreams pass into our world. Dreams that exit through the ivory gates are false visions, whereas dreams that exit through the gates of horn are true.<sup>88</sup>

This reference, along with the emphasis on clarity and openness in the lines cited above (“transparente,” “ouverte,” “apparente”), reveals that the Amant Vert moves not only toward spiritual and virtuous works after his death, but toward the truth, as well, much as Lemaire does by devoting himself to a project intended to reveal the truth behind the origins of the Gauls.

If the *Épîtres* reinforce the narrative of Lemaire’s career as one of devotion to historical truth and the imitation of *auctoritates*, the paratext of the subsequent volumes of the *Illustrations* grounds this narrative more firmly within the political landscape of France in the last years of the reign of Louis XII. This period was marked above all by the king’s conflict with Julius II and his need to convince the French people of the justice of his cause with the aid of authors such as Lemaire and Pierre Gringore. Books Two and Three of the *Illustrations* both make this context explicit and exploit it to advertise for the favorable reception of the *Illustrations*.

### Ungrateful Popes and Grateful Readers

Throughout his celebratory and polemical works, Lemaire repeatedly urges war against the Ottoman Empire in the form of a Crusade to reclaim the Holy Land. Such a Crusade was, in fact, one of the projects agreed upon in the Peace of Cambrai celebrated in the *Concorde du genre humain*, though it ultimately proved impossible. In the *Légende des Vénitiens*, one of the harshest criticisms Lemaire levels at *La Serenissima* is of its permissive attitude toward Turks and Saracens, with whom the Venetians, in anticipation of Voltaire’s remarks on commerce in the *Lettres philosophiques* 225 years later, would rather do business than go to war. In

---

<sup>88</sup> Cf. *Odyssey*, bk. 19, ll. 560-70; *Aeneid*, bk. 6, ll. 893-96.

Lemaire's eyes, this mercenary betrayal of fellow Christians is tantamount to Judas's betrayal of Christ for thirty pieces of silver (25-26). This fervor carries over into Chapter One of the

*Illustrations*, in which Lemaire, now speaking as himself, lays out one of the goals of his book:

Et d'autre part, à fin que les nobles esprits de la langue François et Gallicane, prennent coeur chacun en son endroit, d'enhorter par vive voix comme par leurs escritures, nosdits tresillustres Princes du temps present, à ce qu'ilz se congnoissent vrayz Gaulois et vrayz Troyens la plus noble nation du monde: et ne laissent plus fouler leur honneur par les Turcz. Lesquelz faulsement et torçonnierement usurpent, non seulement le nom de la nobilité de Troye, mais aussi tous les regnes, terres et seigneuries jadis du Roy Priam de Troye. Laquelle chose n'ont peu souffrir nosdit Princes, se congnoissans estre tenuz, non seulement comme Troyens, mais d'avantage comme Chrestiens et treschrestiens (Stecher I.15).

The *Illustrations*, then, are meant to move French-speaking rulers, as well as the orators and writers in their employ, to action against the Ottoman usurpers, whose crime is underscored by the pun "Turcz/torçonnierement" ("wrongly"). Louis XII is singled out by the allusion to the French king's title of "Roy treschrestien." This allusion encourages the reader to consider the *Illustrations* alongside the more explicitly polemical *Traicté*, which was also first published in May 1511, and which is written specifically in support of Louis XII's policies toward the pope, Julius II.<sup>89</sup>

After the conclusion of the Peace of Cambrai and Louis's decisive victory over the Venetians at Agnadello in May 1509, Julius began to machinate against the French in the hopes of ridding the Italian peninsula of their presence. He made peace with Venice in February 1510, effectively negating the Peace of Cambrai, secured the services of Swiss mercenaries to be used against the French, attempted to trick the French naval commander at Genoa into leaving the city

---

<sup>89</sup> It is possible, though unproven, that Louis himself commissioned the *Traicté*. Britnell stresses that it is not at all clear that Louis or his ministers orchestrated a propaganda campaign: see "Anti-Papal Writing in the Reign of Louis XII: Propaganda and Self-Promotion" in *Vernacular Literature and Current Affairs in the Early Sixteenth Century: England, France and Scotland*, ed. Jennifer Britnell and Richard Britnell (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000). See also the introduction to Britnell's edition of the *Traicté*, p. 13.

undefended and ripe for the picking by a papal/Venetian fleet, secured the allegiance of Ferdinand of Aragon and Henry VIII against Louis (though Louis did not become aware of it until it was too late), and excommunicated the Duke of Ferrara, Alfonso d'Este, Louis's strongest Italian ally. Louis responded by convoking an assembly of the French clergy, which met at Tours in September 1510 and resolved that if Julius would not agree to stop his warmongering and convoke a general council for the reform of the Church, Louis was within his rights to withdraw his allegiance and convene his own council with the aim of deposing Julius. Julius, of course, refused to convoke a council, and pressed the campaign against Ferrara, which led to one of the most infamous moments of his papacy: commanding in person at the siege of Mirandola in January 1511, he refused to enter through the gate upon the city's surrender, choosing instead to enter with his troops through a breach while armed and armored. This incident, which cemented Julius's legacy as the "Warrior Pope," prompted Guicciardini to say of him that he retained nothing of the pontiff save the clothing and the name (2.9.13.976).<sup>90</sup> On May 16, 1511, Louis and the Gallican national synod called for a general council to meet in September in Pisa, and all the princes of Europe and their clergy were invited. The principal goals of the council were the reform of the Church (the main step in this direction being the deposition of Julius) and the calling of a Crusade against the Turks. Julius called for a concurrent council, threatening all who attended the Council of Pisa with excommunication.<sup>91</sup>

These events are remarkable not only for how they could potentially have led to a schism or for how Julius's actions would come back to haunt the Church during the Reformation, but for the propaganda campaign that accompanied them in France. To be sure, those authors who took

---

<sup>90</sup> Similarly, in the *Julius exclusus e coelis* (1517) attributed to Erasmus, Saint Peter rebuffs Julius for wearing a superb pontifical habit over bristling and clanking arms (39).

<sup>91</sup> For more on the events leading up to Louis's convocation of the council, see Baumgartner, pp. 209-15.

part in the campaign sided with Louis's policies, but they were especially concerned with how to justify them to the greater public. After all, a schism was the last thing most subjects of the French crown wanted, and the idea of deposing the pope by force of arms or through clerical procedure was equally hard to swallow; Queen Anne was herself vehemently opposed to the idea (Baumgartner 215). The pope, in addition to his own mercenaries and the troops of his allies, held the considerable spiritual powers of excommunication and interdiction, and had shown in his dealings with Venice and Ferrara that he would not hesitate to use them. To persuade the public of the rectitude of Louis's actions, writers relied on the distinction between the papacy as an institution, whose legitimacy and supremacy in matters of religion they did not contest, and the man currently sitting on the throne of Saint Peter, who had to be deposed for the good of Christendom. Gringore's *Jeu du Prince des Sotz et Mere Sotte* typifies this distinction, as it depicts Mere Sotte (Julius) masquerading as L'Eglise, only to be unmasked at the end of the *sottie*. One of Mere Sotte's attendants, Sotte Occasion, issues her a warning typical of one of the chief accusations leveled against Julius: "Ingratitude vous surmonte; / De promesse ne tenez compte / Non plus que bourgeois de Venise" (p. 273, ll. 376-78).<sup>92</sup> Julius's ingratitude toward Louis and the French for their key role in the war on Venice is a recurring theme in antipapal propaganda of this period, including Lemaire's own contributions.<sup>93</sup> The most scathing of these, found only in manuscripts, is "Vim Ludovicus habet," in which "Ingratitude" is the first personage to speak, followed by "Obstination" and "Folle Esperance" (Armstrong and Britnell

---

<sup>92</sup> Similarly, Julius is depicted in the accompanying *moralité* as L'Homme Obstiné, and is deemed "ingrat" by Pugnition Divine (296.171). Furthermore, it is interesting that Mere Sotte's ingratitude renders her comparable to the same sort of "bourgeois de Venise" that Lemaire decries in the *Légende des Vénitiens*.

<sup>93</sup> It was likely a theme in official French political discourse, as well. Christine Shaw relates that at the assembly of the French clergy in Tours in September 1510 which laid the groundwork for the convocation of the Council of Pisa, the French chancellor, Jean Ganay, chalked Julius's affronts to the French up to the pope's ingratitude (281).

15). As in Gringore, the “Sainct Siege Apostolicque” is distinguished from “Le Pape Julles,” and in fact takes him to task for his treatment of the French, “la nation envers laquelle tu t’es monstré ingrat, obstiné, et follement esperant de les getter hors de leur juste possession d’Ytalie, à mon grand desplaisir” (Armstrong and Britnell 21).

It is in this context, then, that the *Traicté* and the similarities it bears to the *Illustrations* must be understood. In the *Traicté*, Lemaire insists upon a second and even graver shortcoming of Julius, one which stems from his ungrateful treatment of the French. The *Traicté* seeks to assuage public fears of a schism and reassure readers that Louis is right to convoke a council by demonstrating that historically, popes rather than princes have been responsible for schisms, and that councils have benefited the Church by instituting salutary reforms. Its treatment of Julius II, though comparatively restrained, hinges largely upon the two works appended to the *Traicté*, the *Histoire moderne du Prince Syach Ismail* and the *Saufconduit donné par le Souldan*. The first details how Shah Ismail, the founder of the Safavid Dynasty, may be regarded as an ally of European nations in that he constantly makes war on the Ottomans; the enemy of an enemy is a friend. The second details how Qansou Ghoury, the last Mamluk sultan of Egypt, concludes a pact with Louis XII that permits the French to pass through Egypt on pilgrimages to the Holy Land. These two Muslim rulers act as a foil to Julius II, the spiritual leader of Christendom, who not only fails to urge Christian princes to wage war on the Turk, but turns them against one another and takes an active part in this travesty. Lemaire supports this opposition with the image of the armed Julius at Mirandola:

Encoires declairerons-nous une autre merveilleuse difference en la fin de ceste euvre: c’est de la gracieuseté et tractabilité du souldan envers le roy treschrestien, au regard de la rigueur et obstination du pape moderne, lequel, tout martial et tout rebarbatif en son harnois, comme s’il deust faire parler de ses armes terrible et bellicqueuses comme du grand Tamburlan empereur et souldan des Tartres, veult tousjours perseverer à la guerre, laquelle lui est aussi bien seant comme à ung moisne houzé de danser (84).

To return to the *Illustrations* and their ultimate deliberative goal of urging a Crusade, we should, given their proximity to the *Traicté* and Lemaire's criticisms of Julius, acknowledge that they play a significant role in Lemaire's antipapal propaganda campaign. In other words, to demonstrate the necessity of a Crusade is to demonstrate that Julius, whose unjust war on the French makes him an impediment to such a Crusade, needs to be deposed. This aspect of the *Illustrations* is made even clearer by the eventual addition of the *recueil-Epistre*, which further connects Lemaire's career with France's political situation.

In Lemaire's *œuvre*, papal ingratitude coexists alongside an equally significant form of ingratitude centered on literary production. This form first occurs in the dedication of the *Concorde du genre humain* to Mercurin de Gattinaire, in which Lemaire explains how the fact that animals, even wild ones, are capable of behaving gratefully toward their benefactors "[...] doibt beaucoup mouvoir les cueurs des hommes à ce que le vice d'ingratitude ne domine entr'eulx" (49). If animals are capable of gratitude, humans have an obligation to display it. In this context, Lemaire attempts to prove his own gratitude toward Gattinaire by dedicating the work to him. Over the three volumes of the *Illustrations*, however, it is applied more and more to the reception of his own work by his readership. Lavinius's epistle, in fact, evokes the debt the book's readers owe the author who gave the volume to them as a gift: "Cui Gallorum respublica se maxime debere fatetur" ("The nation of the Gauls acknowledges that it is greatly indebted to him"; Stecher IV.434).

In the "Excuse de l'acteur" addressed to "Seigneurs vertueux, et dames honorees, qui lisez ce livre" at the end of Book One, the debt of gratitude owed by the reader is tied explicitly to the favorable reception of the author's work. Lemaire, explaining why only one volume of the *Illustrations* has been printed thus far, provides three reasons why the next two books have yet to

be published. The first is that the dedicatees (Claude and Anne) should be the first to receive copies. The second is that Book Three is still in need of some correction and augmentation. The third almost reads as a translation of Lavinius's expression of debt in his epistle, so close is the vocabulary: "A fin que ledit acteur sache premierement et fasse la preuve, comme les petites forces de son industrie auront impetré faveur, recueil et grace devant les yeux de voz magnificences et benigntez, *et de toutes la chose publique de Gaule*" (Stecher I.349; emphasis mine). If the "Gallorum respublica" wishes to see the next two books, they must first prove themselves to the author by receiving the first book favorably ("faveur") and gratefully ("grace"). By predicating the full publication of the *Illustrations* upon the reaction of his readership to the first book, the "Excuse" provides the reader with an incentive to read in a manner favorable to the author. The conclusion of Book Two clarifies that this manner of reading is similar to the one that Rabelais later equates with *pantagruélisme*: "[...] priant aux lecteurs et auditeurs, qu'ilz ne prennent les choses sinon en bonne part, et excusent les fautes par benevolence" (Stecher II.244-45).<sup>94</sup>

In the paratext of the Third Book, published in Paris by Geoffroy de Marnef in July 1513 (Abélard A3, Munn 12c), gratitude definitively comes to the fore and intersects with the narrative of Lemaire's career.<sup>95</sup> On the title page, readers are encouraged to receive the book graciously as they have the previous volumes, and to ensure that other readers do the same: "Lecteurs et auditeurs benivolentz, prenez le bien en gré et le gardez d'injure et d'oultraige

---

<sup>94</sup> Cf. the definition of *pantagruélisme* in the prologue of the *Tiers livre*. See below, Chapter Three, p. 237.

<sup>95</sup> Lemaire procured a new privilege in May 1512, which he transferred from Baland to Marnef prior to the publication of Book Two in August 1512 (Abélard 93). Marnef, like his brothers Enguilbert I and Jean I, was a *libraire-juré* of the University of Paris, which accounts for the majority of his publications, but he does appear to have shown an interest in *Rhétoriqueur* works prior to Lemaire, as indicated by his 1506 edition of Gringore's *Folles entreprises* (Moreau I, p. 194, no. 72). For more on Marnef, see Renouard, pp. 296-97.

comme vous avez fait les autres precedentz de vostre bonne grace. Et l'acteur vous en prie, affin qu'il congnoisse que la nation Françoisne ne soit point ingrate de ses petiz labeurs, pour lesquels mettre au net il a beaucoup veillé et traveillé" (Stecher II.247-48, n. 1). The onus is placed on the reader to prove his gratefulness for the book with which he is provided, or rather, to prove that he is not ungrateful. In this sense, the title page advertises for the reception of the *Illustrations* less by representing an ideal reader which the actual reader may emulate than by representing an anti-ideal, an image against which the reader may define himself by favorably receiving the book and seeing to it that other readers do, as well.

This anti-ideal hinges upon the definition of ingratitude found in another component of the paratext, Lemaire's letter to Guillaume Cretin, which bears a striking resemblance to the aforementioned letter to Mercurin de Gattinaire in the paratext of the *Concorde du genre humain*:

Nul vice en ce monde, à mon advis, ô mon tres honnouré precepteur, n'est plus enorme et detestable envers Dieu et les hommes que le peché d'ingratitude, comme celuy qui me semble estre le pié, le tronc et la racine de tous les autres. Car se le gendre humain n'eust esté ingrat envers la clemence divine, dont il a receu tant de haultz benefices, jamais il ne fust tumbé en la ruyne pecheresse dont sont maculez tous les filz d'Adam, ne jamais on ne feroit injure à soy mesmes, comme font gens desesperes qui souillent leurs mains en leur propre sang. Ne aussi on ne mefferoit à autrui, ains useroit chascun de la vertu de gratitude, c'est à dire de rendre graces des biensfaictz qu'on a receu de Dieu premierement, de ses parens, de ses maistres, de ses voisins et prouchains" (Stecher II.255).

Lemaire equates ingratitude with suicide *qua* ungratefulness for the gift of life, and, more importantly, with original sin *qua* ungratefulness for the gift of eternal life. To equate ingratitude with original sin is to acknowledge that all human beings are capable of it, as they are all "maculez" by the fall of Adam and Eve. What makes the beginning of this letter such a powerful advertisement for the favorable reception of the *Illustrations* is not just that it decries ingratitude, but that it makes readers aware of their own capacity for ingratitude and encourages

them to combat it in their reading of the book to follow. In so doing, they may imitate the author, who consummates his career with an act of gratitude toward the man originally responsible for it. Not wanting to seem ungrateful, Lemaire dedicates the third book of the *Illustrations* to Cretin “comme à celuy qui es et peuz estre deffenseur et protecteur de ce mien labeur, et comme à celuy derechief qui as esté la cause premiere que je me suis enhardy et entremeslé de mettre la main à escripre en ceste nostre langue françoise et gallicane” (Stecher II.255). In Lemaire’s account, Cretin plays a similar role to that of Mercury in the prologue of Book One, and actually precedes Mercury by two years, as Lemaire explains that he was originally a finance clerk for Peter II of Bourbon, but a visit from Cretin prompted him to take up the orator’s art at the age of 25 (Stecher II.256). Gratitude marks the origin and source of Lemaire’s career, even before his devotion to Minerva; the author is not only the perfect man to perform a task upon which the good of the French nation depends, he also serves as an ideal in teaching his readers how to requite a favor, which is precisely what the *Illustrations* are, according to Lavinius’s epistle.

Lemaire further justifies the grateful reception and defense (if necessary) of his work by reminding Cretin (and by extension, all French readers) that his publications have all been for the good of the French nation:

Or doncques, tres cler precepteur, je prie à ta courtoisie naturelle et françoise, que veu et entendu que tout tel que je suis en nostre langue moderne, ta bonté me deffende contre les detracteurs (se aucuns en y a, ce que je ne croy pas), car je ne fuz jamais malivoltent à homme de France, posé ores que je n’en soye natif, et mes euvres precedentes declairent assez l’affection que j’ay eue tousjours au bien publicque de la nation françoise, si comme les deux livres precedentz des *Illustrations*, la *Legende des Veniciens*, que je feis pour monstrar la bonne querelle que le roy avoit contre ladicte popularité tyrannique, pareillement la *Difference des Scismes et Concilles*, à cause de donner à entendre que le pape avoit tort de faire la guerre (Stecher II.256).

Lemaire allays possible skepticism regarding his loyalty, given that he was born outside of France and spent a significant portion of his career in the service of one of France's rivals. He does so by presenting himself as benevolent toward the French despite his foreignness, and by presenting the ensemble of his recent publications as written for the "bien publicque de la nation françoise." The letter to Crétin attempts to condition reception by holding up authorial intention as the single most important criterion for judging a book's worth, as well as that of its author. In this sense, the letter, and the entirety of the paratext in the *Illustrations*, epitomizes prestige advertising in that it promotes the product by presenting the public with a certain image of the producer and the methods and aims of production. It is not just a question of what Lemaire makes, but of why and how he makes it, and for whom. Having raised these questions, the paratext of the *Illustrations*, in conjunction with the *Épîtres*, answers them with Lemaire's persona.

While this persona is partially defined by the pretension to literary immortality, it is primarily defined in relation to France's political and cultural situation in the early 1510's, and especially by the increasingly desperate conflict between France and Rome. This conflict acts as the governing principle of the recueil-*Epistre*, published only one month after Book Three. The collection draws upon Lemaire's persona as elaborated in the *Illustrations* and *Épîtres* in such a way as to prove to the French monarch and his subjects why they need Lemaire's services now more than ever, and to prove at the same time that Lemaire, a foreigner who could potentially use his influential position at court to profit at France's expense or perhaps even aid France's enemies, has nothing but France's best interests at heart.

## History and Exemplarity in Desperate Times

Between the publication of Book One of the *Illustrations* in May 1511 and the publication of Book Three and the *recueil-Epistre* in July-August 1513 (Armstrong and Britnell A, Munn 12e), France's fortunes in the Italian Wars went from bad to worse, despite a few flashes of hope. The Council of Pisa met with such opposition from the city that it had to be moved to Milan, where attendance was poor. Even worse, Julius had succeeded in forming the so-called Holy League with Spain, England, Venice, and the Swiss cantons against France in November 1511. Louis, realizing that his only chance for success was to take action swiftly, put one of France's greatest commanders, his young and charismatic nephew, Gaston of Foix, in command of the French army and ordered him to seek a decisive battle and march on Rome if victorious.<sup>96</sup> In early 1512, Gaston, in a brilliant campaign, retook Bologna and Brescia, and routed the Spanish-papal army at Ravenna on Easter Sunday, one of France's most stunning victories in the Italian Wars, but also one of its costliest. Gaston was killed in the fighting, and the French army fell apart shortly thereafter, being driven out of Italy and losing Milan. In late 1512, the Spanish took Navarre and Emperor Maximilian committed to the Holy League, leaving Louis with only James IV of Scotland for an ally. The death of Julius II on February 21, 1513 brought little relief to Louis, as the new pope, Leo X (Giovanni di Lorenzo de' Medici), was no ally of the French, who had helped to oust his family from power in Florence, and initially showed every sign of continuing Julius's policies (Baumgartner 227; Quilliet 419). Meanwhile, Henry VIII's invasion of France from the north got underway in June 1513, and the English army laid siege to the French stronghold at Thérrouanne in July, eventually taking it in August, while at the same time, a force of 20,000 Swiss pikemen laid siege to Dijon. In short, it is no

---

<sup>96</sup> For more on Gaston of Foix and the campaign, see Quilliet, pp. 403-12.

exaggeration to describe 1513, despite the Warrior Pope's demise, as an *annus horribilis* for France and especially for Louis, and it was in the midst of this bleak political landscape that the recueil-*Epistre* was printed.

The collection is composed of five pieces: the "Epistre du Roy à Hector de Troye," the "24 coupletz de la valitude et convalescence de la Royne," an epitaph of Gaston of Foix, the *Concorde des deux langages*, and Guillaume Cretin's "Plaincte sur le trespas de messire Guillaume de Byssipat." A letter from Lemaire to François Le Rouge, Anne's Master of Requests, is appended to the end of the volume. The collection is defined by the Italian Wars, which are the explicit subject of the "Epistre du Roy," Gaston's epitaph, and Cretin's "Plaincte," and the implicit subject of the *Concorde*. The "Epistre du Roy," notably, is one of Lemaire's most critical pieces vis-à-vis Julius II. However, the context of these pieces, composed prior to 1513 and circulated at court, raises two significant questions about the publication of the recueil-*Epistre*: if the collection focuses on dated events and on a pope who has been dead for six months, why is it published when it is, and what role does it serve? Brown, focusing on the "Epistre du Roy," proposes the fact that it places criticism of the pope in Louis's mouth as an explanation why it was not published until after Julius's death (*Shaping* 105-06). Brown only offers the suggestion, but I would add that works critical of Julius, such as Gringore's, tend to represent the French king as a victim rather than as an aggressor. A work in which the king offers scathing criticism of the pope might have made the king's case seem more like a personal quarrel, and hence less justified in the eyes of an already wary public.

Yet, this risk only explains why the recueil-*Epistre* was not printed sooner. It does not explain what purpose it is meant to serve, other than to publish more of Lemaire's works. Why are these works "dignes de veoir," as the collection's title indicates? The letter to Le Rouge

provides a sense of how the recueil-*Epistre* fits within the body of Lemaire's printed works. It states that the collection is meant to accompany the *Illustrations*: "En la fin de mon troisieme livre des *Illustrations de France*, j'ay bien voulu, à la requeste et persuasion d'aucuns mes bons amy,z, adjouster les oeuvres dessus escriptes, et mesmement les communiquer à la chose publique de France et de Bretaigne" (71).<sup>97</sup> Lemaire refers to the *Illustrations* not by their usual title of the *Illustrations de Gaule*, but as the *Illustrations de France*, abandoning the deliberately ambiguous term "Gaul" in an attempt to clear up any remaining doubts about his loyalties, much as he does in dedicating Book Three to Cretin. It is clear, then, that the recueil-*Epistre* is meant to act as a companion piece to the *Illustrations*, and that any analysis of the collection or its individual components must account for this proximity. From this standpoint, the recueil-*Epistre*, is the culmination of advertisement for the *Illustrations*. Armstrong, agreeing that the recueil-*Epistre* and its contents promote French military, political, and cultural concerns, claims that such a "propagandist context" attenuates the self-conscious features of the "Epistre du Roy" and the *Concorde* (*Technique* 147). I would argue that, if anything, the context of the Italian Wars heightens these self-conscious features, as the collection serves to confirm the essential role that historiographers play in a time of crisis like the one France was experiencing in 1513.

The "Epistre du Roy" appears first in the collection, and is the only work mentioned by name in the collection's title. It was originally a response to an epistle from Hector to Louis by the royal chronicler, Jean d'Auton.<sup>98</sup> Brown claims that Lemaire's epistle is too playful to have

---

<sup>97</sup> All citations from the recueil-*Epistre* are from Armstrong and Britnell's edition, save those from the *Concorde*, which are from Frappier's edition.

<sup>98</sup> D'Auton's epistle is reproduced in Armstrong and Britnell (pp. 77-103). LeBlanc groups D'Auton's and Lemaire's epistles within a category she calls "dead hero letters," in which a mythical hero or deceased prince writes to a living successor or his former subjects with advice ("Va lettre va" 113). For more on this sort of epistle, see Jennifer J. Beard, "Letters from the Elysian Fields: A Group of Poems for Louis XII," *BHR* 31 (1969), pp. 27-38. Another

been meant for consumption beyond the court, as its realistic development of Hector's role as addressee detracts from the polemical tone of the work; in Brown's assessment, it was composed more to entertain Louis and the court than to win support for the king's policies among the people (*Shaping* 103). This may well be the case for the original composition of the "Epistre du Roy," but when considered within the context of the recueil-*Epistre* as a companion piece to the *Illustrations*, it serves as a defense not only of royal policies, but of the usefulness of history. The "Epistre du Roy" rehashes criticisms of Julius II as ungrateful toward the French for their help in reclaiming Church lands, and as an impediment to the Crusade that would reclaim the Holy Land and ancient Troy from the Turks (35.104-05; 42-43.333-38; 43.352).<sup>99</sup> At the same time, it stresses the role that "vraye histoire" plays in drumming up support for the crown in both theory and practice (35.116).<sup>100</sup> To begin with, there is a distinct parallel between the "Epistre du Roy" and the *Illustrations*, as the very frame of the former, with Louis addressing Hector as his ancestor, articulates with the *translatio* at the heart of the *Illustrations*; the epistle also mentions certain episodes recounted in the *Illustrations*, such as Francus founding Sycamber (46-47.425-70).<sup>101</sup> More to the point, the epistle stresses the exemplarity of Hector as a leader and a warrior defending his land against invasion, which articulates with the role of the *Illustrations* as a mirror for princes and reemphasizes the justness of Louis's military campaign, which had shifted from offensive to defensive, and which was conceived of in the first place not as an invasion of Italy so much as the defense of France's rightful possessions: "Et que tu es

---

prominent example is Jean Bouchet's "Epistre par le feu Henry a Henry son filz VIII," published anonymously in 1513 and later in Bouchet's *Epistres Morales et Familieres du Traverseur*.

<sup>99</sup> The accusation of ingratitude also figures in D'Auton's epistle (96.499-501).

<sup>100</sup> In this vein, Brown points out that while Lemaire isn't as present as an author in the "Epistre du Roy" as in other works, "the king's comments about historical veracity, his scattered references to the organization of the letter and his developed rhetorical style represent the concerns of an historiographer more than those of a royal correspondent" (106).

<sup>101</sup> Cf. *Illustrations*, bk. 3 (Steher II.308-09, 317-22).

droit exemple aux bons princes / Pour bien *garder* royaumes et provinces” (34.88-92; emphasis mine). In pursuing their discipline, historiographers provide a set of examples, both good and true, to follow. By selecting historical *exempla*, historiographers can define virtue and exhort readers to conform to this definition.<sup>102</sup> This is, in fact, the theme of two brief poems by Lemaire that were included in a presentation manuscript with “Vim Ludovicus habet” and other poems centered on the Italian Wars and the value of history, “A la louenge des princes et princesses qui ayment la science historialle” and “Histoire, que faiz-tu?”<sup>103</sup> The former explains that were it not for the quills of “bons acteurs,” “Tous nobles faictz en oublieux abisme / Mectroit le temps, qui tout pert et consume, / Sans avoir bruit moins que une sourde lyme” (11.12-14).<sup>104</sup> The latter, a series of questions addressed to “Histoire,” reveals that history “fay les bons ensuivre,” and that its virtue may be found “en maint volume et livre” (13.1-4).

Gaston of Foix’s epitaph, the third piece in the recueil-*Epistre*, illustrates this capability of historiography, and more specifically, of vernacular historiography. It recounts the “parolles vrayes” spoken by Gaston as he lay dying on the battlefield at Ravenna (69.8). The epitaph thereby insists upon Lemaire’s ability to point to true examples and to do so for a vernacular audience in his capacity as a “truchemant,” as the epigraph, according to its title, has been “Translaté de latin en françois par Jan le Maire, secretaire et indiciaire de la Royne, et rendu le françois correspondant au nombre des syllabes du latin” (69).<sup>105</sup> Gaston’s example is one of

---

<sup>102</sup> Cf. O. B. Hardison’s account of the theory of praise in antiquity and the Renaissance: “The poetry of praise depends on an emotion – the hunger for fame – but it uses this emotion to strengthen the state by inculcating virtue” (27).

<sup>103</sup> BNF ms. fr. 25295 (designated “Pa” by Armstrong and Britnell).

<sup>104</sup> A “lime sourde” is a smooth file that makes no noise when used, hence the expression “faire la lime sourde,” to refuse to listen to someone (Cotgrave).

<sup>105</sup> The Latin original, if indeed there was one, has not been located. The French, at any rate, is rendered in alexandrines, as is the description of the Temple of Minerva in the *Concorde*. See below, p. 97.

“courage invaincu” in the face of imminent death, as he continues to lash out on all sides as the blood pours from his numerous wounds (69.4-8). It is Gaston’s determination and fierceness in battle, rather than his shrewdness as a military tactician, which wins him glory, as his last moments correspond to the *aristeia* of classical epic: “Et, par la presse fendre, acquiert le bruit de Mars” (69.6). Whereas the Pallas of the *Illustrations*, who embodies order and strategy in battle, is meant for princes, Gaston’s example is intended to encourage French subjects and French soldiers to fight ferociously on behalf of their king and their nation, as Gaston, with his dying words, ties his own glory to the good of France: “Ma mort aura triomphe et consequente gloire, / Et la nation nostre, honneur en la victoire” (70.17-18).

The second piece in the recueil-*Epistre*, the “24 coupletz de la valitude et convalescence de la Royne,” elucidates the role that historiography may play in revealing the truth behind historical circumstances. The poem, a dialogue in which “France” and “Bretaigne” pray for the queen’s recovery, is based on Anne’s grave illness and miraculous recovery in March 1512.<sup>106</sup> The 24 couplets are followed by a prose section in which the *acteur* recounts how Louis, seeing that the prayers of France and Brittany have gone unanswered, “[...] s’advisa promptement de son tresdigne et tressainct tiltre qui est de chrestienté en degré superlatif, au moyen duquel il a achevé maintes haultes besoignes et evité maintz grandz perilz et infortunes dressez à lui et à son peuple” (63). The intervention of the *Roy treschrestien* proves efficacious, implying that his power to intercede with God on behalf of his people will lead to France’s triumph against the Holy League, as well (Armstrong and Britnell 64, n. 5). Yet, the political and military situation could hardly have seemed more desperate than it did in the summer of 1513. Consequently, the *acteur* explains the crucial role that the writing of history can play in assuaging people’s fears.

---

<sup>106</sup> Cf. Jean Marot’s “Prieres sur la restauration de la santé de Mme. Anne de Bretaigne,” pp. 120-54 in *Les deux recueils*, ed. Gérard Defaux and Thierry Mantovani (Geneva: Droz, 1999).

By recounting past events, assigning a certain significance to them, and holding them up as *exempla*, an author can influence how the people perceive current events; this is why, in the words of the *acteur*, the “infinies actions et graces” of God must be “redigées par escript en memoire perpetuelle, affin qu’on congnoisse cy après par exemples certains, ou plustost histoires approuvées, de combien les puissances supercelestes et ultramondaines sont plus familières et enclines au secours de la sacrée couronne et majesté treschrestienne que ne sont les choses terrestres et visibles” (63-64). The choice of the pronoun “on” suggests that history is capable of teaching this lesson to everyone who needs to learn it. Even though the vast majority of “choses terrestres et visibles” in the summer of 1513 suggest that Louis’s foreign policy has brought France to the brink of collapse, Lemaire is able to point to Anne’s near-death experience and Louis’s successful intervention on her behalf to reassure readers that in spite of appearances, God is still on the side of the Most Christian King. In so doing, he illustrates the power of history and exemplarity to provide this form of reassurance.

The final poem of the collection, Cretin’s “Plaincte sur le trespas de messire Guillaume de Byssipat,” is similar to the epitaph of Gaston of Foix in that it laments the death of a prominent man killed during the siege of Bologna in 1512.<sup>107</sup> Why, though, would this allographic work have been included in the recueil-*Epistre*? In the letter to Le Rouge, Lemaire explains that in having the collection published, he especially wanted to show “comment la langue gallicane est enrichie et exaltée” by Cretin’s works, who has done as much for the French language as Ockhegem has done for music (71).<sup>108</sup> But if the illustration of the French language accounts for why a piece by Cretin has been included, it does not entirely explain why this

---

<sup>107</sup> Cretin is not directly named as the author of the poem, but is identified by his motto, “Mieulx que pis.”

<sup>108</sup> In the same vein, an addition to the prologue of the *Concorde* in the *princeps* edition indicates that Cretin is the prince of French poets (4).

particular piece has been selected. Although its circumstances connect it with the Italian Wars, it is not propagandistic or even overtly political. Rather, it seems to be a condemnation of war in general along the lines of Molinet's *Temple de Mars* or Erasmus's *Querela pacis*, as Cretin, saddened and embittered by the loss of his friend, laments the senseless bloodshed experienced by both sides:

[...] ja pieça ne leut on  
 En vraye histoire  
 Occision sy extreme et notoire  
 Pour tant de sang en humain territoire  
 Estre espandu, quoy que on ayt la victoire (p. 74; ll. 24-28).

It would seem that Cretin's stance on war runs counter to Lemaire's pro-Louis propaganda, as the above citation implies that even victory is not worth the loss of men like Bissipat; to put it in mythographic terms, having Pallas on one's side does not make Mars any more tolerable.

However, the recueil-*Epistre*, in keeping with the French propaganda of the time, represents the French campaign in Italy as a just war, one which the pope has forced upon the French king through decidedly un-popish policies. In the context of the collection, the "Plaincte" should be read less as a condemnation of war in general than a condemnation of a war fomented by a belligerent pope and the loss this war entails.

It is in considering how Cretin represents both the nature of this loss and the figure of the *acteur* that the function of the "Plaincte" within the recueil-*Epistre* is revealed. In describing the deceased Bissipat, Cretin stresses first of all that he was a gifted writer skilled in Greek, Latin, and especially in French(76.89-92).<sup>109</sup> The ensuing dream vision, in which the *acteur* visits Parnassus and witnesses the nine Muses arguing (in rondeaus) for Bissipat's deification, places even further emphasis on his knowledge and skill as a writer, traits which resonate with

---

<sup>109</sup> Similarly, Marot mentions "L'un Bissipat, que neuf soeurs allaicterent" in the "Complainte de Guillaume Preudhomme" (*OC* II.336.118; *OPC* II.390.118).

Lemaire's persona; Calliope, the muse of epic and the last to speak, even praises Bissipat's "vertu et grace *palladine*" (88.446; emphasis mine). In this sense, Bissipat serves as a double for Lemaire: by showing just how much France loses with the death of such a gifted writer, Cretin's "Plaincte" makes readers even more grateful for the continued services of Lemaire, who shares Bissipat's traits as well as those of Cretin's *acteur*. The latter draws attention to his own work within the dream vision, presenting himself as a scribe or secretary and insisting on the accuracy and clarity of his transcription: "D'elle et ses seurs coppiay les escriptz, / Et m'est advis selon qu'estoyent descriptz / Que cy apres sont ses termes patentz" (82.287-89). By holding up Cretin as the prince of French poets and including a piece by Cretin in which the *acteur* behaves very much like the perfect "truchemant" that is Lemaire, the recueil-*Epistre* stakes the claim that precision and accuracy are tantamount to excellence; Lemaire and his *Illustrations* embody this excellence every bit as much as Cretin does.<sup>110</sup>

If the components of the recueil-*Epistre* illustrate France's need for historical exemplarity and Lemaire's ability to provide it, how does the enigmatic *Concorde* fit into this collection? In answering this question, I will follow Brown in regarding the *Concorde* as an attempt to direct the focus of the reader toward the literary text itself, as well as to Lemaire's own endeavors ("Merging" 35).<sup>111</sup> In so doing, I will consider the *Concorde* as a hypothetical exercise, one in which Lemaire imagines for the benefit of the reader what his career would be like were he not in Pallas's service.

---

<sup>110</sup> Cretin also praises Lemaire in the "Plaincte" in asking him to compose his own lamentation of Bissipat's death: "Abbé d'Auton, et maistre Jehan le Maire, / Qui en nostre art estes des plus experts, / Ouvrez l'archet de vostre riche aumaire" (91.541-43).

<sup>111</sup> I do not, however, agree with Brown that the political implications of the *Concorde* are "superficial at best" (34). If anything, Lemaire's self-referentiality is meant to show the crucial role that he plays in supporting royal policies and in encouraging the people's will to become one with the king's.

Critics have been sharply divided over how to interpret the *Concorde*, disagreeing over the seeming disparity between its prologue and its content, and over whether Lemaire privileges the Temple of Venus, the Temple of Minerva, or regards the two as complementary. Cornilliat separates these critical accounts into three strains: moralizing (“moralisante”) readings which support the text’s official preference of Minerva over Venus; synthetic (“synthétique”) readings which support the concord of Venus and Minerva; and estheticizing (“esthétisante”) readings which attempt to flesh out a preference for Venus over Minerva on formal grounds (*Or ne mens* 742). Cornilliat himself, as well as Stone, Cynthia Skenazi, Ann Moss, Michael Randall, and others, opts for a moralizing reading which situates the *Concorde* within the historical circumstances of its time and sees in it both a preference of French policies over Roman ones and a preference of historiography over Florentine poetry, and specifically Petrarchan love poetry (*Sujet caduc* 191). While I agree with Cornilliat’s conclusions, I differ from him in terms of how I approach the text and its audience. Cornilliat, in keeping with his focus on *inventio*, sees French writers as the ultimate audience for its metadiscursive reflection on what subject to choose (*Sujet caduc* 199). I do not exclude this possibility in the least, but when considered as another component of Lemaire’s persona in the *Illustrations* and the *recueil-Epistre*, the *Concorde* reinforces the *recueil-Epistre*’s advertisement for the necessity of historiography to the French crown and the French nation.

In considering the *Concorde* as a reflection of Lemaire’s role within the political circumstances of his time, I will first focus on the troubling figure of Genius. I will then focus on the changes the *acteur* undergoes from the Temple of Venus to the Temple of Minerva. This is not to suggest that the *Concorde* may be taken as an autobiographical conversion narrative, as

Paul Imbs claims (183-85).<sup>112</sup> In fact, the *Concorde* is revealed to be a hypothetical exercise in its prologue, which concludes with a perfect conditional: “Or commenceray je ce labeur, *comme se autrefois je eusse esté* curieux de frequenter le temple de Venus, et que maintenant je cherche le chemin de celuy de Mynerve, la belle et vertueuse deesse, à qui ce present est consacré, desirant qu’elle le reçoive pour agréable” (6; emphasis mine).<sup>113</sup> Lemaire writes as if he had been eager to choose Venus over Minerva; not only does the perfect conditional indicate that this was not actually the case, but the reader, familiar with the narrative of Lemaire’s career so carefully elaborated in the paratext of the *Illustrations*, knows that the ensuing *dit* will run counter to it. In this vein, the *Concorde* may be compared to *It’s a Wonderful Life* in that it is meant to make readers all the more grateful for Lemaire’s production by showing them what could have happened had he chosen to follow a different path, and then by reassuring them that he will stay on his chosen path, given the proper recompense.<sup>114</sup>

### ***Malus Genius: The Parasitic Rhétoricien***

Beginning with the title assigned to it in manuscript and print, “le traicté intitulé *La Concorde des deux langaiges*,” the *Concorde* is cast in a political framework of peace (Brown, “Merging” 30). It is also cast in the framework of Lemaire’s own political tracts, such as the *Traicté*, thus raising the question of how an orator or writer may serve his king and his nation. In the *Concorde*, the reader encounters a figure who clearly recalls the image of Lemaire as an

---

<sup>112</sup> Frappier and Robert Griffin also cast aspersions on autobiographical readings of the *Concorde* (Frappier 2; Griffin, “Cosmic Metaphor” 20).

<sup>113</sup> Cf. Moss, “Fabulous Narrations,” p. 18.

<sup>114</sup> In a similar vein, Moss argues that the role of the Temple of Venus is ultimately to make the Temple of Minerva seem all the more salutary (“Fabulous Narrations” 27). Armstrong, while approaching the dichotomy from the angle of the opposition between concrete knowledge and abstraction, also claims that the two temples represent an opposition rather than a progression or a superposition (“Songe” 64).

author, and who possesses similar skills, but who uses them for purposes diametrically opposed to Lemaire's. This figure is none other than Genius.

Genius is, of course, inspired by the allegorical personage of the same name from Jean de Meun's continuation of the *Roman de la Rose*, though he preaches on behalf of Venus rather than on behalf of Nature. His name also connects him with the vocabulary of genius from the paratext of the *Illustrations*, as well as with Mercury, as Genius identifies the wing-footed god as his father: "Mon geniteur celeste et deïfique, / Se dit Mercure, eloquent, prompt et sade, / Le dieu d'engin et de toute trafficque" (p. 29, ll. 538-40). As in the prologue of the *Illustrations*, Mercury is the god of eloquence. However, unlike in the prologue, he is also revealed to be the god of commerce ("trafficque") that Fulgentius would have him to be. Whereas this role of Mercury is suppressed in the *Illustrations* in keeping with Lavinius's description of them as a gift to the French-speaking nations, it is underscored when Genius introduces himself, making it clear that while Lemaire offers, Genius sells. Indeed, anyone who tries to get at Venus's relics without forking over a hefty offering "[...] ja n'aura ne grace ne pardon, / Tant est le prebtre estrange de nature, / Qui tout debvroit presenter en pur don" (16.214-16).<sup>115</sup>

Lemaire and Genius, who both trace their origins to Mercury, represent two different sides of the same coin, as suggested when Genius claims that his mother was the nymph Lara, in keeping with Boccaccio's account of the Lares as the twin sons of Mercury and Lara.<sup>116</sup> Boccaccio notes that the terms "Genius" and "Lar" are interchangeable, but even more significantly, that everyone has a good and an evil Lar or Genius (12.65.1236). Mercury

---

<sup>115</sup> In fact, Griffin sees in Genius a reference to the sale of indulgences, suggesting that the character anticipates the couplet "Wenn die Münze im Kästlein klingt, / die Seele in den Himmel springt" ("When the coin in the coffer rings, / the soul from purgatory springs") associated with the German commissioner of indulgences, Johann Tetzel ("*Discordia concors*" 63).

<sup>116</sup> Robert Cottrell sees in "Lara" a reference to Petrarch's Laura and to "l'aura," which he bizarrely ties to the "or" in "Concorde" (274).

presents himself as just such a “Bonus Genius” in the prologue of the *Illustrations*, and the Genius of the *Concorde* does, as well: “Genius suis, vous suyvant en tous lieux / Pour vous semondre et vous persuader / Ce que je sçay qui vous affiert le mieulx” (29.529-31). The verbs “semondre” and “persuader” tie Genius’s nature as a guiding spirit to his rhetorical skill, but in such a way as to make the reader, who has been made painfully aware of Genius’s obvious venality, suspicious of the effects such skill might have. Genius claims to be good, but he is in fact a *Malus Genius*, a wicked double of Lemaire who shares the *Rhétoriqueur*’s knowledge and abilities, but who uses them to line his own pockets at the expense of the French nation. In fact, Genius’s self-presentation may be described as a parody of prestige advertising. He claims to be concerned only with what is in his audience’s best interests, but it is clear that in making this claim, he defines these interests so as to profit all the more from his audience’s credulity.

Some of the specifically French referents of the Temple of Venus, notably Lyons and the false etymology that has Fourvière deriving from *Forum Veneris*, have not gone unmentioned by critics. Others have, however, beginning with Genius himself. Genius, I would argue, has a French referent beyond Jean de Meun’s character, a historical person who figures prominently in the paratext of the *Illustrations*. Genius is a “metropolitain” (archbishop) and the “premier primat haultain / De toute Gaule” (15.197-200). Given that the Temple of Venus is situated in Lyons, Genius holds the exact same position as François de Rohan, “Archiepiscopum, et comitem Lugdunensis ac maximum Galliarum primatem,” whom Lavinius addresses in his epistle (Steher IV.433).<sup>117</sup> Is Genius a denunciation of Rohan? In light of the latter’s role in the quarrel between Louis and Julius, it appears that the opposite is true. Rohan may be characterized as a supporter of Louis in that he presided at the Council of Tours in 1510, where

---

<sup>117</sup> Cf. Rigolot, “Concorde ou discorde,” p. 167, and *Texte*, p. 96.

French prelates unanimously ruled that the king was justified in using force against the pope.

Genius, whose sermon addresses the “jeunesse gallicane et françoise” assembled at the Temple of Venus, strives to convince them not to go to war, in what Cornilliat succinctly describes as an “appel sophistique à la démission” (*Sujet caduc* 372). He is a servant of Rome and an enemy of France, who, not unlike the late Julius, does not hesitate to threaten with excommunication those who prove reluctant to be bent to his will or neglect to serve Venus as he sees fit:

Et s'il s'en treuve aucun si negligent  
 Qu'en son temps n'ayt servy Venus, sa dame  
 Il en mourra de pardon indigent,  
 Et sera dit anatheme et infame,  
 Fourclos d'aller aux beaux Champs Helisées  
 Où le siège est de mainte benoite ame (28.502-07).

Genius is a perverted version of Rohan in his ecclesiastical capacity; like the title character of *Julius exclusus*, he is willing to do whatever it takes to augment the Church's temporal wealth and power (not to mention his own), and is utterly insouciant of the spiritual well-being of his flock.<sup>118</sup> He is also a perverted version of Lemaire in his capacity as an orator and rhetorician. His sermon, and specifically his praise of the French at the conclusion of his sermon, drives this second duality home by revealing that he has recourse to the same set of knowledge and rhetorical flourishes as Lemaire, but that he uses them strictly in pursuit of gain. To wit, the sermon is introduced as the use of epideictic rhetoric (the praise of Venus) with a mind to garnering more offerings:

Il s'appresta pour ung peu sermonner  
 Et declairer de Venus les merites,

---

<sup>118</sup> Furthermore, in the *Julius exclusus*, the late pope is accompanied by his Genius, whom Peter suspects to be “malus” (41). In the absence of specific historical evidence, I would not go so far as to argue that Erasmus, if he was indeed the author of the *Julius exclusus*, drew inspiration from the *Concorde*, but it is worth noting that Erasmus was in Paris briefly in 1511, the year from which the Carpentras manuscript dates, and could potentially have drawn inspiration from Lemaire.

Affin que ceulx qui d'offrir prestz se monstrent  
Ne fissent pas leurs ententes irrités (22.360-63).

He does not praise to edify, but to flatter and profit, and as such, his sermon corresponds to Guy's description of praise poems as "monuments du parasitisme."<sup>119</sup>

Genius's praise of the French is directly preceded by his description of those who owe him tribute (31.568). He prefaces his praise by informing the French that "Telz estez vous" (31.580). His "praise" suggests that paying tribute to Genius is a necessary condition for those who wish to conform to the ideal image of Frenchness that he holds up. In elaborating this image, he borrows from the *Illustrations*, the "Epistre du Roy," and even from the prologue of the *Concorde*. He first praises the French as "Peuple de Gaule aussi blanc comme let," drawing on Lemaire's explanation in the second chapter of Book One of the *Illustrations* ("Les expositions de ce terme Gallus") that "[...] en l'etymologie Grecque, [Gallus] signifie blanc comme lait" (31.581; Stecher I.16). He alludes to the very title of the *Illustrations* in addressing the French youth as "Illustre sang, troyenne nation" (31.587). He then breaks into *vers senés* that distinctly echo Lemaire's variations on "France" and "françoise": "François faictiz, francz, fortz, fermes au fait, / Fins, frecz, de fer, ferores, sans frayeur, / Telz sont voz noms concordans à l'effect" (31.583-85).<sup>120</sup> Reinier Leushuis points to this device as evidence of how Genius

---

<sup>119</sup> Cornilliat, Skenazi, and Hervé Campagne have seen in the Temple of Venus a criticism of "merchandise" motivated entirely by profit, and its ability to tie value to objects for sale, regardless of moral implications (Cornilliat, "Échec poétique" 384, *Sujet caduc* 242; Skenazi 61; Campagne 109). Though I see their point, I would argue that this criticism is itself a form of "merchandise" in that it is meant to compel readers to value Lemaire's morally sound eloquence all the more. To put it another way, charges of dishonesty in advertising or enslavement to the profit motive are themselves a form of advertising.

<sup>120</sup> Cf. "Epistre du Roy": "Doncques, par tous les climatz renommez, / Crestiens sont francs et pour francs sont clamez. / Aussi France est de toute gent franchise; / Franche en tous cas, tant soit chose precise. / France ores est tresfranche en liberté / Et tousjours franche en liberalité" (47.475-80). Similarly, in the prologue of the *Concorde*, Lemaire speaks of "la langue françoise et sa franchise et bonté naïfve" (3).

“mimes the author figure as a linguistic fertilizer of the French vernacular” (799). While the similarity is undeniable, Leushuis is mistaken in reading the ensuing appeal to war against the Turks as sincere, which prompts him to characterize Genius’s sermon as “addressed to the youth of the temple in the spirit of the Deuteronomy law forcing future warriors to assure physical procreation of the species” (801).<sup>121</sup> Genius’s sermon is not an appeal to war at all, as it flatters the listeners into complacency and certainty of future victory rather than urging them to immediate action, as indicated by the future tense: “Grece a fiance en l’ardant auriflame / Qui d’iceulx Turcz les yeulx *esblouÿra*; / C’est tout l’espoir qu’elle attent et reclame” (32.601-03; emphasis mine).<sup>122</sup> He even appropriates the exemplarity that characterizes the “Epistre du Roy,” “24 couplets” and epitaph of Gaston of Foix for his own purposes, presenting Venus and the Graces’s flirtations as “ung grand signe et exemple” and concluding by urging the French youth to “vacquer à l’exemple de Mars,” who lays down shield and sword to embrace Venus, though the preacher conveniently neglects to mention that this is the very moment when Mars gets ensnared in a trap (21.348; 33.614-16).<sup>123</sup> The most characteristic components of Lemaire’s

---

<sup>121</sup> Cf. *Deut.* 24:5. The verse, however, speaks specifically of the duties of a recently married man; there is, to my mind, no evidence in the *Concorde* that Genius is promoting marriage or serving the Venus of chaste love. If anything, there are strong indications that this Venus is the unbridled version, given the insistence on her adulterous liaison with Mars and the *acteur*’s description of her as “oultrageuse et puissant” (9.43).

<sup>122</sup> Cotgrave notes that the oriflamme was “borne at first onely in warres made against Infidells.” I would, in fact, suggest that Genius’s sermon may be read as a twisted mirror image of Urban II’s exhortation to crusade at the Council of Clermont, which Lemaire recounts in the *Traicté*. In it, Urban makes mention of France’s heritage (Charlemagne rather than Troy) not to flatter the French, but to shame them for not having followed the example of their illustrious ancestor by making war on the enemies of God. He then urges the listeners to leave behind their worldly concerns, including their wives, to win eternal life and glory (148-49). Furthermore, his harangue achieves unity of purpose rather than the chaos that follows the conclusion of Genius’s sermon, as “tout le peuple assistent commença à s’écrier *tout à une voix*, comme se ce eust esté ung cop de tonnoire, ‘Dieu le veult’” (150; emphasis mine).

<sup>123</sup> To wit, Louis reassures Hector in the “Epistre du Roy” that God will recognize “[...] que point n’as voulu suyvre / Volupté orde ou lasche villennye, / Mais prins vertuz pour vaincre

writing, which are hammered home to the reader throughout the recueil-*Epistre*, are also to be found in Genius's bag of tricks: knowledge of the origins of the Gauls, masterful use of rhetorical and poetic devices, and exemplarity. Whereas Lemaire uses these abilities to encourage the French to fight bravely against their enemies, Genius uses them to urge the French to a life of idleness and ease (Moss, "Fabulous Narrations" 25). To put it another way, he performs his duty as the high priest of Venus by encouraging the French youth to imitate another "jeune adolescent," the misguided Paris of the *Illustrations*.

Genius's sermon bears a striking resemblance to the argument Venus makes to Paris. In keeping with Genius's argument for putting off going to war in favor of enjoying "volupté," she declares that she is not at all a "[d]eesse sanguinolente, ny ayant occision" (Stecher I.244). Additionally, she argues for her necessity in largely the same way that Genius does, namely by claiming that her "amoureuse concordance" is necessary to the survival of the human race and to the proper functioning of the entire world (Stecher I.245). The most salient aspect of her argumentation, though, is her ability to adopt the strategies of her opponents and use them for her own purposes, which is precisely what she does with the extended ship metaphor first employed by Juno and Pallas (Stecher I.246-48). Moss, pointing out Venus's adaptation, interprets it as evidence that language, in and of itself, is morally neutral (*Poetry* 34). The same language may be used for ends that are diametrically opposed in terms of morality. The eloquence so closely associated with Pallas may also be put to use by Venus, resulting in the eventual ruin of Paris and of Troy: "L'eloquence artificielle de dame Venus, ses paroles delicates, et sa douce persuasion causerent telle efficace et telle emotion au coeur du jeune adolescent Paris, que encores en pourra il maudire les rhetoriques couleurs, qui luy seront retorquees en douleurs"

---

tyrannye" (34.88-90). Genius, on the other hand, argues that "[e]ntredeux fault à volupté entendre" (33.613).

(Stecher I.249). Venus is presented as a masterful rhetorician capable of moving (*movere*) the emotions of her addressee, and the moral ambiguity of her skill is conveyed by the term “artificielle,” which means both “skillful” and “cunning.” In using a figure of speech in the pun (or *paronomasia*) on “rhetoriques couleurs” and “retorquées en douleurs,” Lemaire conveys both that Venus is using rhetoric for ill ends and that that very same rhetoric may be used to teach a valuable lesson (Cornilliat, *Or ne mens* 827).

To determine if the same lesson may be learned from Genius in the *Concorde*, we must account not only for Genius himself, but for the nature of his youthful French audience, as well. Their reaction in the prose section directly following the conclusion of Genius’s sermon shows that Genius may have been preaching to the choir:

Aux parolles de l’archiprebstre Genius, plusieurs personnaiges de jeunesse gallicane et françoise, esmeuz et entalentéz d’aller à l’offrande, sans attendre la fin du sermon, comme plains de fureur amoureuse, contraignirent ledict predicateur de syncoper sa collation, car, par ardeur tumultueuse et farousche, tant ainsi que se ilz se deussent entrebatre, chascun s’avança qui mieulx mieulx, tendant de baiser les reliques du temple veneriien; et s’entrepressoient de tel sorte que l’un donnoit empesche à l’autre (34).

This war of all against all reveals that the audience is as much to blame for their situation as Genius, who only urges them to do what they came to the Temple of Venus to do in the first place. In fact, they are so eager that, in their rush to plunk down their sumptuous gifts and get to kissing relics, they compel him to cut short his sermon, and the abrupt suspension of the *terza rima* at line 616 reflects this interruption. Even before the beginning of Genius’s sermon, it is mentioned that Genius “[e]st esbahy dont tant de gens lui viennent” (13.207). Simply put, it seems that they have chosen Venus by virtue of coming to the Temple, and Genius and his deacons (Belacueil and Dangier) are simply there to rake in a tidy profit by encouraging them. But why is it that so many French youths have gone down this path, and can anything be done about it? The answer may be found in Genius’s description of those who pay tribute to him. He

alludes to humoral theory in describing them as “bien complexionnez” and “[s]anguins” (31.569-70). Their sanguine complexion, characteristic of youth, makes them rash and prone to lasciviousness, as does the fact that they were born “[s]oubz l’horoscope et regart venericque” (31.571-72). This is, incidentally, the same case for Paris in the *Illustrations*; the fact that Venus (the morning star) presided at his birth makes him “de complexion totalement Venerienne et non evitable” (Stecher I.247). However, Venus’s following may not be attributed to humoral imbalances or astrological sympathies alone. Genius also offers the possibility that his followers “[...] d’eulx mesme ilz se y sont façonnéz” (31.573). His remark, which clearly articulates with Renaissance notions of self-fashioning, attributes this fashioning to free will, much as the golden apple in the prologue of Book One of the *Illustrations* represents Charles’s “propre franc arbitre.” Even if the French youth are naturally inclined toward the idle pursuit of Venus, they retain the ability to fashion themselves in a different manner. This is precisely the argument of another piece of Lemaire’s, “Le dyalogue de Vertu militaire et de Jeunesse françoise.”<sup>124</sup> It makes a case for historical exemplarity and the influence it may exert on young men: “Pour donner exhortation à ung chascun jeune et vertueux seigneur de la langue françoise de tendre à choses plushaultaines et plus memorables, à l’exemple des preux et vaillans princes tant du temps passé que moderne, mesmement du roy, nostre sire treschrestien et tresvictorieux” (1). Whereas historical examples of virtue and bravery spur young men on to fight, Genius’s sermon typifies the sort of flattery that bolster the “excuses de Jeunesse” (Cornilliat, *Sujet caduc* 229; Skenazi 58). By revealing Genius’s audience to be malleable despite its inclinations, Lemaire shows not only that young readers can be influenced by historical exemplarity, but that they must be influenced by it for their own good and that of their nation. As such, the aesthetic

---

<sup>124</sup> It is found in BNF ms. fr. 25295 along with “Vim Ludovicus habet,” “A la louenge des princes et princesses qui ayment la science historialle,” and “Histoire, que faiz-tu?”

sumptuousness of Venus's description in the *Illustrations* insisted upon by Gray, as well as that of the Temple of Venus in the *Concorde*, serves to make readers conscious of their own Venereal inclinations and of their need for a *Rhétoricien* who will correct their tendencies rather than prey upon them.<sup>125</sup> This correction comes in the form of the prudence and historical work represented by Minerva, "[q]ui lascheté destruit et les vices enerve / Et rend homme tout dur, qui paravant fut tendre" (42.102-03).<sup>126</sup>

If Genius clearly represents rhetorical skill in the service of profit, he is only one of two doubles of Lemaire in the *Concorde*. The second is the *acteur*, whose tale is one of a journey from the Temple of Venus to the Temple of Minerva, as well as of a journey between the two poles represented by Genius and Lemaire. As he enters and proceeds through the Temple of Venus, he more closely resembles Genius, but as he is rebuffed by Dangier and approaches the Temple of Minerva, he comes more and more to resemble Lemaire's persona. This doubling of the author is coupled with a doubling of the reader, who is encouraged to receive Lemaire's body of work with the gratitude so strongly emphasized in the paratext of Book Three.

---

<sup>125</sup> Cf. Gray, *La Renaissance des mots*, pt. 5, ch. 1. Moss has a similar account of the Judgment of Paris: "Nevertheless, although Lemaire leaves us in no real doubt about the error of the judgment Paris has just made, the aesthetic based on sensual delight and associated with Venus is conveyed so alluringly that the reader is almost as captivated as Paris" (*Poetry* 36). Renée Norrell also hints at such a reading by equating the *acteur*'s initial choice of the Temple of Venus with Paris's choice of Venus in the *Illustrations*: "Pâris, c'est notre locuteur, c'est l'être humain qui tout d'abord choisit la route vers le temple de Vénus" (153). Cornilliat, for his part, ties the aesthetic question to the Horatian *utile dulci*: "Cette fable peut 'florir' et 'delecter,' si son utilité est de proscrire la délectation pure et les fleurs sans fruit" (*Or ne mens* 831).

<sup>126</sup> Stone equates this individual process of fortification with the strengthening of the Church against corruption through councils as described in the *Traicté* (72).

## The Evolution of the *acteur* from Amant Vert to Labeur Historien and the Danger of Ingratitude

The very first thing we learn about the *acteur* in the Temple of Venus is that he is young and entirely concerned with his own advantage: “En la verdeur du mien flourissant aage, / D’Amours servir me vouluz entremettre, / Mais je n’y euz ne prouffit n’avantaige” (7.1-3).<sup>127</sup> He is thus an ideal candidate to enter the Temple of Venus and learn at the feet of Genius along with the French youth. He follows the lesson of Genius’s sermon even before reaching the Temple, as he was born in Hainaut, “pays enclin aux armes,” but leaves for Lyons to imitate Petrarch and compose love poetry instead of epic: “Si changeay Mars au noble dieu d’amours, / Et chant bellicque aux amoureuses larmes” (7.14; 8.17-18). These lines are a reminiscence of the *incipit* of Ovid’s *Amores*, with the difference that Ovid complains of Cupid stealing away a foot from the dactylic hexameter he was about to write, whereas Lemaire’s *acteur* willingly adopts *terza rima*.<sup>128</sup> He even makes ill use of exemplarity in the same way Genius does, invoking Clio, the Muse of history, to “explicquer des haulx faictz de Venus / Ce que j’en vis, en matiere fecunde” (12.131).<sup>129</sup> In the Temple of Venus, then, the *acteur* more closely resembles Genius than he does Lemaire’s persona. One could even describe Genius as the goal to which the *acteur* aspires, as Genius has found a way to derive both “prouffit” and “avantaige” from serving Venus at the expense of the French youth who flock to him in throngs.

Certain aspects of the *acteur*’s self-presentation, however, harken back to the Amant Vert. Like the latter, the *acteur* leaves his native land to serve the lady with whom he is

<sup>127</sup> Cf. the *incipit* of Guillaume de Lorris’s section of the *Rose*: “Au vuintieme an de mon aage, / Ou point qu’amors prent le peage / Des joenes genz [...]” (42.21-23).

<sup>128</sup> Lemaire had used *terza rima* before, specifically in lines 392-640 of the *Temple d’Honneur et de Vertus*.

<sup>129</sup> Cornilliat deems the *acteur* “le naïf acolyte d’une ‘Clio’ trop vite invoquée” (*Sujet caduc* 252-53).

enamored, whether the anonymous “amour lionnoise” or Venus herself (7.15).<sup>130</sup> Moreover, his “amoureuses larmes” and especially his “verdeur,” a sign of youth, invite a comparison with the parrot, whose tomb, it will be remembered, is sacred to Venus. Just as the Amant Vert undergoes a transition from the first to the second epistle, so too is the *acteur* of the *Concorde* in a stage of development and learning, as suggested by his invocation of Clio. According to Fulgentius and Boccaccio, the nine Muses represent nine stages of learning and knowledge, with Clio standing for the earliest conception of learning (Fulgentius 1.15.25-26; Boccaccio 11.2.1078). Clio’s name, Fulgentius explains, derives from the Greek κλέος (fame/rumor), as no one seeks knowledge that does not redound honorably to his reputation. In invoking the Muse of history, the *acteur* reveals that he possesses an inkling of the proper use of historical exemplarity, that is, of knowledge acquired and marshaled so as to exhort oneself and others to virtuous behavior through imitation. However, he is still in an early stage of learning how to become a proper historiographer, as he applies this rudimentary knowledge to Venus rather than to the more suitable Minerva. Like the Amant Vert, he learns by imitation, and in the Temple of Venus, he follows the instructions of Genius and the example of the French youth, making his offering to Venus “à l’exemple des autres” (35). The rejection of his offering by Dangier, though it initially renders him despondent, proves to be a blessing in disguise, as it compels him to venture out into the wilderness, where the first trace he finds of the Temple of Minerva are “aucuns pas humains impriméz en la sablonniere seiche” (36). These few footprints suggest that only a select few have been capable of reaching the Temple of Minerva, and that the *acteur* will literally follow in their footsteps; they are the “meilleurs indiciaires et historiographes” of whom Lemaire claims to be the “treshumble disciple et loingtain imitateur” in the letter to Perréal

---

<sup>130</sup> Doranne Fenoaltea points out this similarity, as well, though she oddly connects this wandering to the historical Lemaire leaving Margaret’s service for Anne’s (29).

before the *Épîtres*. From the Temple of Venus to the Temple of Minerva, the *acteur*'s abilities remain the same; the difference lies in those whom he chooses to imitate.

The change in the *acteur*'s application of his abilities comes to the fore in his encounter with the Temple of Minerva, or rather his encounter with its description. The Temple, along with the Palais d'Honneur, sits high atop a mountain. The *acteur*, searching around the base of the mountain for "chose aucune digne de memoire," finds an engraving which describes the mountain, the Temple, and the Palais d'Honneur (38). The engraving is in alexandrines, which distinguishes it on the basis of its Frenchness from the distinctly Tuscan *terza rima* of the Temple of Venus; the prologue specifies that the Temple of Minerva is written in "ryme françoise que on dit alexandrine" (6). The *acteur* also alludes to the alexandrine's association with the *Roman d'Alexandre*: "[...] pource que les prouesses du roi Alexandre le grant en sont descriptes es anciens rommandz, dont aucuns modernes ne tiennent compte aujourduy, toutesvoies ceulx qui mieulx scevent en font grand estime" (43). His description of the romance as a chronicle of Alexander's "prouesses" makes it seem more like a *chanson de geste* than a romance, and as such, the description of the Temple of Minerva marks a return to the "chant bellicque" that the *acteur* had abandoned for "amoureuses larmes."<sup>131</sup> What sets the alexandrine apart is not only who has used it (the French), but the fact that it has been used for the purposes of historical exemplarity. The "concorde" is one in which rhetoric and language, be it Tuscan or French, is employed in the pursuit of history and the moral truths it can teach:

Dedens ce palais est de Mynerve le temple,  
Ouquel maint noble esprit en hault sçavoir contemple  
Les beaux faitz vertueux en cronicque et histoire,  
En sciënce morale et en art oratoire;  
Là se treuvent conjointz, vivans en paix sans noise,  
Le langaige toscan et la langue françoise (41.69-74).

---

<sup>131</sup> Alexander also figures in the "Dyalogue" (5.81-88) and in the "Epistre du Roy" (48.499-504).

It is a critical point that the Temple of Minerva should be located within the Palais d'Honneur, and this specificity may be understood in relation to the *acteur*'s invocation of Clio, whose name inextricably links the pursuit of knowledge, and specifically the pursuit of historical knowledge, with the pursuit of an honorable reputation (κλέος). Unfittingly evoked in the Temple of Venus, Clio is restored to her proper place in the Temple of Minerva inside the Palais d'Honneur.

Should we therefore see the move from the Temple of Venus to the Temple of Minerva not as a farewell to poetry, but as a defense of poetry employed for the purposes of edification?<sup>132</sup> Within the context of the *acteur*'s evolution, it is less a question of preference than of the work the *acteur* performs as a reader and writer. The concluding prose section in which the *acteur* meets Labeur Historien begins by depicting the work he performs in transcribing the description of the Temple of Minerva. Like Cretin's *acteur* in the company of the Muses, he writes down ("notay") the six lines beginning with "Dedens ce palais est de Mynerve le temple" cited above (43). However, he does not transcribe the first line word-for-word, but adapts its syntax to be more suitable for prose: "Dedens ce palais est le temple de Mynerve, etc..." (43). Campagne argues that the *acteur*'s entry into Minerva's domain is also an entry into the domain of repetition and commentary, and the contemplation of the "déjà-écrit"

---

<sup>132</sup> David Cowling distinguishes between the two modes of writing represented by the Temple of Venus and the Temple of Minerva on the basis of permanence: in his view, the durable historiography, moral science and oratory of the Temple of Minerva, which he equates with "the more highly valued products of *rhétoriqueur* activity, including of course Lemaire's own text and, ultimately, the *Illustrations de Gaule*," neutralizes the threat posed by the ephemeral lyric and song of the Temple of Venus and its false pretensions to immortality (201). Though I agree with the opposition Cowling traces, I do not agree that lyric should be described as ephemeral; after all, one of the most celebrated proclamations of poetic immortality, Horace's "Exegi monumentum aere perennius," itself originates in a book of lyric poems (*Odes*, bk. 3, ode 30, l. 1).

(106).<sup>133</sup> I would argue, based on the *acteur*'s adaptation of the source he cites and on the fact that the *Concorde* concludes with a prose section, that it is also an entry into the domain of prose, though not necessarily a condemnation of poetry. At the end of the *Concorde*, the *acteur* is prepared to undertake a project much like that of the *Illustrations*, themselves a prose history based heavily on the citation of authorities in both prose and verse.

Just then, the aptly-named Labeur Historien appears to guide the *acteur* in this undertaking. The nature of this “esprit familier” makes it clear that he is an anti-Genius, or rather a *Bonus Genius* who opposes the *Malus Genius* of the Temple of Venus (44). Like Jean de Meun's Genius, he is a servant of Nature, “[...] et ne s'appert jamais pour quelque conjuration qu'on luy face, sy non que dame Nature luy commande” (44). If Labeur Historien has appeared to the *acteur*, it can only be because Nature has mandated it, which tells us as much about the *acteur* as it does about Labeur Historien. The former asks to be allowed to devote himself to the latter's service as part of a gift economy: “[...] luy suppliai treshumblement qu'il m'octroyast ung don, c'est que à tousjours mais je demourasse avecques luy et le service comme son clerc; ce qu'il m'accorda, considerant ma grant affection et inclination naturelle à l'aymer” (45). This exchange further distinguishes Labeur Historien from Genius, for whereas Genius's undertakings are universally motivated by profit, Labeur Historien, not unlike Honneur, freely dispenses gifts to those who are worthy of them. The *acteur* is one such person, and his “affection et inclination naturelle” for loving Labeur Historien explains why Nature has consented to make the spirit appear to him and take him into his service. At this moment, the *acteur* finally resembles the Lemaire that readers know and love, the young Lemaire whom Mercury chooses to undertake the *Illustrations*. Though he appears to be naturally inclined to the service of Venus by virtue of his

---

<sup>133</sup> I fail to see, though, how the “*je de l'énonciation*” characteristic of the Temple of Venus is lost in this section (Campagne 106).

youth, as is the “jeunesse gallicane et françoise,” he is revealed to be naturally inclined toward historiography.

Through the figure of the *acteur*, the *Concorde* effectively takes Lemaire’s persona away only to restore it in the end, revealing in the process just how harmful the author could be if engaged in a parasitic rather than a symbiotic relationship with his patrons and their subjects. There remains, however, the sticking point of the *Concorde*’s conclusion, in which Labeur Historien promises the *acteur* that if he finds him worthy of the Palais d’Honneur and Temple of Minerva, which can only occur after the *acteur*’s death, “[...] que lors il feroit tant que j’auroie deux guides qui sont deux paranymphe arcangeliques, l’un nommé Repos et l’autre Guerdon, lesquelz me feront veoir à plain la tresvertueuse et tresnecessaire concorde des deux langaiges” (46). Armstrong, describing the *Concorde* as “Lemaire’s Consolation of Philology,” reads the conclusion as an assertion that didactic and historical writing merits the consolation of immortal fame after death and an eternal scholarly existence (“Yearning” 91-92). While this is certainly a possibility, there are further possible connotations of “repos” and “guerdon.” In Armstrong’s account, “repos” is to be understood as eternal rest, and “guerdon” as the recompense of eternal fame. However, the *acteur* does not actually meet Repos and Guerdon; rather, Labeur Historien only provides him with a glimpse of Repos and Guerdon, “[...] dont en ung miroir artificiel, fait par art magique, il me monstra les vifves ymaiges embrassans l’une l’autre en la presence de la deesse” (46).<sup>134</sup> The mirror, which, in Rigolot’s view, is emblematic of the didactic character of European literature in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, recalls the presentation of the *Illustrations* as a mirror for princes (*Texte* 25). The final image of the *Concorde* is a mirror

---

<sup>134</sup> Randall suggests that the pronoun “dont” can refer either to Repos and Guerdon or to the two languages (“Flamboyant Design” 22). While this is grammatically admissible, I find that the context of the phrase makes it clear that Labeur Historien is showing the *acteur* images of the Repos and Guerdon he will eventually receive.

for princes, as well, one which holds up an image of an ideal ruler governed by the prudence and respect for history characterized by Minerva. Such a ruler provides not only Repos in the form of peace, but Guerdon in the form of generous remuneration of the deserving. This is precisely what occurs in the Palais d'Honneur and Temple of Minerva: the two languages live in “paix sans noise,” and Honneur is a “[...] roy puissant, juste, grandipotent, / Qui maintz riches *guerçons* à tous cueurs nobles tend” (41.67-68; emphasis mine). In this sense, the *acteur*'s dream vision corresponds to the author's reality: Lemaire serves a just king who promotes peace (according to French propaganda of the time) and rewards those who serve him well, and as a result, Lemaire has been able to envision the “tresvertueuse et tresnecessaire concorde des deux langaiges” and put it into writing as the *Concorde des deux langages*. As such, the *Concorde* advertises for Lemaire's continued service to Louis: in holding up Honneur as a mirror for princes, the *Concorde* encourages Louis to conform to this image by continuing to reward Lemaire for the essential services he provides.

At the same time, the *Concorde* is not just a mirror for princes, but a mirror for all readers of Lemaire's works in that it harkens back to Lemaire's insistence on gratitude as the only appropriate mode of reception, notably in the paratext of the concomitantly-published Book Three of the *Illustrations*. Grateful reception and its dire counterpart, ungrateful reception, are personified in Genius's deacons, Belacueil and Dangier. While these allegorical personages are borrowed from Jean de Meun, as is Genius, the description of Dangier particularly resonates with criticisms of the Church and of Julius II in particular:

Le diacre nommé Dangier, qui d'autre part tenoit pié ferme, ayant une grande et longue verge en la main, de dur mesplier poly et plain de neux, d'un visaige rebarbatif et d'une voix tonant et redoubtable menassoit ceulx qui s'efforçoit d'approucher à main vuide aux riches coussinetz sur lesquelz reposoient les belles ymaiges et symulachres feminins et venericques, et, de fait, les reboutoit rudement (35).

Dangier's rod is made of medlar, whose fruit, which is only edible when rotten, signifies corruption.<sup>135</sup> Moreover, Dangier's "visaige rebarbatif" directly recalls Lemaire's description in the *Traicté* of Julius at the siege of Mirandola as "tout martial et tout *rebarbatif* en son harnois."<sup>136</sup> If Dangier resembles Julius in appearance, he resembles him in behavior as well, threatening those who do not conform to his wishes in his "voix tonant et redoubtable," and ultimately excommunicating the *acteur* for what he perceives to be an unsuitable form of tribute.

In fact, it is in his rejection of the *acteur*'s gift that Dangier, "le rude diacre plain d'avarice sacerdotalle," exhibits one of Julius's most salient and offensive traits: ingratitude (35). The *acteur* sees that the rest of the French youth are giving gifts of gold, silver, perfume, rings, and "toutes especes de richesse mondaine," and also that some are giving "des tableaux paintz de leurs nauffraiges et misadventures, pour rendre grace à la deese de ses miracles impetréz tant par mer que par terre" (34-35). Knowing that he will be repulsed by Dangier if he approaches empty-handed, he offers "[...] ung petit tableau de mon industrie, assez bien escript et enluminé de vignettes et flourettes, lequel j'estimoye ung chief d'œuvre, pour le planter et dediier devant l'ymage de ma demy deesse" (35). The fact that this object is "bien escript" suggests that it is a presentation copy.<sup>137</sup> Belacueil welcomes the gift with "quelque peu de faveur," but Dangier sees in the offering nothing but "un peu de parchemin ataché en bois" with "guieres de metal,

---

<sup>135</sup> Might the rod also be a reference to the first of Love's bows in Guillaume de Lorris? The bow is "d'un bois / Dont li fruiz est mau savorez," and like Dangier's rod, it is "Tous plains de neuz et bocerez" (86.907-09).

<sup>136</sup> See above, p. 69.

<sup>137</sup> Cottrell interprets it specifically as an illuminated manuscript (278). Though I agree with this interpretation, I would suggest that it may represent luxurious printed editions, as well. Such is the case of BNF Vélins 1175, which contains Book Three of the *Illustrations* and the recueil-*Epistre* up through Gaston of Foix's epitaph. The latter is another copy of the *princeps* edition (Armstrong and Britnell A), and the entire volume is printed on high-quality parchment with red ruling and rubrication in gold paint, though I have not been able to determine whether the latter are posterior additions.

d’or ou d’argent pesant ou massif, fors seulement de dorure ou enlumineure superficielle” (35).

On strictly material grounds, despite the obvious care that has gone into its preparation, and despite the fact that its writer deems it his masterpiece, it cannot compare to the “richesse mondaine” proffered by the other members of the congregation. Dangier sees no value in it whatsoever, and tosses it aside “[...] sans ce que aultrement il regardast que tout ce servoit à l’honneur et exaltation de la deesse Venus et de son temple” (35). Dangier’s ingratitude resembles Julius’s in that just as Julius fails to recognize the service that Louis and the French have performed for him in protecting the papacy from such enemies as Venice, so too does Dangier fail to recognize the service performed by the *acteur*. Unable to see that writing could benefit him and his superiors by redounding to their honor, he blindly pursues material wealth; when considered in light of Fulgentius’s account of the Judgment of Paris, the Temple of Venus is also the Temple of Juno.

Dangier’s rejection of the *acteur*’s gift makes him not only a double of the pope, but of the reader, or rather, of the ungrateful reader. By repudiating the *acteur*’s “petit tableau,” he goes against the proviso on the title page of Book Three, in which Lemaire expresses his desire to learn that “la nation Françoisse ne soit point ingrate de ses petiz labeurs.”<sup>138</sup> However, Dangier is only one half of a pair; the other half, Belacueil, represents the grateful reader in that he welcomes the *acteur*’s gift with “quelque peu de faveur.” Dangier and Belacueil are thus less tied to the Temple of Venus than they are to reception, as they may also be found on the path to the Palais d’Honneur and Temple of Minerva. In other words, if a work in honor of Venus (love poetry) may be received favorably or unfavorably, so too may a work in honor of Minerva

---

<sup>138</sup> See above, p. 72.

(history). Indeed, the presence on the path of Dangier, or rather of rod-bearing monsters who bear him a strong resemblance, serves as a deterrent to many travelers:

Monstres y a vilains, plus hideux que luittons,  
Horribles, letz et ordz, tous garnis de bastons,  
Qui tant d'ennuy et paine aux entrepreneurs font  
Que pour le plus souvent leur vertu ploye et fond (39.17-20).

Those who persevere, on the other hand, are assured of “Belacueil” and “repos eterne” (40.25). Lemaire has persevered in this way, despite the constant threat of finding more Dangier than Belacueil among his readership, a threat he evokes directly at the conclusion of Book One by predicating further publication of the *Illustrations* upon the “faveur, recueil et grace” of his readers.<sup>139</sup> This opposition suggests that Lemaire’s work, whose necessity to the good of the French nation is amply demonstrated in the whole of the *recueil-Epistre*, cannot ultimately survive without the “bel accueil” of its readers.

### **Lemaire and Marot: The Poet of Princes and the Prince of Poets**

Biased though they are, critics like Guy and Weber are right to portray Lemaire’s relationship with his patrons as a defining characteristic of his body of work, and as we have seen, this is certainly the case for the publication of the *Illustrations* and its accompanying pieces. Lemaire’s relationship with his patrons also hinges on his relationship with the subjects of these patrons. By emphasizing the didactic bent of his works and their ability to affect the behavior and beliefs of the French nation, Lemaire demonstrates his ability to bring subjects into line with their ruler’s way of thinking, no matter how controversial and risky it may be. In this way, Lemaire kills two birds with one stone, or as Skenazi puts it, “[l]a fonction pédagogique de l’œuvre est aussi la préparation du monarque pour son rôle de mécène” (*Poète architecte* 78).

---

<sup>139</sup> See above, p. 71.

What ultimately unifies Lemaire's body of printed work is the authorial persona conferred upon him both by the metadiscursive dimensions of his text and by the paratext that articulates with these dimensions. This persona conveys, above all, the author's motivations, the principles to which he adheres, the intellectual and scholarly labors he undertakes, and the fruit of these labors, the *Illustrations*. In this sense, we might regard the *Illustrations* and recueil-*Epistre*, to borrow a phrase from the *Concorde*, as "ung petit tableau de [son] industrie," in that they depict Lemaire's industriousness and its results. Editions of Lemaire impose a fixed persona upon an author whose political allegiances and attitude toward his courtly obligations, when considered strictly on the basis of his career and the text of his works, remain ambiguous. In other words, Lemaire may very well have been a political opportunist who regarded his duties toward his patrons as necessary evils impeding his more ambitious projects, but in his editions, he takes on the persona of a loyal servant who labors tirelessly for the good of his patron and his patron's subjects, expecting no greater reward than the "repos" and "guerdon" necessary to sustain his efforts.

Yet, if we regard Lemaire's authorial persona as a form of *occupatio*, it means that there must be a set of objections to his position in the first place. If the specter of Genius is raised in the *Concorde* only to be exorcised and used as a foil for Lemaire's persona, the fact that Genius so closely resembles this persona should give us pause. Time and time again, profit is disavowed as a possible motivation behind Lemaire's work: the *Illustrations* are given as a gift to patrons and readers alike, Lemaire is identified with Boccaccio's Mercury rather than Fulgentius's, and as a whole, the *Illustrations* and recueil-*Epistre* set up an economy based not on commercial exchange, but on service freely given and duly rewarded out of gratitude. But this disavowal of profit calls attention to the paradoxical nature of prestige advertising: to claim not to be

concerned with profit is, of course, a way of seeking even greater profit, much as pretending not to be ambitious is the surest sign of ambition, and the air of effortlessness and nonchalance and referred to by Castiglione as *sprezzatura* is the result of great effort and concern as to how one is perceived. While it may seem obvious that Lemaire's persona, and indeed any persona, is a fiction, nowhere is it clearer than with respect to prestige advertising and ideal readership based on gratitude: Lemaire expects remuneration from his patrons, the *Illustrations* are sold, not given, and Lemaire's *ingenium* entails as much mercantile cunning (*engin*) as it does skill. There is a fine line between good and bad Genius, and Lemaire treads it. Perhaps his successful publication history is a testament to how effectively he treads this line through fictions of author and reader, but the fact remains that in Lemaire, these fictions call attention to the very truths they are meant to hide.

Ambiguous though Lemaire's persona ultimately proves to be, it remains remarkably consistent throughout the sixteenth century, both before and after his death. Editions of his works are unusually consistent with respect to textual content, if not necessarily with respect to typographical correctness or *mise en page*.<sup>140</sup> After Lemaire transferred his privilege from Baland to Marnef in 1512, the Marnef clan remained the sole printers of the *Illustrations* and *recueil-Epistre* until 1523, and aside from two editions published in Lyons by Jacques Mareschal (Abélard/Armstrong and Britnell K; Munn 24) and Antoine du Ry (Abélard/Armstrong and Britnell L; Munn 27) in 1524 and 1528 respectively, no editions were published outside Paris until the last sixteenth-century edition of Lemaire published in France, the 1549 edition prepared

---

<sup>140</sup> The exception to this trend may be found in the woodcuts of the *Illustrations* (excepting Lemaire's coat of arms). As Abélard and others have noted, Margaret's arms were gradually phased out in favor of Louis's and Anne's, and subsequent editions either omitted or replaced with poor copies the engravings of Noah and Hercules by the "maître du nombril."

by Antoine du Moulin and published by Jean de Tournes which serves as the basis for Stecher's edition.<sup>141</sup>

Three later editions, including the 1549 Tournes, do involve significant changes to the paratext, but these changes create very much the same authorial persona and the same insistence on the book's utility through exemplarity found in the *princeps* editions. The 1531 Galliot du Pré edition (Abélard O, Munn 30), which contains only the *Illustrations*, suppresses Lavinius's paratext in favor of an anonymous preface "aux lecteurs" and a dedication of the work to Francis I. It is possible, however unlikely, that the dedication is authentic, and that Lemaire wrote it in the hopes of securing the new king's patronage after the death of Louis XII on January 1, 1515, but the significant lapse of time between Francis's accession and the publication of this edition, not to mention the fact that Lemaire's motto, "De peu assez," does not appear in either the preface or the dedication, renders Lemaire's authorship of the pieces a highly dubious proposition in my assessment. However, if the author is not Lemaire, he does display a level of familiarity with previous editions of Lemaire, as he employs the same strategies for presenting the author and his work to the reader. The dedication grounds the *Illustrations* firmly within the context of exemplarity as an incitation to virtue, as it claims that reading "histoires anciennes en quoy sont escriptz les faictz des chevalereux et vaillans hommes du temps passé [...] nourrist et accroist le courage des nobles et gens de cueur aux haultes entreprinses et beaux faictz" (a2r). This exemplarity is especially meant to incite the young to "vouloir ensuivre semblables faictz

---

<sup>141</sup> Britnell looks to the publication history of Lemaire for insight into his mysterious disappearance and death, reasoning that he must have died around 1517 due to the sharp decline in the quality of his editions beginning in this year; see "La mort de Jean Lemaire de Belges, l'édition de 1514 du *Traité des schismes et des conciles*, et les impertinences d'un éditeur," *BHR* 56.1 (1994), pp. 127-33. Evidence has recently surfaced, however, placing Lemaire's death closer to 1524: see Pascale Chiron and Grantley McDonald, "The Testament of Jean Lemaire, 1524," *BHR* 71.3 (2009), pp. 527-33.

qu'ilz oyent reciter en esperance d'avoir icelluy honneur qu'on faisoit à leurs predecesseurs" (a2r). Almost as if he were addressing the French youth in the Temple of Venus, the author of the dedication urges those who wish to avoid "oysiveté" to read "ce present oeuvre de grand fruict et utilité" (a2r). Though Lemaire's arms and the Phaedrus quotation are absent, the emphasis on utility remains. The dedication to Francis I is remarkably similar to the letter to Perréal attached to the *Épîtres*, as it explains that the author was encouraged to dedicate the work to Francis by "ung de voz bons serviteurs et varletz de chambre ordinaire," who reassured him that the king gladly receives the work of the his best "Indiciaires, Croniqueurs et hystoriographes, desquelz je suis disciple" (b7v). This "imitateur" of the best historiographers goes on to ask Francis to receive his "petit labeur en aussi bonne part comme de tout mon cuer, et en toute humblesse et subjection je le vous presente, intitule et dedie" in terms reminiscent of the paratext of Book Three, encouraging the king to base his reception of the work on the intentions of its author (b7v).

The shared edition of Lemaire's works published in Paris in 1548 (Abélard/Armstrong and Britnell R; Munn 45) preserves the original paratext, but adds three epigraphs by one François Barat. The first, addressed to Barat's uncle Pierre de Vaulx, is in Latin, and appears after Lemaire's letter to François Le Rouge. It resembles Lavinius's epigraphs in stressing the didactic value of the *Illustrations* for France:

Antiquum genus, et gentis primordia Gallae  
 Certior haec Marii perdocet historia.  
 Nosse igitur nostrorum res qui curat avorum,  
 Hanc legat, haec Gallum Gallica scripta juvent (Stecher IV.437).

This history of Lemaire's teaches thoroughly and more surely of the ancient lineage and origins of the Gallic people. Therefore, whoever cares to know about the matters of our forefathers should read it, and may this Gallic work be of aid to a Gaul.

The second and third, addressed to the “lecteur françois” and Jean Baron, respectively, appear at the end of the volume after the *Temple d’Honneur et de Vertus*. Both stress the exhortation to virtue that the volume may impart: the French reader is encouraged to “deschasser ce qui ame et corps blesse / Oysiveté, de vertu la foiblesse” by reading the *Illustrations*, and Barat sends Baron the volume “sachant que tu verse[s] / Où de vertu honneur à homme est quiz” (Stecher IV.438).

Antoine du Moulin’s preface to the Tournes edition, while lengthier and more philosophically robust than the anonymous paratextual pieces of the 1531 Galliot du Pré edition or Barat’s epigraphs, similarly hinges upon the twin stakes of utility and honor. Drawing on the Aristotelian concept of the prime mover and on the notion of man as microcosm, Du Moulin argues, in his own version of the Horatian *utile dulci*, that just as God labors endlessly for his own glory through the whole of creation, so too must man strive after honor and usefulness with the aid of pleasure:

Et pource en ceste petite nature de l’homme et Microcosme l’esprit bouillant ne cesse jamais de s’exerciter ou à son proufit, ou à sa gloire, et combien que ces deux yeux de nostre vie, qui sont *l’honneur*, et *l’utilité*, soient les deux buts de nostre exercitation, si trouve je que davantage nature nous ha baillé une fidele scorte pour nous guider et accompagner à laquelle que nous voudrons parvenir de susdites fins, qui est le plaisir, sans lequel les autres deux ne peuvent rien (\*2r; emphasis mine).

Why would there be such consistency throughout Lemaire’s publication history in terms of how the author and his works are presented? The fact is that those who edit or produce paratextual material for posthumous editions of Lemaire are themselves readers of earlier editions, and the manner in which they present Lemaire and the *Illustrations* to their readers is evidence of how they themselves have read the *Illustrations* and interpreted Lemaire’s persona. Their fidelity, as it were, to Lemaire’s authorial persona is perhaps a testament to just how effectively that persona is constructed and conveyed in the editions examined in the present study.

Rigolot has pointed to Lemaire as evidence of how the authorial persona in the Renaissance is subject to Zumthor's *mouvance* from version to version ("Intentionnalité" 189; *Texte* 62). Though this is indeed the case from manuscript to print, as Rigolot demonstrates, it is much less the case from one edition of Lemaire to another. To get a better sense of just how much an authorial persona can change across an author's publication history, we must turn to Clément Marot, who turns to print as a way to distinguish authorized editions of his works from their unauthorized counterparts through the careful construction and propagation of a poetic persona meant to impose order upon a vast and varied body of production. However, this very same variety allows subsequent printers to impose their own versions of Marot's persona upon the poet's constantly expanding *œuvre*, and Marot's subsequent reaction raises the same ambiguities of prestige advertising and ideal readership that come to the fore in Lemaire.

## Chapter Two

### “Quel bien par rime on a”: Marot’s Persona and the Prestige of the Book<sup>142</sup>

By 1532, the year of Clément Marot’s official entry into the world of print, it had become clear that the printing press was a permanent fixture in France, some sixty years after its introduction by Ulrich Gering and company in Paris in 1470 (Febvre and Martin 262). Although Lemaire and other *Rhétoriqueurs* had recognized the importance of this new medium and had taken steps to adapt their works to it and to add to their own prestige through it, some court poets like Mellin de Saint-Gelais or Clément’s father Jean felt no need to have their works printed. In contrast, the younger Marot’s great interest in print has been well-documented by critics, who have revealed not only the painstaking attention he devoted to the publication of his own works, but also the principles he adopted in producing editions of his father’s and Villon’s works.

However, this abundance of critical attention to editions of and by Marot has led to just as much oversight as insight. In examining original editions of Marot, critics have been all too quick to regard Marot’s own pronouncements as law and disavow unauthorized or dubious editions as spoiled or bastard children, focusing almost exclusively on the 1538 *Œuvres* (Mayer 70, 71), the *princeps* editions of the *Adolescence* and *Suite* (Mayer 9, 15), or, in the case of Claude Mayer, the 1544 *Œuvres* (Mayer 129). Defaux, the first modern scholar to base an edition of Marot’s complete works on the 1538 *Œuvres*, particularly exhibits this tendency. Guided by the view that Marot valued the printing press above all as a way of disseminating the faith, Defaux repeatedly decries the hindrances posed to this project by careless and unethical printers (“Trois cas d’écrivains éditeurs” 96). Furthermore, Defaux’s perception of Marot and

---

<sup>142</sup> Parts of this chapter were given as a talk entitled “The Author despite Himself: Additions to the *Adolescence clémentine* and *Suite* between 1532 and 1538” at the Annual Meeting of the Renaissance Society of America in Montreal, March 24-26, 2011.

his works as militantly evangelical leads him to hypothesize that certain editions were authorized by Marot even when there is no factual basis for such speculation. More recent studies of Marot's material bibliography, especially Guillaume Berthon's thesis at Paris-Sorbonne, have done much to rectify these views,<sup>143</sup> but the fact remains that critics have paid far too much attention to how Marot asserts his own authority over the printing of his works and not enough attention to how Marot's image is constructed in these printed editions, both authorized and unauthorized, through the ordering and presentation of the poet's works. Desan, in this vein, has argued that the "honneur de l'auteur et profit du libraire sont bel et bien en train de devenir une seule et même chose dans l'œuvre de Marot," precisely because of the significance of readership to both the author's honor and the bookseller's profit (697).

Book historians have long been aware of the influence printers exert on the presentation of the author, though they have not necessarily gone so far as to claim that the author is a concept constructed by the printer. Hirsch indicates that since it was in a publisher-bookseller's best interests to clearly identify his product and its importance, it was often he who accented the importance of the author (8). Andrew Pettegree adds that if, by the middle decades of the sixteenth century, the prestige of a book was becoming increasingly linked with authorial identity, this change in the author's status may be attributed as much to the pragmatism of printer-publishers as to the creative genius of the authors (166). Even the legitimation of authorial authority, according to Anne Réach-Ngô, results from the inscription of the printer-publisher's intermediary reception of the author's text, which justifies the text's publication (73). The same may be said of Marot's persona in his editions, both authorized and unauthorized,

---

<sup>143</sup> It should be noted, however, that Defaux's views on Marot's bibliography, while influential, have never been universally shared. Brown, for example, identifies the Juste editions as unauthorized (*Poets* 251).

which enjoyed unparalleled popularity. Mayer lists eight editions of Marot, such as the 1531 *Opuscules* published in Lyons by Olivier Arnoullet and anonymous *plaquettes* of the “Temple de Cupido” or “Epistre de Maguelonne,” published prior to the August 12, 1532 *Adolescence* (Mayer 9). The existence of these editions proves that by the time he set out to produce an authorized edition, Marot’s works were already quite popular in print, to say nothing of manuscript circulation or oral transmission of the *chansons*. Defaux, based on Pasquier’s remark in his *Recherches de la France* that no book had ever been sold as much as Marot’s, deems our poet a sixteenth-century bestseller, and the most authentically popular French poet other than Victor Hugo (*OPC* I.411, n. 2; *Poète en son jardin* 128). The fact that Mayer lists 233 editions of Marot published before 1600, and that even more editions have been discovered since the publication of Mayer’s bibliography, confirms that Marot’s works, even if they were not the best-selling books in sixteenth-century France, were phenomenally successful. In fact, Marot’s preface to the *Adolescence* expresses the poet’s displeasure “[...] d’en ouir cryer et publier par les rues une grande partie, toute incorrecte, mal imprimée, et plus au proffit du Libraire, qu’à l’honneur de l’Autheur” (*OC* I.35; *OPC* I.17). His remark reveals not only his concern for his own reputation and his belief that he should have the final say in how his works are made public, but also his awareness that printing his works is a profitable venture, which explains why printers are more than willing to invest the time and money in printing them and even advertising them with criers. In other words, there is no need to create demand for Marot’s works, as they are already in high demand, but the profit motive, as Marot sees it, is ruining his reputation.

If the primary goal of advertising, commercial or non-commercial, is to inspire demand for a product or service whose supply exceeds or at least precedes its demand, why do products with such widespread appeal as Marot’s editions need to advertise for themselves? Marot’s

situation necessitates prestige advertising in that editions of his works seek to maintain preexisting interest by dissociating the poet and printer/publisher's work from the profit motive and presenting an image of the poet that solicits a given public, or several distinct yet potentially overlapping publics, such as those who would read Marot purely for entertainment, or those more attuned to Marot's humanist and evangelical inclinations. Additionally, the very concept of the *Adolescence* is one that may readily be compared with advertising, or more specifically with offering a sample, a tactic commonly employed by French wine criers (Presbrey 11). André Tournon claims that, in referring to the *Adolescence* as "coups d'essai," Marot uses an artisanal metaphor that compares the collection to a work by which an apprentice's skill may be evaluated, a work whose main purpose is to demonstrate its maker's capabilities ("Coups d'essai" 118). Tournon's reading is substantiated by Cotgrave, who defines *coup d'essay* as the "Maister-peece of a young workeman, or of one thats but newly come out of his years," but also as "a flourish, or preamble, whereby a tast of a thing is given, or taken," which indicates that the *Adolescence* is meant to leave its public hungry for more.<sup>144</sup> Text, paratext and the order of works in the *Adolescence* combine to create an image of this "youthful" work as a taste of better things to come, as a sapling that will grow into a magnificent tree, and this image persists and is reinforced not only in the 1538 *Œuvres*, but in the numerous editions of the *Adolescence* and *Suite* published between August 12, 1532 and the summer of 1538. Indeed, Étienne Dolet, the original editor of the 1538 *Œuvres*, acknowledges that Marot "tousjours laisse ung desir de soy" in his preface to Antoine Héroët's *La parfaicte amye* (2).

---

<sup>144</sup> Audrey Duru claims that the term *coup d'essay* is quite common in prefaces and other paratexts, though the examples she cites are all from the second half of the sixteenth century, notably Guillaume Du Bartas and Jean de Sponde (134). As such, it seems that Marot's use of the term in this context is an innovation, though it should be noted that Rabelais uses the term in the prologue of *Gargantua* to refer to the prologue itself as a "prelude, et coup d'essay" (6). See below, Chapter Three, p. 219.

The present study will examine how Marot's poetic persona and career trajectory are constructed and maintained in the paratext and order of editions of the *Adolescence*, *Suite* and *Œuvres* from 1530 to 1538. The term "order" denotes the order of poems within the collection and within individual genre groupings; for unauthorized editions, this also includes changes made to the order of the *princeps* editions, as well as the inclusion of apocryphal or allographic works. The study will also add several relevant observations to the well-documented subject of Marot's presentation of his own career and persona in the text of authorized editions. These observations are meant to provide suggestions of how the text might invite the way in which various printer-publishers read and edit it, and to show how, as in Lemaire, Marot's poetic persona draws the reader's attention to prestige advertising as a commercial fiction. I have elected to begin with the 1530 *Opuscles* because, as one of only two known pre-1532 Marot collections in print, it may fruitfully be compared with the *princeps* edition of the *Adolescence*.<sup>145</sup> The end date of 1538 corresponds to the Dolet/Gryphius *Œuvres*, typically regarded as the definitive edition of Marot.

### **From *Opuscles* to *Adolescence***

The Lyonese printer Olivier Arnoullet (ca. 1486-1567) almost uniquely devoted his attention to works in French, showing a particular predilection for adaptations of *chansons de geste* like *Girart de Roussillon* and *Huon de Bordeaux*, devotional treatises, translations and works of *Rhétoriqueurs* like Octavien de Saint-Gelais, Jean Meschinot or Pierre Gringore (Baudrier 10.29). It is not surprising, then, that he would be the first to print a collection of

---

<sup>145</sup> The other collection of Marot's works from before the *Adolescence* is the *Petit traicte* published in Paris by the widow of Jean Saint-Denis (Mayer 6bis). It copies the content of the *Opuscles*, adding the "Epistre au Roy par Marot estant malade à Paris" (OC I.226-30; OPC I.320-23) and the "Huictain à ce propos" (OC I.230; OPC I.324) (Mayer, *Clément Marot* 229).

Marot's works, probably in late 1530 or 1531 (Mayer 6). The title page reads: *Les Opuscles et petitiz Traictez de Clement Marot de Quahors, Varlet de chambre du Roy. Contenenens Chantz royaux Ballades Rondeaulx Epistres Elegies avec le Temple de Cupido et la plaincte de Robertet ensemble plusieurs autres choses joyeuses et recreatives redigees en ung et nouvellement imprimees a Lyon par Olivier Arnoullet* (a1r). The title is followed by a generic woodcut of an author writing, the only instance of a woodcut other than a printer's mark on a title page in all of the editions published during Marot's lifetime. The title is worth citing in its entirety because of how much it contrasts with that of the *Adolescence*: there is no indication whatsoever of chronology or development in Marot's *œuvre*, nor does the title lay out any lofty poetic ambitions for Marot, describing the contents as "choses joyeuses et recreatives," not unlike how the Gueffier manuscript (BNF Rothschild 2964) features a closing poem describing it as a "petit livre plain de joyeusetez" wherein the reader will find "assez bons motz pour rire" (150r). Given that this collection was published in Lyons, far from the watchful eyes of the Sorbonne and Parlement of Paris, several years before the Affair of the Placards (October 17, 1534), there is little reason to believe that the title is meant to protect the book from the authorities. Rather, the emphasis is placed solely on the reader's enjoyment of an already well-known poet: the persona of Marot as royal poet from Cahors appears from the outset in both the title and the woodcut and is confirmed by the presence of Marot's mottos, the preferred "La mort n'y mord" at the end of the *Déploration de Florimond Robertet* (here "Mord [sic] n'y mord," d8r) and the lesser "De bouche et cueur" at the end of the acrostic rondeau "duquel les lettres capitalles portent le nom de L'acteur" which accompanies the "Epistre de Maguelonne" (e8v).<sup>146</sup> Of the fifteen poems contained in the collection, six reiterate Marot's name in the title.<sup>147</sup>

---

<sup>146</sup> For an account of the polyvalence of "La mort n'y mord," which can be read in the context of

The novelty of this edition, as well as the attention it devotes to Marot's persona, leads Berthon to claim that, in spite of its many errors, inelegant *mise en page* and inclusion of allographic works, it "semble bien plus fait à 'l'honneur de L'auteur' qu'à celui du libraire" ("Intention" 283). However, the edition calls just as much attention to the printer's role as it does to the author's notoriety. The title distinguishes the collection from other early printings of Marot, namely the *plaquettes* of the "Temple de Cupido," "Epistre de Maguelonne," "Epistre du Camp d'Attigny," "Complainte de Semblançay" and "Déploration de Florimond Robertet" (Mayer 1-5). Marot's joyful and merry works have been "redigees en ung," collected into one handy octavo volume where previously, they were scattered across quarto-sized *plaquettes*; the emphasis is on the work the printer-publisher has performed in assembling the works of a famous poet for the convenience and enjoyment of a reader who enjoys Marot's humor and wit. The act of compilation suffices in and of itself, as the poems do not seem to be organized

---

poetic glory or of Pauline faith in redemption, see Rigolot, "Authorial Authority," p. 41, and "Clément Marot et l'émergence de la conscience littéraire à la Renaissance," pp. 33-34. Note that "De bouche et cuer" appears only in the Arnoullet edition and in the *plaquette* of the *Epistre de Maguelonne* (Mayer 2). It echoes a line from the poem: "Semblables motz je dys de cuer et bouche" (OC I.81.89; OPC I.67.91), and its use here as a motto may constitute an early example of what Defaux has described as the perfect communion that Marot dreams of establishing between himself and his reader by speaking from the heart ("Rhétorique" 311; *Marot, Rabelais, Montaigne* 79). Note also that in the *Adolescence*, "acteur" is changed to "auteur." This abandonment of the author/narrator figure of the medieval *dit* (whose etymology implies gathering more so than origination) in favor of a modern rival of the ancient *auctoritates* is characteristic of the changes between the *Opuscles* and the *Adolescence* with regard to the figure of the author.

<sup>147</sup> Of the nine that do not, one is the aforementioned rondeau, and three are not by Marot. The first of these is the anonymous "Balade sur la venue des enfans de france" (a6v – a7r), signed with the motto "Après mort vie," reminiscent of Marot's own "La mort n'y mord." The second is the "Balade a la louenge de ma dame Alienor Royne de france" (a7r – a8r), probably by Guillaume Bochetel, and the third is Jean Fillastre's "Chant Royal sur le grant decret que le Pape ordonna" (e2v – e3v), which appears just after Marot's "Chant Royal de la Conception nostre Dame" (OC I.128-30; OPC I.127-29) in a collection of *Palinodz, Chantz-royaulx, Ballades, Rondeaux et Epigrammes, a l'honneur de limmaculee conception* (Mayer 234), and which Arnoullet probably included in his edition due to an ambiguous attribution in that earlier collection (Berthon, "Intention" 282-83).

according to any discernible ordering principle, and the edition is devoid of any paratextual aids to readers like a table of contents or even page or folio numbers. Although the title page lists the various genres contained in the *Opuscules*, the poems are not organized by genre as they will be in all subsequent editions of Marot's works. For example, no two epistles are placed consecutively. The works are certainly not ordered chronologically, as this edition begins with the "Chant Royal treschrestien" and "Chant Royal dont le Roy bailla le refrain" (*OC* I.213-16; *OPC* I.357-60), both almost certainly composed between 1526 and 1531, and ends with the "Epistre de Maguelonne," probably composed between 1517 and 1519 (*OPC* I.444, 766-70). In other words, the collection's order is the opposite of that of the *Adolescence*, beginning with mature works listed in the *Adolescence* as "Autres oeuvres de Clement Marot, valet de chambre du Roy, faictes depuis l'eage de son adolescence," and ending with a more youthful work (*OC* I.188). The *Opuscules* stand as proof that prestige advertising characterizes collections of Marot from the very beginning, though in this case, it is less Marot's prestige than Arnoullet's, who calls attention to his own role in making Marot available to the reader.

### **"Arres de ce mieulx": *L'Adolescence clémentine***

Of the little we know about Pierre Roffet, alias Le Faulcheur, none of it makes the Parisian printer, binder and bookseller a likely candidate to become the first exclusive vendor of authorized Marot editions (Berthon, "Intention" 288). Setting up shop on the île de la Cité in 1511, and working until his death in 1533, his work as a printer, binder and bookseller was devoted to books of hours, missals and breviaries, an expensive operation that he most often

shared with other Parisian printers.<sup>148</sup> While Roffet's participation in Marot's first foray into print remains difficult to explain, Geoffroy Tory's does not. A humanist printer/bookseller and translator, and the king's printer from July 1531 until his death in late 1533, he would likely have been familiar with Marot at court, had a similar taste in letters to Marot, and likely saw in the poet a strong pillar for the defense of the French language (McFarlane 108). Indeed, his engagement in the project clearly goes beyond that of printing, as he contributes a Latin epigraph and perhaps influences the preface, as well.

The fruit of the collaboration between Marot, Tory, and Roffet is a truly remarkable octavo volume entitled *L'Adolescence clementine, Autrement, Les Oeuvres de Clement Marot de Cahors en Quercy, Valet de Chambre du Roy, composees en l'eage de son Adolescence. Avec la Complaincte sur le Trespas de feu Messire Florimond Robertet. Et plusieurs autres Oeuvres faictes par ledict Marot depuis l'eage de sa dicte Adolescence. Le tout reveu corrige et mis en bon ordre* (+r). The title contains a wealth of information, and is best dealt with piecemeal, beginning with its most prominent aspect, *L'Adolescence clementine*, appearing in capitals above the rest of the title. First of all, the term "adolescence" has drawn a great deal of critical attention. Defaux, drawing on Censorinus's *De die natali liber* and Du Cange's *Glossarium*, identifies the *adolescens* as the second of five ages of man, corresponding to the period from fifteen to thirty years of age (*OPC* I.410). Defaux's definition seems to be justified by the fact that the period is referred to in the title as "l'eage de son Adolescence." For Marot, the year in which he leaves his adolescence behind (1526) corresponds closely to his assumption of his father's post at court after the latter's death. The title, which equates the book's contents with the author's life in a way that the *Opuscules* do not, promises that the volume will exhibit both

---

<sup>148</sup> Moreau, vol. 3, nos. 520, 717, 681, 835, 836, 1276, 1277, 1285, 1390, 1864, 2216, 2217 and vol. 4, no. 239.

the work of a young, promising poet and the results of that poet's maturation, namely the "Déploration de Florimond Robertet" and the "autres Oeuvres faictes par ledict Marot depuis l'eage de sa dicte Adolescence." In other words, the title presents the volume as proof of a process of maturation, which suggests that "adolescence" may be read as "growth" (i.e., as a substantive of *adolesco*) as well as "youth." The application of the term "œuvres" to the works of an author who writes in the vernacular is somewhat uncommon for this period, and serves to mark Marot as an author in the authoritative sense of the word, as the only person with the right to modify, correct, add to or assemble his writings (Rosenthal, "L'œuvre et ses éditeurs" 24). Additionally, the title distinguishes the book from such preexisting editions of Marot as the *Opuscles* by stressing that the volume has been "reveu corrige et mis en bon ordre," which implies both that the edition has been scrupulously compiled and that previous editions were lacking in this respect.

The title also invites a comparison with the *Bucolica seu Adulescentia*, a collection of ten eclogues by the Carmelite monk Baptista Spagnuoli Mantuanus, commonly referred to as Mantuan. Sharing a birthplace with Virgil, Mantuan was regarded as a Christian successor of the great Roman poet. Erasmus, for example, claims in a letter to Henry of Bergen that Mantuan has every bit as much the right to be called "Christianus Maro" as Lactantius did to be called "Christianus Cicero," predicting that in time, his fame will surpass that of his illustrious predecessor (let. 49, p. 163).<sup>149</sup> The *Adulescentia*, Mantuan's most popular work, was even more successful north of the Alps and in England than in Italy; of its 165 extant printings from 1498 to

---

<sup>149</sup> Might Marot and his circle have developed the Maro/Marot comparison (see below, p. 128) as a response to Mantuan's popularity? Prior to the 1703 edition of Erasmus's *Opera omnia*, the letter to Henry of Bergen was printed only in an edition of William of Gouda's *Sylva Odarum* (Paris: G. Marchand, 1497) that Erasmus had edited (Allen 160). Though there is no evidence, to my knowledge, proving that Marot or his circle knew of this volume, or that the appellation of "Maro christianus" appears elsewhere, I would not rule out the possibility.

1600, only ten are Italian (Piepho XXV). In France, it was first published in Paris by Jean Petit in 1502, accompanied by Josse Bade's commentary, and Michel d'Amboise's French translation appeared in 1531. Nathalie Dauvois has pointed out the many similarities between the *Adulescentia* and the *Adolescence clémentine*, such as their titles, their presentation of a general evolution from profane to sacred (as Mantuan adds to the original eight eclogues two more composed after he took up religious orders), and Marot's propensity for pastoral and the prominent position of the "Première églogue de Virgile" (*OC* I.38-43; *OPC* I.21-26) at the beginning of the *Adolescence*, as well as some key differences, notably the fact that Mantuan makes explicit his emendations of a youthful work and provides a much more linear progression than Marot (21).<sup>150</sup> There are several other striking similarities, firstly that Mantuan addresses the same problem in his preface that Marot addresses in his, namely the unwanted propagation of his works in print and his desire to exert control over their diffusion. Mantuan explains that in Bologna, he learned that a man of letters possessed a copy of a book he had written for fun while beginning his studies in Padua, a book entitled *Adulescentia* to reflect the age at which he wrote it:

Carmen est bucolicum in octo aeglogas divisum, quod iam diu tamquam abortivum putabam abolitum. Ubi id rescivi, saturnina fame repente sum percitus, et cogitavi quonam pacto possem proli meae inferre perniciem. Iuvantibus ergo amicis libellum mihi vindicavi, ut perderem quem suspicabar erratis non posse non scaterere. At ubi intellexi et alia quaedam exemplaria superesse, visum est praestare hoc quod vindicaram emendare emendatumque edere, ut eius editione caetera quae continent multa nimis iuvenilia deleantur (2).

The collection of poems is bucolic in character and is divided into eight eclogues. Born prematurely, as it were, it is a work that I thought had been destroyed long ago. So, when I learned of it, I was suddenly roused by Saturn's hunger and pondered the means by which I might be able to bring about my progeny's obliteration. Thus, through the help of friends I laid claim to my little book in order to suppress it, a work that I suspected could not help but abound in errors. But when I learned that certain other copies also

---

<sup>150</sup> See also McFarlane, p. 127, n. 15.

existed, it seemed better to emend the one I had laid claim to and publish it so that through its publication the other copies, which contain much that is too youthful, might be destroyed (trans. Piepho 3).

Mantuan, with the help of friends similar to Marot's "treschers Freres," seeks to gain control over his literary reputation by producing a definitive copy of a work he feels might reflect badly on him in its current state. Like Marot, he responds to preexisting demand (exhibited by the man of letters who owns a copy of the *Adulescentia* and by the existence of other copies) by satisfying it with his own product, one that he believes will better guarantee his prestige.

Mantuan goes even further than Marot in this regard, urging all those who own unauthorized copies of the *Adulescentia* to burn them (2). Finally, Mantuan's book, like Marot's, is equated with its author, as the poet urges his dedicatee, the Mantuan nobleman Paride Ceresara, to accept both book and author and use them as if they were his own according to his own judgment (2).

Though it is impossible to establish with any certainty that Mantuan's *Adulescentia* was an influence on Marot, the similarities between their projects are nevertheless too prominent to ignore. Both projects attempt to reconcile authorial prestige with readerly demand for works composed in an earlier period of the author's life, and as such, aim to present a specific image of the author. The main difference is that Marot's *Adolescence* not only addresses the demand for the works it contains, but seeks to create demand for works to come, as well.

The presentation of Marot's youthful works as a promise of mature ones is bolstered on the title page by Nicolas Bérault's Latin distich: "Hi sunt Clementis juveniles, aspice, lusus. / Sed tamen his ipsis est juvenile nihil" ("Look, these are Clément's youthful diversions. And yet, there is nothing youthful about them"; *OC* I.33, *OPC* I.16).<sup>151</sup> Bérault, a distinguished scholar

---

<sup>151</sup> Note the similarity in vocabulary with Mantuan's *Adulescentia*; "juvenile" recalls the "multa nimis iuvenilia" of the original *Adulescentia*, which Mantuan claims to have composed for fun ("ludens excuderam"), thus presenting them as "juveniles lusus." The difference, as Dauvois

and diplomat, was a correspondent and friend of Erasmus and Guillaume Budé, and one of France's premier humanists who was named a royal reader in Greek (McFarlane 106; Preisig 56-57; Mayer, *Clément Marot* 167). Bérault's name, the Latin of the distich, and the use of Roman type (the "lettres Attiques" of Tory's *Champ Fleury*), make clear the lofty humanist aspirations of this vernacular book and its producers. In fact, Florian Preisig has identified the title page as a site of tension between author and printer, claiming that the title page confers upon the collection loftier pretensions than those of its author, who first refers to the collected poems as "ces miennes petites jeunesses" (*OC* I.35; *OPC* I.17). Preisig even compares the title page to a humanist shop window that serves primarily to advertise the book to the printer's public: "Le sentiment qui domine est celui d'une entreprise qu'on serait tenté de désigner comme publicitaire. On (et c'est sans doute Tory qui se cache derrière ce 'on') veut nous imposer une image de l'auteur en humaniste" (*Métamorphoses* 57).

The verso of the title page contains two more Latin distiches. The first, "Petrus Brissetus in Maroti Adolescentiam," reads "Quae cecinit juvenis juvenili mente Marotus, / Testantur qualis Musa senilis erit" ("What young Marot sings in his youthful state of mind is a testament to what his mature muse will be like"; *OC* I.33).<sup>152</sup> It reinforces the notion that Marot is continuing to mature as a poet; the *Adolescence* testifies to what Marot's mature muse will be ("erit") more so than to what it is. Brisset's distich is followed by Tory's: "Vis lauros, cipryasque comas, charitesque, jocosque / Inde sales etiam nosse? Marotus habet" ("Do you truly wish to know laurels, Cyprian foliage, the Graces, jests and wit to boot? Marot has them"; *OC* I.33). The

---

points out, is that Marot claims to be restoring his youthful, promising works to their pristine, uncorrupted state, whereas Mantuan edits his works to make them seem less youthful. Olivia Rosenthal claims that the distich suggests that even when Marot wrote these poems, he was already speaking of a bygone era, and that consequently, the collection represents Clément's poetic youth more so than his chronological youth ("Les jeunesses" 9).

<sup>152</sup> Of the author, Pierre Brisset, little is known, except that he was likely a friend of Marot.

distich, addressed to an unspecified reader (“Ad lectorem”), endorses the poetic *varietas* that Marot exhibits in the *Adolescence*: the laurels represent Marot’s poetic glory and denote his celebrations of French military victories, the myrtle (“cipryas comas”) and the Graces denote the *Adolescence*’s many love poems and perhaps the “Temple de Cupido” specifically, the jests recall Bérault’s “iuveniles lusus,” and wit represents Marot’s particular knack for satire. It represents the collection as a sort of humanist smorgasbord capable of pleasing readers with different predilections.<sup>153</sup> In fact, the use of the term “jocos” allows for the possibility that some readers will regard the *Adolescence* as a collection of youthful diversions akin to Mantuan’s original *Adulescentia*, which would complicate Preisig’s hypothesis that Tory’s interventions contradict Marot’s representation of his work in the preface. While it is clear that the *Adolescence* is meant to be more appealing to a humanist audience than, say, the Arnoullet *Opuscules*, Tory seems to be well aware of the wide-ranging appeal that Marot would have even among the educated elite capable of reading his Latin epigraph, and his evocation of Marot’s *varietas* is his way of preserving and indeed encouraging this appeal. In other words, one should not rashly assume the uniformity of taste among humanist audiences, especially when noted humanist printers account for varied tastes in addressing their publics.

After the short version of the three-year privilege granted to Roffet to have the *Adolescence* printed comes Marot’s oft-cited preface in the form of a dedication to “ung grant nombre de freres qu’il a, tous Enfants D’apollo” (+2r). In addressing the community of his fellow humanists and poets, whose existence is confirmed by the Latin epigraphs, or perhaps his *fratres charissimi in Christo*, as Screech would have it, Marot addresses a subset of his entire

---

<sup>153</sup> Du Bellay will include a similar “Ad lectorem” at the beginning of his *Regrets* and *Poemata*: “Quem, Lector, tibi nunc damus libellum, / Hic fellisque simul simulque mellis / Permixture salis refert saporem (“This little book that we now give you, reader, tastes of gall, honey and salt all at once”; 45).

readership: “[...] je vous supply (mes Freres) (et vous autres nobles lecteurs) [...]” (*OC* I.36; *OPC* I.18). In so doing, he breaks with the common practice of dedicating a book to a current or future patron, and instead appeals to a general public by encouraging it to live up to its most outstanding members, that is, the ideal readership of the *Adolescence*.<sup>154</sup> In this respect, the preface bears a striking similarity to that of Tory’s *Champ Fleury*, published three years before the *Adolescence*. A truly metadiscursive preface, it opens with an explanation of why the book is not destined specifically for a prominent member of the nobility or clergy, but for all those capable of appreciating it:

Les Poetes, les Orateurs, et les autres Scavans en Lettres et Sciences, quant ilz ont faict et compile quelque Oeuvre de leur studieuse diligence et main, ont de costume en faire present a quelque grant Seigneur de Court ou D’esglise en le exaulceant par Lettres et louanges envers la cognoissance des autres hommes. Et ce pour luy agreer, et afin qu’ilz en puissent tousjours estre si bien venuz au tour de luy, qu’il semble estre oublige et tenu a leur donner quelque gros don, quelque Benefice, ou quelque Office en recompense des Labeurs et vigiles qu’ilz ont mis a faire et composer leurs dits Oeuvres et Presens. Je porrois facilement ainsi faire de ce petit Livre, mais considerant que si je le presentoys plustost a quelcun que a ung autre, Il y porroit avoir quelque enuyeulx scrupule, j’ay avise que ce seroit honnestement faict a moy de vous en faire a tous ung present, O Devotz Amateurs de bonnes Lettres, sans preferer grant a petit, si non d’autant qu’il ayme plus les Lettres, et qu’il est plus intime en vertus. Par ainsi les Prelats et grans Seigneurs, qui sont tous excellens en belles et bonnes vertus, y auront part en sorte que vous n’en perdres la vostre (a2v).

Tory rejects outright the use of the preface as the space of a transaction (praise in exchange for recompensation in the form of money, employment or an ecclesiastical sinecure) with a patron.

What distinguishes this book’s public is not rank, power, or wealth, but love of letters and

---

<sup>154</sup> Though he agrees that Marot addresses a more or less universal reader, Preisig claims that the “noble” in “noble Lecteurs” necessarily means “of the nobility,” pointing out a similarity with Marot’s dizain from the preface to Claude de Seyssel’s translation of Thucydides (52; *OC* II.457; *OPC* II.322-33). I see no reason why this must be the case; if anything, I would argue that the term’s polysemy invites identification from readers noble by birth as well as from readers who believe themselves to be noble in letters or virtue.

virtue.<sup>155</sup> In fact, the language of the preface implies that Tory is especially addressing readers who belong to the Third Estate: “Par ainsi *les Prelats et grans Seigneurs*, qui sont tous excellens en belles et bonnes vertus, y auront part en sorte que *vous* n’en perdres *la vostre*” (emphasis mine). Yet, the fact that the book is no longer offered exclusively to the rich and powerful does not make the preface any less of a transaction. Rather, the transaction has simply been extended to the unspecified reader, who must still prove himself literate and virtuous by buying and reading the book. Tory holds ideal readers as “Devotz Amateurs de bonnes Lettres” so as to present the *Champ Fleury* as a book which will allow any reader to become a part of this idealized community if he so desires, regardless of his station. Marot’s preface addresses a similarly general public while simultaneously holding up certain members of it as ideal: “Ne vous chaille (mes Freres) si la courtoisie des lecteurs ne nous excuse, le Tiltre du livre nous excusera” (*OC* I.35; *OPC* I.17). A courteous reader, it is implied, will appreciate the book as much as the members of the poetic community; the anonymous reader may become a part of this community by receiving the book favorably and in a manner of which the author and all those involved in the book’s publication approve.

Given their similarities, we should consider the possibility that Tory’s preface served as a source for that of the *Adolescence*, or perhaps even that Tory played a role in its composition. Indeed, for however much the preface is pointed to as Marot’s authorial manifesto, and despite the fact that it is written in the first person, it actually represents the publication of the *Adolescence* as a collective project in which many people have a stake (Lestringant 25). Marot attributes the impetus for publishing the collection not only to his concern over unauthorized

---

<sup>155</sup> Tory’s preface exemplifies of the shifting conception of glory described by Joukovsky, according to whom glory, as humanism grows in influence, becomes less a reflection of worldly power and possessions (which Joukovsky refers to as “gloriole” and attributes largely to the *Rhetoriciens*) than of moral and intellectual superiority (195).

editions of his work, but also to the requests of members of his poetic community, whose demand was an even greater factor than his own indignation: “Certainement toutes les deux occasions y ont servy, mais plus celle de voz prieres” (*OC* I.35; *OPC* I.17). In fact, Marot indicates that his brothers’ influence gives them an equal share in the results of the book’s reception: “Puis donques que vous estes cause de l’évidence de l’oeuvre, je suis d’avis, s’il en vient blasme, que la moytié en tombe sur vous [...]” (*OC* I.35; *OPC* I.17).<sup>156</sup> The *Adolescence* is as much a gamble for them as it is for the poet himself.

Adding to the description of his “Oeuvres de jeunesse” and “coups d’essay,” Marot employs an extended metaphor that both acknowledges the tradition of *florilegia* and sets the *Adolescence* apart from this tradition: “Ce n’est (en effect) aultre chose, qu’un petit jardin que je vous ay cultivate de ce que j’ay peu recouvrer d’arbres, d’herbes et fleurs de mon printemps: la ou (toutesfoys) vous ne verrez ung seul brin de Soucy” (*OC* I.35; *OPC* I.17).<sup>157</sup> Like a *florilegium*, the *Adolescence* consists of choice pieces culled from Marot’s youthful production. In this sense, it is not entirely different from the 1531 *Opuscles*, and, much like Arnoullet’s title page, Marot presents his work as having been performed for the benefit of readers: “un petit jardin que je vous ay cultivate.” Contrary to the *Opuscles*, however, Marot insists that the collection is useful as well as enjoyable, in accordance with the Horatian *utile dulci*: “Lisez hardyment, vous

---

<sup>156</sup> To this, Marot adds that “[...] s’il en sort (d’aventure) honneur, ou louange, que vous ne moy n’y ayons rien, mais celluy à qui seul est deu honneur et louange” (*OC* I.35; *OPC* I.17). This someone is almost certainly God, which makes of this phrase a reflection of the key evangelical tenet of *Soli Deo Gloria* (Glory to God alone). Cf. the refrain of the “Chant de joye, composé la Nuyct qu’on sceut les nouvelles de la delivrance des Enfans de France prisonniers en Espagne et le lendemain présenté au Roy a son lever”: “Gloire à Dieu seul, paix en terre aux humains” (*OC* I.346-7; *OPC* I.765). The fact that this phrase is altered to “celluy à qui seul est deu honneur, et gloire” in 1538 would seem to confirm this interpretation (*OC* I.534, n. 7; *OPC* I.17; emphasis mine).

<sup>157</sup> “Soucy” is, of course, a homonym that can mean both “marigold” and “worry.” This pun seems to be a favorite device of Marot’s, and recurs in the *Temple de Cupido* and elsewhere.

y trouverez quelque delectation, et en certains endroictz quelque peu de fruit. Peu dis je, pource qu'arbres nouveaulx entez ne produisent pas fruitz de trop grande saveur" (*OC* I.35; *OPC* I.17).

In other words, the *Adolescence* offers everything the *Opuscules* do, and more. The comparison of youthful works to unripened fruit further reinforces the message that the collection is but a taste of what Marot's mature works will be. The very least his readers should get out of the book is "passe-temps" (*OC* I.36; *OPC* I.18). As Jean-Max Colard has shown, the term, meaning either "pastime" or "the passing of time," simultaneously encourages an immediate reading based on pleasure and a reading which searches for signs of future maturity: "on peut même y voir une stratégie presque éditoriale de la part de Marot, comme si cette mise en attente du lecteur était un principe d'incitation à la lecture de l'œuvre dans sa totalité, et faisait la publicité non seulement de la *Suite*, mais aussi des œuvres futures du poète, à paraître 'de brief'" ("L'écriture comme passe-temps" 86).<sup>158</sup>

Grafting is also a common metaphor for *translatio studii* which figures prominently, for example, in Sperone Speroni's *Dialogo delle Lingue* and Du Bellay's *Deffence et illustration*. Such is likely the case for this reference to grafting, as well, especially when one considers the recurring comparison of Marot's name with that of (Publius Vergilius) Maro and the fact that the *Adolescence* opens with a translation of that same Virgil's first *Eclogue*.<sup>159</sup> Marot employs the garden metaphor so as to direct the reader to look for the signs of his literary evolution, not unlike how Petrarch describes the early poems of the *Canzoniere* as a "primo giovenile errore"

---

<sup>158</sup> Similarly, Perrine Galland-Hallyn compares Marot's image of the garden to the one employed by Poliziano in the dedication of his *Silvae* to Lorenzo de' Medici. Poliziano compares the *Silvae* to a Garden of Adonis (*Adonidos hortus*), that is, a garden of annuals which, like Adonis, are beautiful for the brief time that they last (222). Erasmus devotes an adage to Gardens of Adonis, equating them with trivial things that provide only transitory pleasure (1.1.4).

<sup>159</sup> Marot also uses the grafting metaphor in the "Petite Epistre au Roy": "Car voys tu bien, la personne rimante, / Qui au jardin de son sens la rime ente [...]" (*OC* I.99.13-14; *OPC* I.87.13-14).

which eventually gives way to praise of the Virgin Mary. In fact, the garden metaphor might account for the prevalence of the color green in the *Adolescence*, mentioned thirteen times, and which, much as it does today, denoted youth or inexperience (Bertin 41). To give a sample of his evolution, Marot has included some mature works at the end: “Esperant de brief vous faire offre de mieulx, et pour arres de ce mieulx, desja vous mectz en veue (a la fin de l’*Adolescence*) Ouvraiges de meilleure trempe et de plus polie estoffe” (*OC* I.36; *OPC* I.18). The term “arres,” much like its modern French equivalent “arrhes,” is of a particularly commercial nature; Cotgrave defines it as “mony given for the conclusion, or striking up, of a bargain.” The reader is asked to enter into an agreement to continue reading works that Marot will publish, and the more mature works appended to the *Adolescence* are the sample or down payment that both tantalizes the reader and reassures him that there is indeed more to come.<sup>160</sup> Moreover, these supplemental works are presented as a bonus: readers pay for the *Adolescence* and receive these for free, as they are an “offre de mieulx” in the same way that advertising is offered, whereas the product is sold, according to Baudrillard (202).

Finally, the preface contains the first instance of many in which Marot states that his works should be published in a certain order. Here, he does not specify anything beyond his insistence that “[...] l’*Adolescence* ira devant, et là commencerons par la premiere Eglogue des Bucoliques Virgilanes” (*OC* I.36; *OPC* I.18). Editions of Marot published during the poet’s lifetime would remain true to this principle, reconciling organization by chronology with organization by genre. Critics who have come to grips with the question of order have tended to answer it by portraying Marot’s evolution as one from a profane to a sacred poet, and by

---

<sup>160</sup> Cf. Rigolot: “Marot hopes to whet his readers’ appetite and lure them into buying the next volume (which he would publish as *La Suite de l’Adolescence clémentine* the following year)” (“Authorial Authority” 41). I am not sure that I would equate the *Suite* with the greater works to come, however.

claiming that Marot's works and the order in which they appear (in authorized editions) reflect this evolution. Defaux goes so far as to associate this evolution with an effort on Marot's part to represent his actual self rather than his persona, to make of his poetry a *speculum animi* and the "roman de sa vie" (*Poète en son jardin* 163).<sup>161</sup> Such an interpretation, while attuned to a definite tendency toward transparency in Marot, does not seem to mesh with Marot's own pronouncements on poetic composition.<sup>162</sup> Marot's preface to his edition of Villon that appeared in September 1533 (Mayer 238) abounds in such pronouncements, and has been pointed to as a model for Marot's approach to the publication of his own works. Jacqueline Cerquiglini-Toulet, for example, has noted the similarities with regard to chronological organization, as Marot chooses to put the *Lais* before the *Testament* based on the fact that it was composed five years earlier (159-60). However, Marot differs sharply from Villon in matters of *inventio*. Specifically, the Cadurcian poet complains of the Parisian poet's excessively anecdotal subject matter: "Quant à l'industrie des lays qu'il fait en ses testaments, pour suffisamment la congnoistre et entendre, il faudroit avoir esté de son temps à Paris et avoir congneu les lieux, les choses et les hommes dont il parle, la mémoire desquelz tant plus se passera, tant moins se cognoistra icelle industrie de ses lays dictz" (*OC* II.469; *OPC* II.777). Villon's *Lais* and *Testament* are essentially wasted effort from the standpoint of poetic glory, as they cannot be understood without knowledge of Villon's Paris and its inhabitants, and will therefore be forgotten along with this knowledge. As Chiron points out, Marot aims less at the rehabilitation of Villon's posterity in and of itself than at making Villon more palatable for a sixteenth-century reader (50). In other

---

<sup>161</sup> Yet, in the same study, Defaux points to certain changes that Marot made to his poems for the *Adolescence*, notably the replacement of the *Compte d'Étampes* in the "Ballade a Ma dame la Duchesse d'Alençon" (*OC* I.118-119; *OPC* I.114-115), as evidence of how Marot forges a persona and substitutes fiction for biographical truth (116).

<sup>162</sup> For more on the pitfalls of Defaux's approach, see Berthon, "Clément Marot et la tentation biographique," p. 550.

words, a poet must endeavor to find a subject that will guarantee the survival of his work through the continued appreciation of a broad readership, and this readership must be accounted for in composition: “Pour ceste cause, qui voudra faire une œuvre de longue durée, ne preigne son soubject sur telles choses basses et particulieres” (*OC* II.469; *OPC* II.777).<sup>163</sup> Marot approaches Villon as a poet familiar with the world of printing would approach a poet who was not. In adapting Villon to a sixteenth-century public, Marot strives to adapt him to the kind of public made possible by printing. Consequently, the author, rather than striving for immediacy between himself and the reader, for the unvarnished representation of the self and of his lived experience, should instead pass the personae in which he chooses to appear through the filter of his public, real or imagined. As Yves Delègue puts it, Marot, in fashioning a persona out of his lived experience, reveals himself to be “tout entier dans ce jeu subtil qui fait de l’auteur une marionnette publique” (34). The Marot presented to the reader in the *Adolescence* and other editions is just as much a puppet as the Villon presented to contemporary readers by Marot.

Indeed, Marot’s poetic “autobiography” is that of a persona rather than of an historical person (Melançon 524).<sup>164</sup> To address the question of whether the text of the *Adolescence* and the order of poems corroborate the paratext, we must reconsider this question in the context of readership relations. If the paratext contains elements which appeal to readers seeking enjoyment alone, to humanist readers, and to evangelical readers (or to readers who fit into more than one of these categories), the text of the *Adolescence* consciously cultivates this ambiguity of character that has led to such divergent interpretations as Defaux’s and Scollen-Jimack’s, and which has led Rigolot to compare Marot to Erasmus’s Proteus and Pico’s chameleon (*OC* I.7).

<sup>163</sup> Cf. Rigolot, “Authorial Authority,” p. 42, and *Poésie et Renaissance*, p. 102.

<sup>164</sup> Preisig argues that Marot appears in several different personae, such as “le Dépourceu,” the shepherd or the French Maro, which have much in common despite their distinctness (*Métamorphoses* 106).

However, the text of the *Adolescence* reiterates the claims made in the paratext regarding Marot's capabilities or the promise of greater works to come. Read in the context of the collection, these reiterations strengthen the link between the collection and the author's life and career. They also specify the nature of Marot's evolution, hinting at a religious conversion similar to Mantuan's.

The poems which open the *Adolescence* serve as a guide for the rest of the collection. To be sure, the decision to begin with the translation of Virgil's first *Eclogue* invites the Marot-Marco comparison and implies that much of Marot's early career was devoted to mastering Latin through translation (McFarlane 105).<sup>165</sup> The *Eglogue*'s prominent position also heightens the sense of competition with Mantuan's *Adulescentia*: Galland-Hallyn suggests that beginning with the *Eglogue* may be a nod to Bérault, who worried that Mantuan was becoming more popular than Virgil (234). As such, the *Adolescence* supplants the "Christianus Maro" of the *Adulescentia*, offering readers both the original Maro and his legitimate successor and translator. According to Sébillet, who points to Marot as an example of how to translate well in the *Art poétique*, translations were at the time "[...] le Poème plus fréquent et mieux reçu des estimés Poètes et des doctes lecteurs, à cause que chacun d'eux estime grand œuvre et de grand prix, rendre la pure et argentine invention des Poètes dorée et enrichie de notre langue" (bk. 2, ch. 14, p. 140). Thus, the translation's prominent position articulates with the humanist framing of the paratext, and would seem to appeal above all to "doctes lecteurs" familiar with the image of Mantuan as Virgil's modern successor. The eclogue's conclusion also reflects the horticultural

---

<sup>165</sup> The translation also represents the tension throughout Marot's body of work between imperiled freedom (Meliboeus) and the security provided by the protection of the powerful (Tityrus) (*OC* I.534-535, n. 15). Defaux suggests that this dichotomy evokes Marot's early dependence on his father at court, who played Tityrus to his son's Meliboeus ("Effacer Jean, & escrire Clement" 111).

metaphors of the preface. Meliboeus's concern over soldiers using his fields instead of him, which constitutes a subtle criticism of civil war in Virgil, here echoes Marot's concern over the publication of his works:

Las, pour qui est ce qu'avons semé noz champs?  
O Melibée, plante Arbres à la ligne,  
Entre Poyriers, mettz en ordre la Vigne:  
Las et pour qui? (*OC* I.43.150-53; *OPC* I.25-26.151-54).

The pear trees and vines recall Marot's proviso that "arbres nouveaulx entez ne produisent pas fruitz de trop grande saveur," but even more striking is the reappearance of the "ordre" insisted upon in the title page. Given that the preface makes a point of stating that the *Adolescence* must begin with the "Eglogue," it is highly likely that the preface was written with this translation in mind. As such, the Tityrus/Meliboeus dichotomy evokes not only Marot's ambiguous relationship with patrons, but his claim to authority over his literary production. The question of for whom the trees are planted has been answered in the prologue: "un petit jardin que je *vous* ay cultivé," and Tityrus's gesture of hospitality toward Meliboeus at the close of the poem mirrors that of Marot toward the reader:

Tu pourras bien (et te pry que le vueilles)  
Prendre repos dessus des vertes feuilles  
Avecques moy, ceste nuyct seulement.  
J'ay à soupper assez passablement,  
Des pommes doulces, tout plain de bon frommage,  
Chastaignes molles, avec force laitage (*OC* I.43.163-68).<sup>166</sup>

Tityrus invites Meliboeus to enjoy the fruits of his garden with him in peace, much as the reader is invited to enjoy the fruits of Marot's garden in the preface, and the parallel between this pastoral repast and the material book is invited by the "feuilles" under which the shepherds rest.

---

<sup>166</sup> In 1538, lines 167-68 become "Pommes, Pruneaux, tout plein de bon fructage, / Chastaignes, Aulx, avec force laitage," making the connection with the fruit trees of the preface even clearer (*OPC* I.26.168-69).

Other moments in the *Adolescence* reinforce the comparison of Marot's poetic career to ripening fruit, as well. The last two poems of the "Epistres," the "Epistre pour le capitaine Bourgeon à monseigneur l'escuyer la Rocque" and the "Epistre faicte pour le Capitaine Raisin audict seigneur de la Rocque," constitute a humorous reference to Marot's poetic maturation through the ripening of the "fruit" from one poem to the next (*OC* I.100-103; *OPC* I.88-91). Similarly, the first half of the *Adolescence*, namely the "Oeuvres Poetiques que Clement Marot [...] composa en l'eage de son Adolescence" as opposed to the more mature works that follow, ends with a song celebrating Bacchus and wine, a product of ripened fruit (*OC* I.187; *OPC* I.195). Among the aforementioned mature works, the celebrated "Epistre au Roy par Marot estant malade à Paris" (better known by the title "Au Roy pour avoir esté dérobé") prominently features Marot's bout with the plague. Plague imagery pervades the poem, even the description of the valet's larceny: the "venerable Hillot," seeing that Marot's purse "avoit grosse apostume" after being filled with the hundred écus given by the king, runs away with the purse beneath his armpit, a site where buboes commonly appear (*OC* I.227.17-20; *OPC* I.320.17-20). The poet spends nearly thirty lines describing his own bout with the plague, and predicts that he is likely to die in winter: "Et en danger (si en yver je meurs) / De ne veoir pas les premiers raisins meurs" (*OC* I.228.77-78; *OPC* I.322.77-78).<sup>167</sup> The reader, having seen Marot describe his youthful works as unripe fruit in the preface, may pick up on the echo, and feel relieved that Marot has survived to maturity. Marot's sickness comes to figure even more prominently in subsequent editions of the *Adolescence*, serving as the bridge between the content of the *princeps* edition and the appended poems. Presented as a threat that could have prematurely cut the poet's career short, Marot's sickness allows editors to influence how readers react to poems that follow it.

---

<sup>167</sup> Marot most likely fell ill in mid-to-late 1531, when the plague was ravaging France (*OPC* I.722).

After the “Eglogue” comes the “Temple de Cupido,” a work which has attracted a great deal of critical attention. The full title of the poem reads “Le Temple de Cupido, Et la Queste de Ferme Amour” (*OC* I.44). The “Ferme amour” which the speaker eventually chooses over erotic and inconstant love, whether taken to mean simply constancy and fidelity or Pauline *agape*, is a central concept to Marot’s *œuvre* which recurs *passim* throughout it.<sup>168</sup> The “Temple” is not only a *dit* that draws upon the *Roman de la Rose* and the more recent *Concorde des deux langages*, but the poet’s quest for his own poetics and personal style (*Crescenzo* 78; *Duport* 147). The imagery in the “Temple,” while it facilitates the allegory of love represented by the Mass, anticipates the rest of the *Adolescence* and prepares the reader for it. The reference to the “faulx et desloyal Jason” foreshadows the “Epistre de Maguelonne,” just as the “brandon de Destresse, / Dont fut enflammée Dido” anticipates the acrostic rondeau following the “Epistre de Maguelonne” (*OC* I.49.202, I.50.234-235; *OPC* I.33.202, I.34.234-5). The misgivings arising from the reference to the passions of Dido, Byblis and Helen set up the speaker’s embrace of Ferme Amour and Maguelonne’s refusal to despair, which distinguishes her from the equally jilted Dido. The vaults made of Priapus’s trellises from which hang “Bourgeons et raisins à plaisance” echo the satirical last two poems of the *Epistres*, further encouraging the reader to draw a parallel between Marot’s production and the speaker’s journey in the “Temple” (*OC* I.51.278; *OPC* I.35.278).

In other words, the “Temple” may be seen as a microcosm of the *Adolescence*, and the most indicative clue in this regard is that the poem is strewn with references to the genres and

---

<sup>168</sup> For an account of the *Temple* and of “Ferme amour” as Marot’s choice of *agape* over erotic love, see Defaux, “Les deux amours de Clément Marot,” *Rivista di Letterature moderne e comparate* 46.1 (Jan.-Mar. 1993), pp. 1-30, and “Marot et ‘Ferme Amour’: Essai de mise au point” pp. 137-67 in *Anteros: Actes du colloque de Madison (Wisconsin) mars 1994*, ed. Ullrich Langer and Jan Miernowski (Orléans: Paradigme, 1994).

*formes fixes* that make up the collection. The lessons sung in the Temple are: “[...] rondeaulx, ballades, virelais, / Motz à plaisir, rymes et triolletz” (*OC* I.52.328-29; *OPC* I.36.328-29).<sup>169</sup>

Perhaps even more striking is the Temple’s cemetery, which connects the preface to the “Complainctes et epitaphes” and serves as the first printed indication of Marot’s translation of the Psalms as the culmination of his poetic career:

Le Cymetiere est ung vert boys:  
Et les murs, Hayes, et Buissons.  
Arbres plantez, ce sont les Croix:  
*De profundis*, gayer Chansons (*OC* I.52.313-16; *OPC* I.36.313-16).

In describing the cemetery as a wood with hedges and bushes for walls and trees for grave markers, Marot draws a parallel between the “petit jardin que je vous ay cultivé de ce que j’ay peu recouvrer d’arbres, herbes, et fleurs de mon printemps” and the “Complainctes et epitaphes.”<sup>170</sup> Yet, the description of the cemetery in terms highly reminiscent of both the preface and the *locus amoenus* characteristic of love poetry suggests a negative consequence of the supposedly unpolished poems that constitute the *Adolescence*. Trees, *qua* raw material, cannot adequately mark graves, nor can they truly do justice to the deceased until they have been fashioned into crosses, wooden representations of Christ’s sacrifice and humanity’s redemption through grace. Nor is this comparison the only one of its kind in the *Adolescence*; a similar one occurs, fittingly enough, in the “Oroison contemplative devant le Crucifix”: “Et que mon corps soit tout fendu en bouches, / Pour myeux à plain, et en plus de manieres / Te rendre grace, et chanter mes prieres” (*OC* I.75.72-74; *OPC* I.62.72-74). The pun on “bouches” and “bûches” reinforces the notion that the poet, in his current state, is raw material that must be refined, much

<sup>169</sup> Cf. lines 383-85: “De *Requiem* les messes sont aubades, / Cierges, rameaulx et sieges, la verdure / Où les Amans font rondeaulx et ballades.”

<sup>170</sup> The corresponding section of the *Suite* is entitled “Le Cimetiere, autrement les epitaphes” (*OC* I.348).

like a tree must be hewn into logs. In the poet's case, he must come to voice prayers with many mouths by disseminating the word of God through print. Similarly, Psalm 130, used in the liturgy as a hymn to the faithful departed, has been replaced in the *Temple* with "gayes Chansons" not unlike those with which the *Adolescence* concludes (Ahmed 9). Chanson 12 is a particularly salient example: "Tant que vivray en aage florissant, / Je serviray amour, le dieu puissant, / En faictz et dictz, en chansons et accords" (*OC* I.177.1-3 ; *OPC* I.185.1-3).<sup>171</sup>

Incidentally, Marot does use structures and harmonies from his profane songs for his translations of the Psalms, which suggests that even the *princeps* edition of the *Adolescence* contains an inkling of this project.<sup>172</sup> The "Temple" not only represents an early attempt by the young Marot, but also hints at the mature Marot's misgivings with his poetic production thus far, suggesting that the poet is still seeking a poetry worthy of Ferme Amour.<sup>173</sup> Marot invites the reader, through use of the first-person plural, to search the collection for evidence of this quest: "Or taschons à trouver la chose, / Que je cherche au Temple d'Amours" (*OC* I.54.422; *OPC* I.39.422).

---

<sup>171</sup> The opening of this *chanson* is likely an echo of that of Lemaire's *Temple de Venus*: "En la verdeur du mien florissant aage / D'amours servir me vouluz entremetre." Marot would, in fact, eventually translate Psalm 130, and given its appearance here, his rendering of "speravit anima mea in Domino" is quite revealing: "En Dieu je me console, / Mon ame s'i attend; / En sa ferme parole / Tout mon espoir s'estend" (*OC* II.153.17-20; *OPC* II.623.5; emphasis mine).

<sup>172</sup> To wit, Defaux has described the Psalms as the necessary *telos* of a career which had been striving toward them even from its very inception ("Rhétorique, silence, et liberté" 320; *Marot, Rabelais, Montaigne* 95).

<sup>173</sup> Edwin Duval argues that until he finally reaches Ferme Amour, the speaker of the *Temple* essentially wastes his time: "Tout se passe comme si l'allégorie du poème, ainsi que le monde extérieur qu'elle représente, n'était qu'un énorme leurre, un dédale sans issue ou toutes les pistes sont fausses, car le cœur du poète est le seul endroit qui compte, l'origine et le terme de sa quête, l'alambic secret où l'amour cupidique se mue en Ferme Amour, presque indépendamment de tout acte et de tout événement extérieurs" ("Marot, Marguerite, et le chant du cœur" 561). Cornilliat also regards the *Temple* as an interior quest for Ferme Amour, and adds that Marot refuses to abandon love poetry in undertaking this quest, which marks, in Cornilliat's assessment, a conscious departure from Lemaire's ultimate separation of poetry and history in the *Concorde des deux langages* (*Sujet* 280-83).

In this context, Rondeau 11, “De l’amant doloireux,” takes on a meaning which resonates just as much with Bérault’s distich and the preface of the *Adolescence* as with the antitheses of the Petrarchan or the French lyrical tradition: “Je me voy jeune et en eage fleurir, / Et si me monstre estre plain de vieillesse / Avant mes jours” (*OC* I.136.7-9; *OPC* I.137.7-9). The rondeau even reiterates the notion from the “Temple” of the body as material which must be sacrificed to achieve immortality: “Or si j’en meurs, je veulx Dieu requerir / Prendre mon ame: et sans plus enquerir, / Je donne au vers mon corps plain de foiblesse” (*OC* I.136.10-12; *OPC* I.137.10-12). Through his habitual pun on “vers” (“worms” and “verses”), Marot complicates, as he does elsewhere, the tendency to subsume himself entirely to the glory of God. It is not enough for God to take Marot’s soul: the fact that his body will perish must be compensated by poetic immortality, as well. Marot’s text, like the paratext, invites several different readings of his career trajectory, encouraging those who privilege poetic glory as well as those who would read Marot’s career as a progressive realization that glory belongs to God alone.<sup>174</sup>

Does the order of poems in the *Adolescence* corroborate the maturation indicated in the paratext and text? A great deal of critical attention has been devoted to this question, with critics generally agreeing that there is some significance to the order of poems within genre divisions and within the *Adolescence* as a whole.<sup>175</sup> Their studies have been primarily thematic in nature: those that focus on specific genres have centered on how the themes in the “Ballades” mark a rupture with the “Epistres” and establish a continuity with the “Complainctes et epitaphes,” on how they recount a history of salvation on a personal, national, and universal level, or on the

---

<sup>174</sup> For more on this central ambiguity in Marot’s works, see Miernowski, “Le pas chancelant de la fiction marotique.”

<sup>175</sup> Among critics who deal with the 1532 *Adolescence*, Cécile Alduy is somewhat of an exception, as she claims that Marot is only concerned with order in the paratext of the *Adolescence*, whereas the 1538 *Œuvres* constitute an actual “travail d’ordonnement” (11).

theme of peace in the *Epistres* as an attempt to create a Christian (and likely evangelical) community across both the universal and particular planes of experience (Blum 75; Bauer 150; Goyet 602). Justifiable though these accounts may be, they depend upon adherence to the authorized edition and regard unauthorized editions as inadmissible precisely because they corrupt or threaten this unity. In order to arrive at a clearer idea of how these unauthorized editions are compiled, we must first consider what aspects of the authorized edition's order give rise to them. In the *Adolescence*'s case, it is the narrative of Marot's poetic career.

Duval has undertaken an extensive structural study of the *Adolescence*, noting how the collection's two halves differ in terms of chronology: the *Adolescence* alludes to events which transpired prior to 1526 and during Marot's career at the court of Marguerite de Navarre when she was still the Duchess of Alençon, whereas the *Autres Oeuvres* refer to works produced after 1526, during Marot's career at the royal court. In other words, the two sections are divided by the year in which Marot turned thirty and ceased to be an *adolescens* ("*L'Adolescence clémentine*" 17-18). However, while pointing out this chronological principle, Duval challenges the notion that the order of poems in the *Adolescence* delivers on the promise of evolution or maturation. In his view, the poems of the *Autres Oeuvres*, notably the epistles concerning Marot's imprisonment, illness, and thieving valet, betray the evolution clearly laid out in the long poems at the beginning of the collection: "Si les poèmes longs du début suggèrent une certaine évolution poétique, les épîtres suggèrent plutôt une dévolution autobiographique et même une crise personnelle" ("*L'Adolescence clémentine*" 21). In Duval's assessment, Marot's difficulties prevent him from producing greater works; Marot raises the reader's hopes in the *Adolescence*, only to dash them with excuses in the *Autres oeuvres*. Though I do not necessarily agree that these greater works must correspond to Duval's description of them as "une sorte d'*Énéide*,"

there are a number of instances in which Marot protests that various troubles are keeping him from his calling, as in the “Epistre de Marot aux Dames de Paris qui ne vouloient prendre les precedentes excuses en payement,” wherein the poet lists in the conditional what he would write were he not involved in a petty quarrel over the “Adieux nouveaux” (*OC* I.308-314; *OPC* I.284-290). It should be remembered, though, that Marot does not promise any masterpieces in the preface of the *Adolescence*, only works “de meilleure trempe et de plus polie estoffe” meant to act as an “arres” of greater things to come. Whether or not Duval’s dissatisfaction is justified, it is clear that the personal crisis represented in the last poems of the *Adolescence* leaves Marot’s career in a state of suspense. The reader is left to wonder whether Marot, having recovered, actually will produce works worthier of his mature skill or of his turn toward religion, depending on which reading one pursues. In examining subsequent editions of the *Adolescence*, we find that this same personal crisis, especially the sickness, provides printer-publishers with an answer to this question.

In terms of paratext, the next three Tory-Roffet editions of the *Adolescence* differ little from the *princeps*, though the differences underscore the printer’s role even further. The title pages of the November 13, 1532 and February 12, 1533 editions (Mayer 11-12) indicate that they are “Plus amples que les premiers imprimez de ceste ny autre impression,” referring to the addition of some poems concerning Marot’s illness (a1r). The title page of the June 7, 1533 edition (Mayer 14) adds the following: “Avec certains accenz notez, cest assavoir sur le é masculin different du feminim, sur les dictionz jointes ensemble par sinalephes, et soubz le ç quant il tient de la prononciation de le s. Ce qui par cy devant par faulte d’advis n’a este faict au langaige françoys, combien qu’il y fust et soyt tresnecessaire” (a1r). This introduction of diacritical marks reflects some of the reforms proposed by Tory in the *Champ Fleury*, which

leads Nina Catach to hypothesize that Tory convinced Marot to take his typographical reforms on board for this edition (57). Berthon, however, points out that Marot never openly approves of the introduction of diacritical marks, and that his concern with correct printing has more to do with not corrupting the text than with any perceived inadequacies of typography (“Intention” 317).<sup>176</sup> Whatever Marot’s opinion of the reforms may have been, they remain Tory’s addition more so than his own, and constitute another example of how a printer can impose an agenda upon an edition and guide the manner in which it is read. Indeed, the lengthy addition to the title page places as much emphasis on the enrichment of the French language through printing as on Marot: the marks have been added not just for the benefit of Marot’s poems, but for the benefit of the French language, which has been and still is in need of them. I would also argue that these reforms are meant to aid in reading aloud, which suggests that the *Adolescence* was intended to be transmitted beyond those capable of reading it and appreciating its humanist framing. Consequently, the Tory editions, rather than appealing exclusively to an educated public, are designed to reach as great of a public as possible, all while giving readers an opportunity to regard themselves as distinct through their encounter with the book.

The text of these editions corresponds to that of the *princeps* edition, with the exception of the aforementioned additional poems concerning Marot’s illness appended to the end of the *Autres Oeuvres* under the heading “Autres Oeuvres faictes en sa dicte maladie” (Mayer 11, f. 112v).<sup>177</sup> They are continuous with the three poems at the end of this section, all of which

---

<sup>176</sup> Pauline Smith is similarly skeptical about the collaboration between Tory and Marot on this point, stressing that we cannot know the extent to which Marot’s approval was gained or even sought for these reforms (“Clément Marot and the French Language” 169).

<sup>177</sup> In the 1538 *Œuvres*, these poems all appear in the *Suite* or the *Premier livre des epigrammes*, with the exception of Akakia’s Latin quatrain. The June 7, 1533 edition also includes the brief “Marot envoie le livre de son Adolescence a une dame, et luy mande,” which would be placed in the paratext just before the *Adolescence* in 1538 (*OC* I.386; *OPC* I.15).

revolve around Marot falling ill, being robbed by his Gascon valet, and requesting money from the king to recoup the loss. Cumulatively, they prolong the suspense created by the introduction of Marot's sickness, but when examined piecemeal, they also reinforce the notion of maturity implied by the *Autres Oeuvres*, corroborating both a reading of this maturity as growth in poetic skill and ambition and a reading of it as a religious conversion. The first of these, "Au Lieutenant de Bourges Gontier qui luy escrivit en Ryme," heaps hyperbolic and almost certainly facetious praise on the verses of this "Gontier" (churl), verses "[...] si haults, et arduz à tout prendre, / Que mon Esprit travaille à les comprendre" (*OC* I.407.11-12; *OPC* I.325.11-12).<sup>178</sup> As Rigolot has argued, the mention of Lemaire, as well as the final word of the poem, "reprendra," recalls Lemaire's appearance in the preface as the poet who reproaches Marot for his use of the epic caesura, and this poem represents Marot's effort to put both Lemaire and his ridiculous "lieu-tenant" in their place ("De peu assez" 195). The fact that this poem is placed after the end of *Autres Oeuvres* creates the sense of an even greater separation between the Marot of the "Eglogue" and a mature Marot both willing and able to distance himself from his predecessor. Marot's "apology" positively drips with sarcasm, claiming that his pen is too rustic for a bumpkin. Any doubts about Marot's claim to divinely-inspired poetic talent ("ung esprit Poëtique") are dissipated by his second "excuse":

[L]es Muses me contraignent  
Penser ailleurs et fault que mes Vers plaignent  
La dure mort de la Mere du Roy,  
Mon Mécenas" (*OC* I.408.23-26; *OPC* I.326.23-26).

In other words, it grieves the poet not to have been able to provide a lengthier reply, but he was inconvenienced with the bothersome task of composing the "Eglogue sur le trespas de treshaulte

---

<sup>178</sup> Huguet defines "Gontier" or "franc gontier" simply as "paysan," but Cotgrave adds the more colorful "wealthie whoresonne," which suggests that our Gontier might be something of a Monsieur Jourdain *avant la lettre*.

et tresillustre princesse ma Dame Loyse de Savoye” (*OC* I.204-212; *OPC* I.224-231). Marot presents himself here not as a *rimeur*, but as a poet inspired by the Muses, invoking once again the Maro/Marot parallel by comparing Francis I to Maecenas, the patron of Horace and, of course, Virgil, who dedicated the *Georgics* to him. This same parallel, incidentally, is the subject of the Latin quatrain addressed to Marot by Akakia, and of Marot’s response to it (*OC* I.610, n.139/I.438-439; *OPC* II.1009, n. 1/II.221). The ensuing poem, “A Vignals Thoulousan Escholier a Bourges, qui luy escrivit en prose, avec ung Rondeau,” reinforces Marot’s ironic praise of Gontier. Sparing this *écolier berrichon* much of the spleen vented upon Gontier, the poet inserts yet another criticism of affected style:

Ce neantmoins (Vignals) je pense bien  
 Que tu congnois que le souverain bien  
 De l’amytié ne gist en longues Lettres,  
 En motz exquis, en grand nombre de Mettres,  
 Ains en bon cuer et en vraye intention (*OC* I.408.5-10; *OPC* I.326.5-10).

The “bon cuer” continues the emphasis on simplicity and sincerity over excessive ornamentation from the response to Gontier and recalls the “Ferme Amour” of “Temple de Cupido,” creating the impression that Marot’s maturity has not led him to abandon one of the foundational principles of his poetry. These two poems, which recall elements of the *Adolescence* only to distance themselves from some and readopt others, integrate Marot’s illness with his poetic maturation, thereby accentuating the danger posed by this illness which threatens to cut down the poet just as he begins to realize his full potential.

The poet’s fear of imminent death is even more palpable in the set of poems labeled “Ce qu’il escrivit a ses Medecins en sadicte Maladie,” and especially in the “Huictain a Monsieur Lamy aussi Medecin, nouvellement sorty de maladie,” whose internal rhymes underscore the contrast between the doctor’s own recovery and his inability to aid Marot’s:

Amy de nom, de pensée et de faict,  
 Qu'ay je *meffaict* que vers moy ne prens voye?  
 Graces à Dieu, tu es dru et *refaict*;  
 Moy, plus *deffaict* que ceulx que morts on *faict*.  
 Mort en *effect*, si Dieu toy ne m'*envoye*,  
 Brief ne *pourvoye* au mal qui me *desvoye* (OC I.439.1-6; OPC II.221.1-6; emphasis mine).<sup>179</sup>

The poet calls attention to the doctor's powerlessness and at the same time resigns himself to God's will, which is ultimately all that can determine whether he is to live or die. The additional poems thus begin to hint at a turn toward God in sickness in keeping with a conversion narrative. The last of the additional poems, the "Dizain a Pierre Vuyard secretaire dudict Seigneur," adds to this narrative by representing a speaker torn between the preservation of his body and the liberation of his spirit from its corporeal prison:

Ce meschant Corps demande guerison,  
 Mon frere cher: et l'Esprit, au contraire,  
 Le veult laisser comme une orde Prison:  
 L'ung tend au Monde et l'autre à s'en distraire (OC I.440.1-4; OPC II.222-223.1-4).

The aforementioned connotation of *fratres charissimi in Christo* imparts an evangelical flavor to the poem.<sup>180</sup> Most importantly, the last line, "Du Seigneur Dieu la volonté soit faicte," restates the speaker's submission to God's will in the letter to Michel Amy by rendering the *Pater noster's* "fiat voluntas tua" (OC I.610, n. 143). This scrap of prayer translation anticipates the addition of parts or all of Marot's *Instruction et foy d'ung chrestien* to subsequent editions of the *Adolescence* and *Suite*.

<sup>179</sup> The other three doctors to whom these poems are addressed, Braillon, Lecoq, and Akakia, are also mentioned in the "Epistre au Roy par Marot estant malade à Paris" (OC I.228.71; OPC I.322.71). Jean Dupèbe notes that only Braillon could actually have been a "médecin du roi" in 1531; no documents list Lecoq as a royal doctor, and Akakia only became one in 1545 (191, n. 12). As such, these poems, like the rest of Marot's "roman de sa vie," likely contain a significant amount of fabrication.

<sup>180</sup> The poem, incidentally, was included in Augereau's edition of Marguerite's *Miroir de l'âme pécheresse* (Mayer 240).

The very first edition to add these translations appeared just over three months after the publication of the November 13 *Adolescence*. This was the first edition of the *Adolescence* to be printed in Lyons, and its printer/publisher, François Juste, is today better known for publishing *Gargantua* than for his significant role in Marot's print history. Details on Juste are exceedingly scarce, and any hypotheses as to the man's inclinations must be derived solely from his production, which, similar to that of Arnoullet, reflects a propensity for the vernacular.<sup>181</sup> His early career also reflects his tendency to counterfeit successful works either unprotected by privilege or protected by Parisian privileges with no teeth in Lyons (Berthon, "Intention" 370). The *Adolescence*, of course, falls into the latter category. As for Juste's religious inclinations, he is believed to have shared the evangelical leanings of the authors he is best known for printing. Paul Lacroix suggests that Juste anonymously published a number of Protestant *plaquettes*, but this claim is unsubstantiated (634). Nevertheless, given Juste's affinity for writers suspected of heresy, namely Rabelais, Scève and Marot, we may at least regard Juste's evangelism as probable, and his editions of the *Adolescence* support this theory.

Juste's February 23, 1533 edition of the *Adolescence* (Mayer 13) closely follows the Roffet *princeps* edition in terms of the text, but appends four poems to the end of the *Autres Oeuvres*.<sup>182</sup> The first two of these are "Le Pater noster, et le Credo en francoys faict et traduit pa[r] ledict C. M. et offert na guyeres a la Royne de Navarre" (ff. 114v–115r). These French translations of the Lord's Prayer and Apostles' Creed were also printed in Auguereau's second edition of *Le Miroir de treschrestienne princesse Marguerite de France* (Mayer 240) in December of that same year, and were likely offered to the queen earlier in manuscript form

---

<sup>181</sup> See Gültlingen, vol. 4, pp. 201-222.

<sup>182</sup> See Villey, *Tableau chronologique*, p. 35.

(Berthon, “Intention” 376-77).<sup>183</sup> Their inclusion here suggests that Juste took a particular interest in Marot’s singularly evangelical project of translating prayers into the vernacular, but beyond this, their integration has just as profound an effect on the representation of Marot’s career in this volume as the inclusion of the sickness poems does in the Roffet editions.<sup>184</sup> The evocation of Marguerite’s name recalls Marot’s role as poet of the royal family and underscores his participation in the queen’s literary and religious circle. More significantly, the very presence of these translations at the end of the *Autres Oeuvres* implies that Marot has finally found the greater calling evoked throughout the *Adolescence*, and that his poetic wood has finally been carved into crosses. Marot’s rendering of the last lines of the Apostles’ Creed dovetails with both the poet’s sickness in the *Autres Oeuvres* and the poet’s motto, “La mort n’y mord,” affixed to this translation: “Finablement croy la vie eternelle / Telle est ma foy, et veulx mourir en elle” (*OC* I.434.7-8; *OPC* I.391.7-8). The proximity of these lines to the account of the poet’s near-death encounter with the plague fleshes out the conversion narrative hinted at in the Roffet editions, and in this context, “La mort n’y mord” seems to indicate the poet’s willingness to face death, strengthened by his faith in redemption. Including these translations allows Juste to kill two birds with one stone: he can include additional works that hold a special appeal for an evangelically-inclined audience, and, in so doing, he can make the book appear to deliver more fully on the *Adolescence*’s promise of greater things to come.

The edition does not conclude with Marot’s translations, however. It also includes two allographic poems, the “Chant Royal de la fortune et biens mondains, compose par ung des amys

---

<sup>183</sup> For more on Augereau’s edition of the *Miroir*, see William Kemp, “Marguerite of Navarre, Clément Marot, and the Augereau editions of the *Miroir de l’âme pécheresse* (Paris, 1533),” *JEBS* 2 (1999), pp. 113-156.

<sup>184</sup> The translation of the Apostle’s Creed is split into the “Credo in Deum” and the “Credo in Spiritum”; Rigolot suggests that this division might reflect the evangelical preoccupation with the active virtues of the Holy Spirit within the ecclesiastical community (*OC* I.609, n. 124).

de C. Marot,” and the “Epitaphe de Marie fille aisnee de monsieur d’Estissac, compose par le susdict” (f. 115v, f. 116v). Both poems are signed “F. R.,” which has led to the generally-accepted hypothesis that they were penned by none other than François Rabelais, the former protégé of Geoffroy d’Estissac and tutor of the latter’s nephew, Louis.<sup>185</sup> In the context of this edition, their attribution to Rabelais is less significant than their content and the manner in which they are presented to the reader as poems composed by one of Clément Marot’s friends. They reiterate the importance of community evoked by the mention of Marguerite, and, thematically, they articulate seamlessly with Marot’s prayer translations and the conversion narrative they introduce. The “Chant royal” lends an especially evangelical flavor to the additional poems through the use of vocabulary that evokes the doctrines of predestination and justification by faith alone:

Premierement, devant qu’on soyt reffect  
 Des biens de Dieu, fault que l’on soyt refaict  
 Et relavé, car trop sommes maulmys.  
 C’est par baptesme, ou par sceur compromys:  
 Sommes *esleuz* à la sainte assistance.  
 Puis se vestir de la ferme existence  
 De *foy*, qui l’homme orne tresnoblement” (*OPC* II.758.30-36; emphasis mine).

The “Epitaphe” contains clear parallels both to the “Chant royal” and to the volume’s conversion narrative. Its speaker, the young Marie’s soul, explains how she wished to die rather than to remain in a mortal state permanently tainted by sin, a wish which God granted her through premature birth and a swift death:

Dont ne voulant en ceste turpitude  
 Long sejourner, davant terme nasquis:  
 Et vins au monde, où par baptesme acquis

<sup>185</sup> See Defaux, *OPC* II.343, and C. A. Mayer and C. M. Douglas, “Rabelais poète” (*BHR* 24 [1962], 42-46). Huchon’s edition of Rabelais reproduces these poems and the dubious “Dizain de l’ymage de Venus armée” (1027-1030). In Huchon’s view, Rabelais, in an editorial capacity, is responsible for the organization of Juste’s editions of Marot (*Rabelais* 178-81).

Estre remise en premiere Innocence.  
 Que de rechief craignant perdre, requis  
 Plus tost mourir, par ce moyen exquis:  
 Une heure apres j'en eu[s] de Dieu dispence (*OPC* II.759-760.7-13).

The girl's death echoes the risk of Marot's premature death as evoked in the *Autres Oeuvres* in such a way as to suggest that Marot truly has turned a corner, and, like the girl, would rather resign himself to death and redemption than persist in his youthful errors. Marie acts as a surrogate for Marot, and her death crowns the conversion narrative told by Juste's edition. In this vein, the F. R. poems may be seen as the evangelical equivalent of the Latin distiches in the paratext of the *Adolescence*. The two groups of allographic poems serve to frame Marot's poetic persona within an evangelical or a humanist context, respectively, presenting the poet as either a French poet worthy of the ancients or as a poet who, like Mantuan, eventually turns to God. Furthermore, the coexistence of these two groups of liminary poems within this one edition implies that Juste prepares his edition of the *Adolescence* according to the dictates of prestige advertising, which proves to be quite flexible. The edition, and the image of Marot's career it conveys through the poet's persona, is tailored more and more to evangelical readers without neglecting the humanist readers so prominently targeted in the *princeps* edition. In every edition of the *Adolescence*, Marot's preface informs readers that the poet's garden was planted especially for them. The flexibility of Marot's persona allows printer/publishers like Juste to organize their editions so as to deliver more effectively on this promise for a variety of readers with different, and sometimes conflicting, orientations.

Juste did not stop there, however. In July of the same year, he produced a second edition of the *Adolescence*, this one with many more additional pieces than the first (Mayer 14bis). Defaux has pointed to this edition as evidence of collaboration between Marot, Juste, and Rabelais, claiming that Marot followed the court to Lyons in June of 1533 and entrusted his

poems on the banishment of the syndic Noël Bédà (May 1533) to the good doctor for publication in Juste's edition (*Poète en son jardin* 122-123).<sup>186</sup> As Berthon points out, not only is it unclear whether Marot was even in Lyons at this time, but in the absence of any tangible evidence, there is little reason to believe that Marot would have approved of an edition containing works that he later explicitly disavowed and others that did not reappear in the 1538 *Œuvres* ("Intention" 380).<sup>187</sup> My concern, however, is neither with Marot's intentions nor with which of the apocryphal added poems may or may not be his, but with Juste's second attempt to expand upon Marot's poetic persona with additional material. A glance at the title page reveals that Juste, like a great many early printer/booksellers, was not above false advertising, as the reader is promised "plus de soixante nouvelles compositions lesquelles jamays ne furent Imprimees, comme pourrez veoire a la fin du livre" (a1r). In reality, there are forty, fourteen of which appear in prior editions. At first glance, this mass of new material seems to corroborate Duval's characterization of post-1532 editions as adding archaic *formes fixes* in bulk without any concern for theme, genre or chronology ("L'Adolescence clémentine" 22). Upon closer inspection, however, most of these additions heighten the effects of the previous Juste edition. The Lyonese printer/bookseller seems to have taken a cue from the Roffet reeditions, as the ten sickness poems follow the *Autres Oeuvres*. Directly following these are the "Epitaphe du Conte de Salles" and "Complaincte de Dame Bazoche sur le trespas dudict Conte," two poems that Marot condemns in 1538 as part of the "lourderies qu'on a meslées en mes Livres" (OC I.384; OPC I.10). Although the poet finds them lacking, these poems establish remarkable parallels with the

---

<sup>186</sup> See also Hämel, p. 132, and Villey, "A propos d'une édition de Marot," pp. 159-60. For more on the unrest in Paris following Gérard Roussel's sermons and the banishment of Bédà, see Knecht, pp. 308-311.

<sup>187</sup> Nevertheless, we should not rule out the possibility of at least an initial collaboration between Marot and Juste, as Marot expresses regret in the 1538 preface of the *Œuvres* at having given his copies to printers who went on to show their ingratitude (OC I.383; OPC I.9).

*Adolescence* and sickness poems similar to those in the F.R. poems of the previous edition. The “Epitaphe du Conte de Salles” bears a strong resemblance to the last epitaph of the *Adolescence*, “De Jehan Serre, excellent joueur de Farces,” with the difference that it is much less humorous and centers on the vanity of worldly enterprises: “Des bonnes pars la meilleure ay choisie, / Fol est pour vray qui au monde se fie, / Car tel est bien hault juche qu’on desmonte” (f. 116v). The epitaph employs the same rhetoric of misfortune found in the *Autres Oeuvres* and sickness poems, and its affinity with both groups is made even clearer by an accounting metaphor: “Parquoy laissay pour bon gaige ma vie, / Dont j’ay quittance sans faulte ne mescompte / Escripte au Roolle des mors d’epidimye” (f. 116v). The “gaige” recalls the *Adolescence* which Marot has put down as “arres de ce mieulx,” and the “Roolle” recalls the “Epistre à monseigneur le Chancelier du Prat, nouvellement Cardinal, envoyée par ledict Marot oublyé en l’estat du Roy,” in which Marot demands to be put on the salary roll of the royal estate after having been omitted (*OC* I.220-221; *OPC* I.313-315). The death of this Count in an “epidimye,” as well as the ensuing “Complaincte de Dame Bazoche,” implies that the joyous farces of Marot’s youth are a thing of the past, swept away once and for all by his bout with the plague.<sup>188</sup> In this context, we may see in the line “Car tel est bien hault juche qu’on desmonte” a reference to *Luke* 14:11, “For whosoever exalteth himself shall be abased, and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted,” which would imply that the “on” is none other than God, who has brought Marot down so as to encourage him to humble himself in devotion.

The “Complaincte” is followed by two rondeaus. The first, “Au cueur ne peult ung chascun commander,” reintroduces the heart topos central to the “Temple de Cupido” and seen again in the poem to Vignals (*OC* I.253; *OPC* II.760-761). The second, “Juges, prevostz,

---

<sup>188</sup> Cf. Claude Blum’s argument that the ballad “Des Enfants sans soucy” marks a departure from the previous poems of the *Adolescence* by introducing the theme of youth gone by (75).

bourgeois, marchans, commun,” addresses all three estates as if predicting an imminent apocalypse:

Juges, prevostz, bourgeois, marchans, commun,  
Nobles, vilains, et vous seigneurs d’Eglise,  
Amendez vous: sinon je vous advise  
Que ne verrez l’an cinq cens quarante un (*OC* I.254.1-4; *OPC* II.761.1-4).

In Rigolot’s view, the moralizing warning is meant to have a comedic effect, as no one actually wants to live to the age of 541 (*OC* I.575, n. 785). While this is certainly a plausible interpretation, “l’an cinq cens quarante un” may refer to the year 1541 rather than to the age of 541. Moreover, in the context of a series of plague poems, the warning seems rather more dire than comedic, and the fact that the “seigneurs d’Eglise” are singled out by being mentioned last anticipates some of the more brazenly anticlerical poems to follow. The same may be said of the next poem, “Nostre maistre Geoffroy Brulart,” which, as Defaux and Rigolot note, abounds with theologically-loaded vocabulary, notably “Nostre maistre” (a translation of the title of *Magister Noster* given to theologians of the Sorbonne and other faculties) and “papelart” (*OC* II.464, n. 16; *OPC* II.1091). Addressing a theologian as if he were a physician, the poem serves as a transitional piece between the sickness poems and the three poems on Béda’s banishment; the narrative of Marot’s physical illness and subsequent turn to a higher calling begins to converge with a narrative of the Church’s spiritual sickness and subsequent cure through reform, of which French evangelicals (mistakenly) took Béda’s banishment by the king to be a sign. Marot’s physical illness and his resignation to it are recalled by the ensuing “Remede contre la peste,” a set of humorous instructions whose last two lines reveal its take on the inefficacy of medicine: “Continuez ung an ou deux; / De trois mois ne mourrez de peste” (*OC* II.463.23-24; *OPC* II.290.23-24).

The next five poems present an interpretive challenge; the debate poem beginning “Venir fault en toute saison,” the “Dizain du trop saoul, et de l’affamé,” and “Sur *Juppiter ex alto*” are especially incongruous. “De la Statue de Venus endormye” reiterates the preference of Ferme Amour to erotic love as seen in the *Temple de Cupido* by presenting Venus as a threat: “Ne l’esveille, elle ne vous nuyra. / Si l’esveille, croyez qu’elle ouvrira / Ses deux beaulx yeulx, pour les vostres bander” (*OC* I.371.3-5; *OPC* II.219.3-5). However, the first of these five poems, the rondeau “Qui ses besoignes veult bien faire,” acknowledges that Marot is still bound to attend to the poetic business that being a court poet entails “[s]elon le temps qui present court,” all while implying his increasing dissatisfaction with it: “Le Herault ung peu contrefaire, / Mais encore est il necessaire / Estre beau parleur, et non lourd” (*OC* I.254.7-9; *OPC* II.761.7-9). The notion of a herald suggests Marot’s official capacity as royal poet charged with proclaiming the king’s accomplishments and the major events of his reign; in the context of this poem, this job (“besoigne”) entails dissimulation and playing deaf, two things that Marot will explicitly refuse to do in the “Epistre de Marot aux Dames de Paris.” Unlike its predecessors, then, this edition paints a picture of a Marot who has not, like Victor Brodeau or Mantuan, succeeded in devoting himself entirely to religious poetry, but who retains his official capacity and his financial dependence on the king (as seen in the “Deux placets” included after the Béda poems), and who is burdened with poetic quarrels that detain him from pursuing his true calling.

After these five poems come the “Pater” and “Credo,” as well as a “Benediction devant manger” that would not be included in the 1538 *Œuvres*.<sup>189</sup> Two pious rondeaus, “O quel erreur, parfaictz esperitz” and “O Bon Jesus de Dieu eternal filz,” follow. This suite of religious poems

---

<sup>189</sup> This prayer may contain an implicit reference to the evangelical tenet of *sola scriptura*: “Donne nous par ton escripture / Que noz esprits soient nourris” (*OC* I.609, n. 126; *OPC* I.812.5-6).

is interrupted by what may be termed the *Adieux* quarrel, consisting of the “A Dieulx nouveaux” and Marot’s responses to its authors (though he may have been its actual author) and to the women who accuse him of having offended them by composing this satirical poem. This second response is most pertinent, as it represents a Marot who both distances himself from the *Adolescence* even further and bemoans his inability to undertake tasks worthy of his talent: “N’ay je passé ma jeunesse abusée / Autour de vous [?] laquelle j’eusse usée / En meilleur lieu (peut estre en pire aussy)” (*OC* I.309-310.69-71; *OPC* I.286.69-71). “Jeunesse” refers not just to the image we have of Marot’s youth in Paris from such poems of the *Adolescence* as the “Ballade de Marot du temps qu’il aprenoit à escrire au Palais à Paris,” but to the *Adolescence* in its entirety, suggesting that Marot has wasted his youthful compositions on women such as these (*OC* I.117-18; *OPC* I.113-14). Indeed, the poet explains that this is still the case, and that there are a number of vices he would gladly decry were he not burdened with replying to these impertinent Parisian women:

Tant de broillys, qu’en Justice on tolere,  
 Je l’escriroys mais je crains la collere.  
 L’oysiveté des Prebsters et Cagotz,  
 Je la diroys mais garde les fagotz.  
 Et des abus, dont l’Eglise est fourrée,  
 J’en parleroys, mais garde la bourrée (*OC* I.310.81-86; *OPC* I.286.81-86).

Both the preterition of these lines and the fact that the poems on Béda’s exile, which immediately follow this epistle, do indeed point to abuses of the clergy suggests that this edition defers what it ultimately provides, making use of Marot’s role as court poet and involvement in a quarrel to delay the inevitable arrival of the expanded prayer translations and engagement in what was regarded as a major victory for the evangelical cause. In fact, the poems recalling Marot’s role as royal poet may, in this light, be seen as further proof of this victory: the king’s poet speaks out in approval of the king’s decision, and to portray the poet as “herault” bolsters

the notion of the poet as the king's mouthpiece. Juste's edition thus bolsters the prestige advertising directed at evangelical readers by merging the narrative of Marot's poetic persona with the narrative of the Reformation in France, capping their intersection with the same two F. R. poems as in the previous edition. Marot himself, however, was not about to sit idly by while the persona he and his collaborators had worked so hard to build and publicize was tinkered with to appeal to readers who privileged a certain way of reading the poet's *œuvre*. He decided to fight fire with fire, meeting demand for the additional works promised in the *Adolescence* with the aptly named *Suite de l'Adolescence clémentine*.

**“Je n'en donne ung festu, pourveu qu'ayons son livre”: *La Suite de l'Adolescence clémentine***

The second authorized collection of Marot's works, the *Suite* (Mayer 15), was first published in late 1533 or early 1534 by Louis Blaubloom (who went by the Latinized name Cyaneus) for the widow of Pierre Roffet. As its title suggests, it is a continuation of the *Adolescence* published to compete with counterfeit editions, reproducing several of the poems that had already appeared in them, and to encourage readers of the *Adolescence* to continue to expect greater works from Marot. It serves as an even clearer example of prestige advertising than the *Adolescence*, both on the paratextual and textual levels: it is a much less impressively constructed volume than Tory's first printing of the *Adolescence*, and does not appear to be ordered anywhere near as carefully, but it surpasses its predecessor in terms of reaching out to the individual, anonymous reader.

Although the *Suite* contains much less paratext than the *Adolescence*, the paratext that it does contain is more forceful in calling attention to the printer/bookseller's role in presenting an author to the public. This role is elaborated upon in the first two of three Latin epigraphs which

follow the privilege, the first by Salmon Macrin with a translation by Antoine Macault, and the second by Nicolas Bourbon. The volume is thus endorsed by France's two most eminent Neo-Latin poets at the time, the first having been made a *valet de chambre du roy* like Marot and Macault by 1534, and the second having published his landmark *Nugae* in 1533 (McFarlane 109). In his epigraph, Macrin speaks to the reader as a reader, introducing an adversarial relationship between printer/publisher and poet, not unlike the one in Juste's letter appended to Colin's translation of the *Courtier*.<sup>190</sup> The printer/publisher serves as the reader's ally against the grudging author:

Quos tu tantopere expetis, probasque,  
 Demiransque stupes, amice lector,  
 Clementi nisi surpuisset audax  
 Maroto plagiarus libellos,  
 Esset copia nulla nunc legendi.  
 Proin si praemia danda sunt merenti,  
 Fraudari suo honore fas nec ullum,  
 Ipsi gratia non habenda vati est,  
 Qui nobis sua durus invidebat:  
 Sed furi magis illa publicanti,  
 Hoc quem conspicis ordine ac paratu  
 Non sane illepedo: nec invenusto.  
 Si auctori editio haud placet, quid ad me?  
 Iphis dum liceat frui libellis? (*OC* I.261; *OPC* I.205).

There would be no copy to read of these books which you so desire, esteem, and marvel at in awe, dear reader, had a bold thief not nicked them from Clément Marot. Thus, if the deserving are to be rewarded, and if it is not just to defraud someone of what he has earned, thanks should be given not to the cruel poet who begrudged us his works, but to the thief who makes them public in the not altogether unrefined or unappealing order and preparation that you see. If the author doesn't like the fact that it was published, what do I care, so long as these books may be enjoyed?

Given that the poem reappears in the 1538 *Œuvres*, the epigraph certainly does not reflect an historical fact, but rather the commonplace of the stolen manuscript (McFarlane 109; *OC* I.576, n. 3). The vocabulary ("copia," "publicanti," "editio") suggests that the thief is actually the

<sup>190</sup> See above, Introduction, p. 3.

printer/bookseller who makes the work public, perhaps without the author's approval. This "thief" is also given credit for the painstaking ordering and preparation so important to Marot, whose satisfaction is ultimately insignificant when compared with that of the reader. To return to Greimas's terms, the author who attempts to rein in the publication of his works acts as an *opposant* by impeding the reader's enjoyment of the book, whereas the printer who countermands the author's dictates acts as an *adjuvant*. Ironically, the very same may be said of unauthorized editions, whose printer/publishers could very well have used "Ipsis dum liceat frui libellis" as their motto: "frui" means "to profit by" as well as "to enjoy," and the reader's enjoyment entails their profit. The *Suite* is a case of man bites dog, of an authorized edition imitating unauthorized editions which offer never-before-seen works. Unable to beat these impostors, the *Suite* presents itself as if it were joining them, but in so doing, it legitimizes the sort of prestige advertising whereby these competitors place the desires of the reader above those of the author.

Antoine Macault's translation is notable only in how it renders lines 10-12: "[...] L'autre ce bien a faict, / Qu'en tresbon et bel ordre à ung chascun le livre" (*OC* I.261; *OPC* I.205). The phrase "à ung chascun" addresses an indeterminate public and represents the simultaneous humanist, evangelical, and popular appeal of the *Suite*: it is meant for anyone, even those incapable of or unskilled at reading Latin, and the latter are made to recognize this fact by Macault's French translation.<sup>191</sup> The translation is followed by Nicolas Bourbon's brief epigraph "Ad lectorem," which also privileges the reader's enjoyment over the author's control and reiterates the theme of the book as sample from the *Adolescence*:

---

<sup>191</sup> Cf. "Quinziesme Elegie": "Et là dessus escryz termes mordans / D'ung traict lisible à tous les regardans" (*OC* I.287.29-30; *OPC* I.256.29-30).

Hic liber ignaro Domino volitare per orbem  
 Inque tuas (lector) gaudet abire manus.  
 Ex his conjicito, quae sint, et quanta futura  
 Caetera, quae auctoris lima severa premit (*OC* I.262; *OPC* I.206).

Reader, this book rejoices in heading out, unbeknownst to its master, to fly around the world and into your hands. From it, you can infer how great those things the author's strict revision is shaping are, and how great what else there is to come will be.

The image of the "lima," which figuratively means "revision" but literally means "file," recalls the artisanal metaphors (such as "coup d'essai") introduced in the preface of the *Adolescence*, and portrays the poet in a process of continual production and refinement.<sup>192</sup> The volume has been produced by the "limae labor et mora" whose neglect in Latin letters is lamented by Horace in the *Ars poetica* (291). This neglect, Horace claims, is the only reason why Latium is more famous for feats of arms than for letters; the fact that Marot does not neglect this labor allows him to vie with his Roman predecessors.

The last Latin epigraph, Macrin's second, replaces Marot's poetry firmly within the tradition of *translatio studii*. Drawing on the usual Maro/Marot wordplay, it states that just as Virgil excelled by preferring his native Latin to Homer's Greek, so too does Marot become the prince of French poets ("princeps") by opting for French instead of Macrin's and Bourbon's Latin (*OC* I.262; *OPC* I.206).<sup>193</sup> Georges Soubeille has also seen in the use of the word

<sup>192</sup> Cf. the "Rondeau de Marot à Monsieur de Belleville, qui lui transmist une Epistre parlant de Madame de Chasteaubryant": "Prens cest escript mal poly et lymé" (*OC* I.364.4; *OPC* I.172.4). A translation of Bourbon's epigraph by Macault was added in a posterior edition (Mayer 17), but it does not render "lima" at all. It stresses only the point that the present book is proof of greater things to come: "Lecteur, ce livre s'esjouyt de venir / Entre tes mains sans le sceu de son maistre, / Par qui peux veoir que sera ce du mettre / Lequel repose soubz plus meur souvenir" (*OC* I.576, n. 7; *OPC* I.607).

<sup>193</sup> The Maro/Marot pun is the entire theme of two further unattributed epigraphs, the "A. C. Distichon" and "M. A. Tetrastichon," found in the paratext of late 1534 editions of the *Adolescence* and *Suite* published by Guillaume Boullé and Juste (Mayer 23, 25). Their authorship remains uncertain, though Defaux suggests that "M. A." could be Antoine Macault,

“princeps” a reference to Horace: “Libera per vacuum posui vestigia princeps, / non aliena meo pressi pede” (“I was the first to plant free footsteps on a virgin soil; I walked not where others trod”; *Epistles* bk. 1, ep.19, ll. 21-22; trans. Fairclough).<sup>194</sup> Soubeille argues that Macrin concedes the superiority of French to Latin as a poetic language for the French, and acknowledges Marot’s superior role as an innovator (102).<sup>195</sup> Thus, the paratext of the *Suite* maintains the humanist image of Marot fostered in the paratext of the *Adolescence*, all while augmenting the edition’s prestige advertising by presenting the printer/bookseller as more attentive to the reader’s desires than to the author’s and increasingly soliciting the indeterminate, individual reader who might be otherwise tempted to purchase and read a counterfeit edition.

The text of the *Suite*, in conjunction with the paratext, further blurs the distinction between private transaction and public consumption. Griffin, in describing what he calls the “formlessness” of Marot’s poetry, stresses how often the poet represents himself as a poet, self-consciously engaged in the act of creating (246). When reconsidered in light of the dissemination of Marot’s poems in print, this poetic metadiscourse on the circumstances and techniques of creation may be seen as a guarantor of quality for the reader. For example, the speaker of the eleventh elegy invites his recalcitrant mistress to “fai[re] recueil” of his heart, or rather of the elegy which testifies to the state of his heart, which he presents to her, and which is free “[...] De faulx penser, faintise, ou trahison; / Il n’a sur luy faulte, ne mesprison; / En luy ne sont aucunes amour vaines” (*OC* I.282.15-19; *OPC* I.251.15-19). The parallel between the speaker’s heart and the “recueil” that is the *Suite*, expurgated of errors by a poet who abandons “vaine amour” for “Ferme Amour” in the *Adolescence*, is clear. An even more explicit

---

while Berthon proposes either Martin Akakia or Michel Amy (“Marot, Tory, Rabelais” 420, n. 5; “Intention” 165, n. 1).

<sup>194</sup> Ronsard cites the very same lines in the preface to the 1550 edition of his *Odes*.

<sup>195</sup> See also Pauline Smith, “Clément Marot and Humanism,” p. 137.

confluence of presentation copy and edition occurs in the “Epistre à Monseigneur le Grant Maistre de Montmorency, par laquelle Marot luy envoie ung petit recueil de ses Oeuvres, et luy recommande le porteur.”<sup>196</sup> The *recueil* offered to the future Constable bears a truly striking resemblance to the *Adolescence* as described in its preface:

C'est ung amas de choses espendues,  
 Qui (quant à moy) estoient si bien perdues,  
 Que mon esprit n'eut onq à les ouvrer  
 Si grant labeur comme à les recouvrer.  
 Mais comme ardant à faire vostre vueil,  
 J'ay tant cherché qu'en ay faict ung recueil  
 Et un jardin garny de fleurs diverses,  
 De couleur jaulne, et de rouges, et perses.  
 Vray est qu'il est sans arbre, ne grant fruit.  
 Ce neantmoins je ne vous l'ay construit  
 Des pires fleurs qui de moy sont sorties.  
 Il est bien vray qu'il y a des orties.  
 Mais ce ne sont que celles qui picquerent  
 Les Musequins qui de moy se mocquerent (*OC* I.319.13-26; *OPC* I.296.13-26).

First of all, it is important to note the conflict between the poet's perception of the works in this collection and his burning desire to fulfill Montmorency's request. The poet, not unlike Mantuan in the *Bucolica*, is actually quite pleased that these works were lost, but his desire to please the Grand Maître wins out. As in Macrin and Bourbon's epigraphs, Marot's wishes to restrict the distribution of his works wanes before this reader's desire to acquire a copy of them.

Additionally, the verb “recouvrer” is the same one used to introduce the horticultural metaphor in the preface of the *Adolescence* (“ce que j'ay peu *recouvrer* d'arbres, d'herbes, et fleurs de mon printemps”), a metaphor which is itself applied to Montmorency's collection. There is even a similarity between the description of the presentation copy as “sans arbre, ne grant fruit” and the proviso in the preface of the *Adolescence* that newly-grafted trees do not produce much

---

<sup>196</sup> For more on Marot's relationship with Anne de Montmorency, see Rigolot, *Recueil inédit*, pp. 159-64.

pleasant-tasting fruit. Even the nettles, which are only present in Montmorency's collection to sting the "Musequins" who mock the poet, recall the plethora of biting satirical poems directed at Marot's critics in both the *Adolescence* and *Suite*.<sup>197</sup> The text suggests that the edition in which it appears, the edition which the reader holds in his hand, is comparable in both conception and execution to a manuscript collection submitted to a high-ranking noble with the power to grant offices in the king's household.<sup>198</sup> In so doing, it narrows the gap between a copy prepared for a specific, influential patron and a book meant for production in the thousands and a comparatively wide distribution; a copy of the *Suite* is every bit as much a presentation copy for the reader who acquires it as Montmorency's collection is for him.

If the text of the *Suite* clearly draws attention to the production and distribution of the edition, its effects on Marot's poetic persona are somewhat less clear, especially in terms of thematic and sequential coherence. While the *Adolescence* follows a definite chronological principle and represents the evolution of both the poet's career and the poet's vocation, the *Suite*, aside from its continuation of grouping by genre (with the notable exception of the "Menu"), does not present any distinct sense of ordering or maturation. If anything, the collection appears *prima facie* to disrupt the illness and conversion narrative toward which Roffet editions of the *Adolescence* had begun to work. The "Elegies" are entirely devoted to love, both good and bad, as if to suggest that the poet, even after leaving his "adolescence" behind, remains a servant of

---

<sup>197</sup> Cotgrave amusingly renders "Musequin" as "an effeminate, or perfumed Courtier, that makes love to every wench he accompanies." The epistles "A celluy qui l'injuria par escript, et ne se osa nommer" and "A celluy qui devant le Roy dist que ce mot, viser, (dont Marot usa) n'estoit bon langage" which follow shortly after the epistle to Montmorency particularly come to mind.

<sup>198</sup> Cf. the "Dizain de Marot à Monsieur le Grant Maistre pour estre mys en l'estat" in the "Menu" (OC I.366; OPC II.213).

the God of Love.<sup>199</sup> The *Suite* does not overtly contain a movement from lesser to greater works, either, as the title of the concluding “Menu” (Lat. *minutus*, “diminished”) implies that the section is comprised of pieces of lesser importance (*OC* I.593, n. 236).<sup>200</sup>

Nevertheless, the *Suite* does contain subtle hints at the poet’s continued maturation toward greater works, and the most salient of these hints may be found in the twenty-first and final elegy. A reprise of the traditional theme of the *mal mariée*, the elegy closely resembles the “Epistre de Maguelonne” in both structure (notably the concluding rondeau) and theme, in that its speaker resigns herself to her situation rather than commit a sin (here, taking a lover rather than Maguelonne’s option to commit suicide). Rather, she appeals to the Virgin Mary and, in keeping with *Matthew* 5:39, resolves to turn the other cheek: “Je ne feray ne serviteur, n’amy, / Mais tiendray foy à mon grant ennemy” (*OC* I.304.87-88; *OPC* I.273.87-88). The speaker then justifies turning to Mary with a reference to the opening lines of Psalm 41: “Comme le Cerf, qui court à la fontaine, / Cherchant remede à la soif qui le presse. / Nature aussi ne veult que ailleurs m’adresse” (*OC* I.305.96-98; *OPC* I.273.96-98). The “Elegies,” then, when taken on their own, do indicate a move toward religion, and specifically toward translation of the Psalms. This same sense of evolution toward the Psalms is adopted in subsequent editions as a way of reconciling the *Suite* with the *Adolescence*, and of establishing a more consistent trajectory for Marot’s aspirations.

---

<sup>199</sup> Cf. Duval: “Tout se passe comme si Marot, prisonnier de sa première manière, était incapable de parvenir tout à fait à ce ‘mieulx’ prévu et promis en 1532” (“*L’Adolescence clémentine*” 22).

<sup>200</sup> The “Menu,” incidentally, no longer appears in the *Suite* in the 1538 *Œuvres*.

**“Ma Jeunesse abusée”: The *Adolescence* and *Suite* during Marot’s Exile**

The March 7, 1534 Roffet edition of the *Adolescence* (Mayer 16) is likely a response to the second Juste edition. Like the latter, it includes the sickness poems, and after these, the remainder of the *Adolescence* matches the content of the Juste edition quite closely. However, the prayer translations do not appear here, but rather at the beginning of the corresponding *Suite* (Mayer 17). They are grouped under the heading “L’Instruction et foy d’ung chrestien,” the same title affixed to them in the Augereau editions of Marguerite de Navarre where they first appeared in print, and they now include a translation of the *Ave Maria* and the “Graces pour ung enfant” (OC I.434-435; OPC I.390-392). They are also followed by Marot’s translation of Psalm 6, whose “Argument” presents it as a song of the afflicted: “L’Affligé de longue Maladie (quant à la lettre) prie ardemment icy pour sa santé, ayant horreur de la Mort, et desirant (ains que mourir) glorifier encores le nom de Dieu. Puis tout à coup s’esjouist de la guarison recouvrée, et de la honte de ses Ennemis” (OC I.435; OPC I.392). It is as if the psalm were the inevitable outcome of the sickness poems and Marot’s “longue maladie.” Right from the beginning, the *Suite* provides an image of the poet that picks up where the narrative of the *Adolescence* leaves off. The poet nearly succumbs to the plague, confronts death, and sees the error of his ways, resolving to glorify God’s name and begging God not to punish him any further: “N’en ta fureur terrible / Me punir de l’orrible / Tourment qu’ay meritè” (OC I.435.4-6; OPC I.392.4-6). The psalm translation stands as proof that Marot has applied his skills to the glorification of God by bringing God’s word to all readers, even those only capable of understanding the vernacular.<sup>201</sup>

This edition, as well as all the ensuing Roffet editions, compensates for the perplexing and

---

<sup>201</sup> In this vein, George Joseph notes that Marot’s Psalm translations are written in a low style so as to reflect the idea that the Supreme Being expresses Himself humbly in order to reach everyone (120).

potentially disappointing structure of the *Suite* by appending the *Instruction* and Psalm to the beginning of the standard text. In so doing, it perpetuates the interest of evangelical readers by holding up the Psalm as proof that Marot has fully committed himself to their cause.

At the same time, however, the Roffet editions of the *Suite*, starting with the third edition (Mayer 20), also attempt to impose a sort of order on the collection as a whole in the paratext. An anonymous quatrain is inserted after the table of contents which provides instructions, as it were, on the place of each section within the *Suite*:

Les Elegies suyvent L'adolescence.  
Non differant Epistres, Chantz divers,  
Le Cymetiere plaint apres tristes vers,  
Quant le Menu vient a convalescence (\*2r).

The collection follows the *Adolescence*, and is meant to be regarded as continuous with it, even if printed separately. The phrase “Non differant Epistres, Chantz divers” implies that these sections might have been of greatest interest to many readers, whom the quatrain reassures that they will not have to wait long to reach them. It even implies that the troublesome “Menu” has a salutary role, that of providing joy and laughter to counteract the “tristes vers” of the “Cymetiere.”<sup>202</sup> While the edition justifies itself to evangelical readers with the addition of the *Instruction* and Psalm, it also justifies itself in the paratext to readers primarily seeking entertainment. Printer/publishers can manipulate both the order of poems and the way in which the reader perceives this order.

Denis de Harsy's 1534 *Adolescence* (R1) hedges its bets between an evangelical and humanist audience and an audience concerned with pure enjoyment.<sup>203</sup> Notably, it is the first

---

<sup>202</sup> Cf. the dizain in the paratext of *Gargantua*: “Voyant le dueil, qui vous mine et consomme, / Mieulx est de ris que de larmes escripre” (3). See below, Chapter Three, p. 218.

<sup>203</sup> This edition, like all of Harsy's editions of Marot, does not list the publisher or place of publication, but does contain Harsy's mark in the colophon, a foot soldier holding a shield with a

edition to shift “Marot envoye le livre de son Adolescence à une Dame” from text to paratext by placing it before the preface, a practice adopted in the 1538 *Œuvres*. After the preface, it inserts an anonymous *douzain* which underscores the essential role played by editors of both prose and poetry in Western literature from its very beginnings:

Merveille n'est si es Auteurs antiques  
 Tant en couleurs, qu'en fureur poetiques  
 Maint Aristarque a sa dent impose.  
 Merveilles n'est aux oeuvres authentiques  
 De douce prose ou biens plaisans Cantiques  
 Des trespassez si tant ont transpose,  
 Change, brouille, corrompu, suppose,  
 Faulcifie, deprave, transpose,  
 Car de Clement poete a stile fin,  
 Qui en beau francoys maintz vers a compose  
 En ses traictez a l'on interpose,  
 Qu'il n'est pas mort, et si vivra sans fin (f. 3r).<sup>204</sup>

The *douzain* sets up a parallel between the editors of Marot and Aristarchus of Samothrace, the grammarian and early editor of Homer who literally left his mark on the Greek bard's epics (“a sa dent impose”). Editorial intervention may often result in unwelcome changes from the author's point of view; to wit, the litany of violations visited upon past authors (“Change, brouille, corrompu, suppose, / Faulcifie, deprave, transpose”) bears a striking resemblance to the accusations Marot levels against printers in his prefaces. Nevertheless, this intervention is the only means of guaranteeing a text's survival and, with it, the author's fame. Desan somewhat

---

face on it. Notably, Harsy published an edition of Mantuan's *Bucolica* in 1523, and as his career progressed, he shifted focus from breviaries and missals to editions and translations of ancient and modern authorities, including Seneca, Petrarch, Erasmus, Bembo, Juvenal, Horace, Lucan, and Quintilian. Harsy's editions of Marot, then, mark a departure from his usual fare, and may represent an attempt to expand his market beyond humanists and clerics. See Gültlingen, vol. 4, pp. 101-53.

<sup>204</sup> Villey reproduces this *douzain* in its entirety (*Tableau Chronologique* 61), as does Desan (697). Both critics, unaware of the Rutgers copies, claim that it first appeared in the 1537 Denis Janot edition (Mayer 55), which is in fact a counterfeit of the Harsy editions, as is the accompanying *Suite* (Mayer 56).

tersely points to this *dizain* as proof that a text no longer belongs to its author once the editor transforms it into a book (“Profit du libraire” 697). However, if this *dizain* places all editors, from Aristarchus to contemporaries, on the same level, it especially does so for all editors of Marot, attributing interventions in the *Adolescence* not to any specific editor, but simply to “l’on.” In so leveling all editions of Marot, authorized and unauthorized, it justifies to readers the existence of the Harsy edition, whose content is derived entirely from Roffet and Juste editions.<sup>205</sup> This clever strategy is diametrically opposed to the one adopted in Roffet editions, which, as early as the August 19, 1534 *Adolescence* (Mayer 19), speciously claim that “Et ne sont en ce present livre autres meschantes oeuvres mal composees, que on impose estre du dict acteur, les quelles il reprouve et desavoue” (f. 1r).<sup>206</sup> Whereas the Roffet editions stake a dubious claim to authenticity, the Harsy edition, essentially a counterfeit of other counterfeits, defines the role of the editor in such a way as to put clearly unauthorized editions on the same footing as authorized ones by privileging the editor over the author, not unlike how Macrin and Bourbon privilege the printer/publisher over the author in the paratext of the *Suite*.

The Harsy *Adolescence* also makes itself even more accessible to vernacular readers than previous editions, providing translations of all three Latin epigraphs. The rendering of Tory’s is of particular note in that it is geared strictly toward amusement: “Veulx tu brocards, esbas, jeux, ris et graces? / Viens a Marot, et de ce rendz luy graces” (f. 3v). Gone is any reference to laurels

---

<sup>205</sup> Its most original contribution to Marot’s publication history comes in the form of generic woodcuts before each poem, which Janot would also copy.

<sup>206</sup> This edition contains many of the apocryphal works first printed in Juste’s July 12, 1534 *Adolescence*, and adds several more, including the “Alphabet du temps present” that Marot would disavow in 1538. To be fair, they are preceded by a heading which reads “S’ensuyent aucunes oeuvres qui ne sont de la facon dudict Marot” (250). However, not only is this header misleading, as several of these works would later be included in the *Suite* or *Œuvres*, but its attribution of the works to poets other than Marot does not change the fact that the section belies the title page.

or Cyprian myrtle, leaving in the translation only an indication of Marot's humor, wit, and lighthearted poetry. By adding this translation, but keeping the original Latin, the edition simultaneously frames Marot's persona for both humanist readers likely to see in Marot a rival of the ancients and vernacular readers interested in the popular Marot.

As for Juste, he did not remain quiet after Marot went into exile following the Affair of the Placards on the night of October 17, 1534. In fact, the oppressive atmosphere that followed in the wake of the event does not seem to have daunted him in the least, if his December 12, 1534 *Adolescence* and its accompanying *Suite* (Mayer 24, 25) are any indication, though of course, Lyons's distance from the capital afforded it greater freedom than could be enjoyed in Paris. Not only does Juste keep the Bédà poems in the *Adolescence*, but he adds two more strongly anti-Sorbonne poems at the end of the *Suite*. The first, the *huitain* "Le Roy, aymant la decoration," suggests that the Sorbonne should be made into "la place aux veaux" as part of Francis I's renovations of Paris (*OC* II.472.8; *OPC* II.289.8). The second, the "Dizain sur le dict d'ung Theologien," is even more risqué, as it goes beyond simple anticlerical satire to argue against the efficacy of works. In it, a doctor of theology admits to his recalcitrant lover that "Je ne peux rien meriter de vous, belle," then preaches that eternal life can be earned by what one does and says. The poet's response parodies the language of scholastic disputation:

*Arguo sic: si magister Lourdis*  
 De sa Catin meriter ne peult rien,  
*Ergo* ne peult meriter Paradis  
 Car pour le moins Paradis la vault bien (*OC* II.471.7-10; *OPC* II.288.7-10).<sup>207</sup>

Given Marot's absence during the publication of this edition, it is difficult to determine whether these poems are actually his. Nevertheless, their presence at the end of the *Suite* perpetuates the

---

<sup>207</sup> Defaux suggests that "*magister Lourdis*" could refer to the potbellied Bédà (*OPC* II.1088, n. 3).

image of a Marot all the more committed to the evangelical cause despite the stunning reversal of its fortunes after the Affair of the Placards and his own exile.<sup>208</sup>

In this same year, Harsy once again proves to be an innovative publisher of Marot, this time by incorporating both the so-called *cycle carcéral* and Marot's exile in Ferrara into the *Suite* (R2).<sup>209</sup> The *cycle* is followed by the "Dixain a ses amys, quant en laissant la Royne de Navarre fut receu en la maison et estat de ma dame Renee, Duchesse de Ferrare," the "Dixain au Duc de Ferrare par Clement Marot a son arrivee," and the "Huictain faict a Ferrare" (*OC* II.213-14, 322; *OPC* II.251, 296-97).<sup>210</sup> To conclude the *Suite* with poems written from exile reflects the latest development in the poet's career, and, not unlike the plague poems in the Roffet editions of the *Adolescence*, leaves this career in a state of suspense. Yet, the close proximity of these poems to the *cycle carcéral*, as well as several clear parallels between the two sets, must be noted. The narratives of both sets revolve around Marot running afoul of the authorities. However, the roles played by the poet's ladies are reversed between these two narratives. The *cycle* begins with the "Rondeau qui fut cause de sa prinse," in which the poet laments that his lover abandons him "Comme inconstante et de cuer faulse et lasche" (*OC* I.395.1; *OPC* I.176.1). In the ensuing "Ballade qu'il feit en prison" the poet goes on to explain that this same woman precipitated his arrest, stressing not only the famously ambiguous accusation of "Prenez le, il a mangé le Lard," but also her vindictiveness: "Or est ma cruelle Ennemye / Vangée bien amerement" (*OC*

---

<sup>208</sup> Juste's 1535 editions (Mayer 31, 34) are almost identical in terms of content.

<sup>209</sup> The *cycle carcéral* was first published in the second edition of the *Premier Livre de la Métamorphose* (Mayer 21) with the heading "Item certaines oeuvres qu'il feit en prison." Consequently, this edition's description of it as "Certaines oeuvres, que Marot feit en la prison, lesquelles n'avoient encores estees mise[s] en lumiere jusques a present" is inaccurate (L5r). For an account of how the *cycle* is altered in the 1538 *Œuvres* to reflect genre more than autobiography, see Huchon, "Rhétorique et poétique des genres."

<sup>210</sup> These poems also appear in the collection offered to Montmorency and preserved in Chantilly ms. 524 (*Recueil* 204, 271). After his falling-out with Ercole d'Este, Marot rededicates the Duke's *dizain* to the Duchess in the collection.

I.392.17-18; *OPC* I.126.17-18). In the “Dizain a ses amys,” on the other hand, it is the poet who appears to be inconstant, conceding that “Mes Amys, j’ay changé ma Dame; / Une autre a dessus moy puissance” (*OC* II.213.1-2; *OPC* II.297.1-2). Although he speaks of his patronesses in the vocabulary of courtly love purely in jest, and is in fact referring to the fact that he joined Renée’s retinue after seeking refuge with Marguerite in Nérac after the Affair of the Placards, the poem’s proximity to the *cycle* invites a parallel reading. Whereas the poet’s lover further betrays her jealousy by seeking vengeance, Marguerite exhibits no sign of jealousy toward the poet’s “inconstancy”: “Je suis bien sur qu’elle en aura / Plus d’aise que de jalousie” (*OC* II.214.9-10; *OPC* II.297.9-10). Similarly, in this context, the *huitain* could be read as praise of the steadfast support of Renée, Marot’s new “amye” whose affection grows the more Marot’s enemies attempt to discredit him. This reversal of roles between the two sets underscores the fact that Marot, despite being in exile, still has true friends in high places, and hints that just as the poet is eventually set free in the *cycle*, so too will he eventually return from exile. By juxtaposing these two narratives, the edition leaves Marot’s career in a perilous state, but provides the reader with ample reason to believe that it will take a turn for the better once again.

### **“[A]ffin que les Lecteurs ne se plaignent”: The 1538 *Œuvres* as a Response to and Adaptation of Unauthorized Editions**

The twin publication of the 1538 *Œuvres* in Lyons by Étienne Dolet and Sébastien Gryphe (Mayer 70, 71) both departs from and imitates the practices of previous editions, including the unauthorized editions which Marot laments in the preface.<sup>211</sup> The *Œuvres*

---

<sup>211</sup> For historical details of the edition, Marot’s quarrel with Dolet, and Juste’s involvement as printer, see Defaux, “Trois cas d’écrivains éditeurs” and “Marot et ses éditions lyonnaises: Étienne Dolet, Sébastien Gryphe et François Juste,” *RHLF* 93.6 (1993), pp. 819-49. See also Veyrin-Forrer, “Les *Œuvres* de Clément Marot: Questions bibliographiques” and “Les premières

represent the height of prestige advertising in Marot's publication history, strongly indicating the poet's familiarity with multiple unauthorized editions of his works and tacitly incorporating some of their most significant strategies. In so doing, they reveal that the demands of the reader are ever present to both poet and publisher, and that the success of the unauthorized editions must have been great enough to compel them to beat these editions by joining them.

The full title of the *Œuvres* reads: *Les Oeuvres de Clément Marot de Cahors, valet de chambre du Roy. Augmentées de deux Livres d'Epigrammes Et d'un grand nombre d'autres Oeuvres par cy devant non imprimées. Le tout songneusement par luy mesmes reveu, et mieulx ordonné* (OC I.381). It simultaneously indicates the additional and never-before-seen material contained in the volume, Marot's personal and painstaking revision of the edition, and the superior ordering of this edition with respect to previous ones. Yet, if the title points above all to the author's role, other aspects of the paratext point primarily to the printer/bookseller's role, especially in the Dolet edition. In it, Dolet's mark, which directly follows the title, calls attention to the Orleanese humanist's role as editor: "Scabra, et impolita ad amussim dolo, atque perpolio" ("That which is rough and unfinished, I hew with precision and polish"; OC I.381). The image of the "doloire" or "dolouere," a planing hatchet, resonates with that of the "amussis" (ruler or straightedge) to formulate an artisanal image of the editor who transforms the raw material of the text ("scabra, et impolita") into the finished book.<sup>212</sup> Dolet's Latin epigraph on the verso of the

---

éditions collectives de Clément Marot publiées à Lyon." The Dolet edition is the base for both *OC* and *OPC*, whereas Frank Lestringant's edition of the *Adolescence* is based on the Gryphe edition.

<sup>212</sup> As in the *Suite*, Marot himself refers to carpenter's tools in the epistle "A Alexis Juré de Quiers en Piedmont" in a manner highly reminiscent of Dolet's mark: "Mais il fault / Ton deffault / Raboter / Pour oster / Les gros noeudz / Lours et neufz / Du langage / Tout ramage. / Et que limes / Quand tu rimes / Tes Mesures / Et Cesures" (OC I.415-16.29-40; OPC I.334.29-40). Griffin points to this epistle as proof of Marot's familiarity with Horace (95).

title page, addressed “ad Clementis Maroti librum,” further stresses that an edition is the result of a collective effort:

Autoris arte tui superbus in lucem  
 Exi Liber: sed non minus superbe unguem  
 Ostende cuilibet, nitore tam raro,  
 Mendisque nullis exiens nunc in lucem.  
 Exire sic te voluimus nonne Amici,  
 Purum, nitidum, tersum, et carentem omni labe (*OC* I.382; *OPC* I.6).

Go forth proudly in public, book, thanks to your author’s art. But do not display your perfection to anyone with any less pride, for its elegance is so rare, and you appear in public now free of faults. Is this not how we, your friends, wanted you to come out: pure, splendid, clean, and free from all defects?

Similarly to Bourbon in his epigraph for the *Suite*, Dolet puts Marot in position to vie with the ancients through a reference to the *Ars poetica*, and indeed to the very same passage to which Bourbon refers. Just after complaining of the absence of “limae labor” in Latin letters, Horace instructs his Calpurnian correspondents to condemn any poem that has not been rigorously corrected ten times over “ad unguem” (“to the test of the close-cut nail”; 294; trans. Fairclough 475).<sup>213</sup> This perfection and polish is not the result of the author’s work alone, but of the efforts of its “friends,” both those involved in its publication (reinforced by Marot’s references to Dolet as “Amy” in the preface) and the larger community of “freres d’Apollon” evoked in the preface of the *Adolescence*.

In the preface of the *Œuvres*, addressed to Dolet in Dolet’s edition and to “ceux qui par cy devant ont imprime ses oeuvres” in the Gryphe edition, Marot takes to task the editors of unauthorized editions, and the fact that the poet speaks of them collectively implies that all of the

---

<sup>213</sup> Horace also employs the phrase in the *Satires*, describing Fonteius Capito as an “ad unguem factus homo” (bk. 1, sat. 5, ll. 32-33). Fairclough notes that the metaphor originates in sculpture, where the artist would pass his fingernail over marble to test its smoothness (66, n. b). Cotgrave gives the equivalent French expression of “conduire à l’ongle,” “to finish, or bring unto perfection; to leave no jot undone of.” Erasmus, for his part, lists “Ad amussim” and “Ad unguem” next to one another in the *Adages* (1.5.90-91).

previous editors and printer/booksellers of Marot's works, including the Roffet clan, are equally guilty.<sup>214</sup> Their editions, Marot claims, have both stained his honor and put him in personal danger:

[C]ar par avare couvoitise de vendre plus cher, et plustost, ce qui se vendoit assez, ont adjousté à icelles miennes Oeuvres plusieurs aultres qui ne me sont rien: dont les unes sont froidement et de mauulvaise grace composées, mettant sur moy l'ignorance d'aultruy, et les aultres toutes pleines de scandale et sedition (*OC* I.383; *OPC* I.9).

Marot's adversaries are represented as being motivated entirely by profit. Not content with counterfeiting a work that, as Marot claims and his publication history confirms, has already sold very well, they have opted to add allographic works, some of which are not worthy of Marot's skill, thereby staining the poet's honor, and some of which are scandalous enough to endanger a poet with a penchant for getting himself into trouble.<sup>215</sup> Adding these works allows them to sell more copies and perhaps to charge more for them by virtue of novelty, and it is true that a great many of these additions advertise the presence of new material within them on their title

---

<sup>214</sup> See *OC* I.598-599, n. 1-15 for a list of variants between the respective prefaces of the two editions. See also Lestringant's *Adolescence*, pp. 37-38, for the full version of the Gryphe preface.

<sup>215</sup> It is unclear which works Marot believes to be "pleines de scandale et sedition." The July 12, 1533 and December 12, 1534 Juste editions of the *Adolescence* and *Suite* (Mayer 14 bis, 24, 25), which contain the "Gracieux adieux faictz aux Dames de Paris" as well as the anti-Sorbonne poems, seem like probable candidates, though the latter actually satirize theologians who themselves encourage sedition. Interestingly, the June 20, 1535 Roffet *Adolescence* (Mayer 32), whose authority is questionable due to the fact that it was published during Marot's exile, contains a proviso on its title page whose language is quite reminiscent of the 1538 preface. It claims that the works it contains have been reviewed and corrected by the author against counterfeit printings, "[...] ausquelles a son grant deshonneur ont este adjoustees aulcunes oeuvres scandaleuses mal composees et incorrectes, desquelles craignant yceluy non seulement le blasme de chose si mal faicte, aussy le grant dommaige qui luy pourroit venir a cause desdictes oeuvres scandaleuses, apres avoir desavoue lesdictes oeuvres a obtenu privilege oultre les troys ans premiers deulx autres ans qui sont cinq ans, commencans a la date de la premiere Impression" (f. 1r).

pages.<sup>216</sup> To attribute the interventions of printers and editors to avarice discredits these editions in the eyes of consumers. Prestige advertising, the mode adopted by Marot in both the preface of the *Adolescence* and that of the *Œuvres*, is precisely intended to allay fears the consumer might have regarding the profit motive; by claiming to focus on craftsmanship or the good of the consumer, producers absolve themselves of the charge that they are willing to sacrifice quality for profit. Conversely, to accuse competitors of caring only for profit is to imply that they produce products of inferior quality. Marot's accusation, when combined with the title page's insistence on both the author's and the editor's care and attention to detail, refocuses the argument on quality, and points to the additional material offered by competing editions as evidence not of their worth, but of their deficiency: by giving more, unauthorized editions are, in fact, giving less. The preface of the Dolet edition is far from a universal condemnation of unscrupulous printers, as it uses the latter as a foil, much as Juste does in Colin's *Courtier*. Dolet's skill is stressed by the poet who entrusts him with the task of reprinting his works, "[...] non seulement ainsi correct que je le t'envoie mais encores mieulx: [ce] qui te sera facile si tu y veulx mettre la diligence egalle à ton sçavoir" (*OC* I. 384; *OPC* I.10).<sup>217</sup> Whereas competing printer/booksellers are motivated only by gain, and hence are capable only of mutilating the text, Dolet is capable of improving upon the text if needs be, not unlike Aristarchus in the *dizain* from the Harsy editions of the *Adolescence*.

The preface goes on to reintroduce the horticultural and agricultural metaphors familiar to readers of the *Adolescence*: "[D]e tous ces miens Labeurs le proffit leur en retourne. J'ay planté

---

<sup>216</sup> This is the case for all of Juste's editions (Mayer 13, 14bis, 24, 25, 31, 34) and the Boullé, Harsy, Janot, and 1538 Bonnemère editions of the *Adolescence* (Mayer 23, R1, R2, Mayer 55, 58, and 66).

<sup>217</sup> Of course, this sentence does not appear in the preface to the Gryphe edition, which is no longer addressed to Dolet.

les Arbres; ils en cueillent les fruictz. J'ay trayné la Charrue; ilz en serrent la moisson" (OC I. 383; OPC I.9). This iteration of the metaphor makes the connection between Marot's revindication of his authorial rights and Meliboeus's lamentation of the misuse of his fields even clearer.<sup>218</sup> Although Marot does not single out any specific printer/booksellers, he does go on to single out several specific works that have been appended to the *Adolescence*, perhaps a subtle way of discrediting every edition since the original *Adolescence* and *Suite*: of the "Epitaphe du Conte de Sales," the "Complaincte de Dame Bazoche" and the "Alphabet du temps present," one or more appears in every edition of the *Adolescence* that I have examined, beginning with the July 12, 1534 Juste edition. Additionally, the poet refuses to accept the inclusion even of allographic works which he esteems, a practice he regards as tantamount to theft of the honor owed to their authors: "Encores ne leur a souffy de faire tort à moy seul mais à plusieurs excellens Poëtes de mon temps: desquelz les beaulx Ouvrages les Libraires ont jointtz avecques les miens, me faisant (maulgré moy) usurpateur de l'honneur d'aultruy" (OC I.384; OPC I.10).<sup>219</sup> Marot's protestation acknowledges that the inclusion of allographic works can and has redounded to his honor. Through his refusal to accept this honor, the poet's persona is distanced even further from printer/booksellers: whereas they unscrupulously pursue profit, Marot treasures his own poetic craft more than any profit, symbolic or otherwise, gained by taking credit for the works of others.

The reader's insatiable desire for more works has also been accounted for in this new edition: "Toutefois, au lieu des choses rejectées (affin que les Lecteurs ne se plaignent), je y ay

---

<sup>218</sup> See above, p. 133.

<sup>219</sup> Once again, it is difficult to identify the works or poets to which Marot is referring. Defaux points to the "Epistre de Complaincte a une qu'a laissé son amy" by Jacques Colin (who, of course, is not named in the editions), which first appears in the third Roffet edition of the *Suite* (Mayer 20) (OPC I.405, n. 6).

mis douze fois aultant d'aultres Oeuvres miennes, par cy devant non imprimées: mesmement deux Livres de Epigrammes” (OC I. 384; OPC I.10). Between the *Adolescence*, *Suite*, and *Epigrammes*, the *Œuvres* do, in fact, contain over 140 previously unpublished works, though a number of them are found in the Chantilly manuscript. Nevertheless, by claiming that there are twelve times as many new works in the *Œuvres*, the preface employs the same hyperbolic advertising strategy as one of Marot’s previous printers, Juste, addressing readers who have grown accustomed to purchasing and reading counterfeit editions with additional material.<sup>220</sup> At the same time, however, the preface attempts to recondition the reader’s priorities by emphasizing not only the edition’s new material, but also its superior order. Marot sarcastically suggests that printers, instead of making *florilegia* out of his works as they appear, ask him for additions: “Car si j’ay aulcunes Oeuvres à mettre en lumiere, elles tumberont assez à temps en leurs Mains, non ainsi par pieces comme ilz les recueillent ça et là, mais en belle forme de Livre” (OC I. 384; OPC I.10).<sup>221</sup> Needless to say, this is not a warning that many printers or booksellers would have been inclined to heed. It is less directed at them than at the ideal reader of the *Œuvres*, who is assumed to prefer a well-crafted, well-ordered book to ones with works added in a catch-as-catch-can manner at the end. Real readers are thus encouraged to reorient their priorities accordingly.

In indicating the changes made to the order, the preface once again acknowledges how Marot’s books have been presented and received. The stakes revolve primarily around the distinction between the *Adolescence* and the *Autres Oeuvres*, which are made into the *Suite*:

---

<sup>220</sup> Dolet and Gryphe’s contributions to this strategy involve indicating “Les oeuvres de Marot augmentées” in the margin to further underscore the presence of this material (a2v). Similarly, the margins later indicate “L’ordre des oeuvres de Marot changé” (a3r).

<sup>221</sup> For more on this expression, see Jean Vignes, ““En belle forme de livre”: La composition de *L’Adolescence clémentine*,” *Op. cit.* 7 (Nov. 1996), pp. 79-86.

Lequel ordre (docte Dolet et vous aultres Lecteurs debonnaire) j'ay voulu changer à ceste dernière revue, mettant l'Adolescence à part et ce qui est hors d'Adolescence tout en ung; de sorte que, plus facilement que paravant, rencontrerez ce que voudrez y lire. Et, si ne le trouvez là où il souloit estre, le trouverez en reng plus convenable (*OC* I.384-5; *OPC* I.10-11).

The division acknowledges that readers might be inclined to read selectively, preferring either the young or the mature Marot, and caters to this preference. The ordering of the *Œuvres*, then, appears to be just as tied to the desires of the collection's imagined public as it is to the author's desire to present himself in a certain manner. Indeed, these remarks, directed to Dolet as a set of instructions in the future tense ("rencontrerez," "voudrez," "trouverez"), address the printer/publisher as a reader who shares the concerns of the "aultres Lecteurs debonnaire" witnessing a supposedly private transaction which precedes the publication of the book. Other readers are made to feel solicited, as if the collection was composed and then assembled with their proclivities and desires in mind.

As in the *Suite*, Nicolas Bourbon lends a Latin epigraph to the *Œuvres*, one which reiterates the artisanal metaphors found on the title page and which, like Bourbon's earlier epigraph, represents the book going forth into the reader's hands:

Saepe quod inspersis nugis foedaverat ausus  
 Quorundam, ut sunt haec candida Secla parum:  
 En tibi, nunc Lector, patria fornace recoctum,  
 Spectandumque; novo lumine prodit Opus.  
 Hic nihil est, quod non sic elimaverit Autor,  
 Ut metuat Momi iudicis ora nihil (*OC* I.385; *OPC* I.12).

Behold, reader: this work, which the daring of certain people had often besmirched by interspersing trifles in it, as ours is hardly a Golden Age, now comes to you to be seen in a new light, reforged in its father's furnace. There is nothing here that the author has not polished, or that would fear anything judging Momus would have to say.

The image of the reforged work creates an image of the poet as wordsmith, and the verb

"elimaverit" recalls the "lima severa" of Bourbon's epigraph for the *Suite* and Dolet's "doloire."

Yet, even more intriguing is the use of the ablative absolute “*inspersis nugis*.” A reference to “*nugae*” in the plural within a poem by the renowned poet of the *Nugae* hardly seems coincidental. In other words, the *Œuvres* are themselves peppered with bagatelles, or at least with one, which suggests that the inclusion of the right kind of “*nugae*” is beneficial rather than detrimental to the work. The epigraph defends not only itself from criticism, but the *Œuvres* as well, claiming that not even Momus, the god of mockery willing to find fault even with Jupiter, would have anything to criticize. The figure of Momus deters readers from receiving the book unfavorably by serving as an anti-ideal akin to ingratitude in Lemaire.<sup>222</sup> Readers who do manage to find fault with the book are, by implication, even pettier and more combative than a deity banished from Olympus for his insolence. In this vein, perhaps the plural “*ora*” has been selected not only out of poetic convention, because Momus is less a deity here than a metonymy for criticism.<sup>223</sup> Momus is constituted of thousands of wagging tongues, and the reader’s own tongue can end up being one of them if he allows it.

The paratext of the *Adolescence* within the *Œuvres* undergoes several significant changes from the *princeps* edition. Of the original Latin epigraphs, only Bérault’s distich is retained, though it is logical that Tory’s would have been removed. It is preceded by two contributions of Marot’s. The second of these, “Marot envoye le Livre de son Adolescence a une Dame,” was introduced into the paratext in Harsy’s editions of the *Adolescence*, a practice which may have been copied for the *Oeuvres*. The first, “Marot à son livre,” furthers the parallel between the author’s work and the editor’s work: “Racler je veulx (approche toy mon Livre) / Ung tas d’escriptz, qui par d’aultres sont faictz” (*OC* I.386.1-2; *OPC* I.14.1-2). The verb “racler” recalls,

---

<sup>222</sup> See above, Chapter One, p. 72.

<sup>223</sup> In the same way, Vulcan is used as a metonymy for fire, Ceres for grain, Bacchus for wine, and, if we take Rabelais’s word for it, Pantagruel for the *pantagruélion* (*TL* ch. 51, p. 506).

once again, the work done by both the “doloire” of the editor and the “lima” of the poet, and the poem’s first two stanzas act as a summary of the preface, in which Marot repeats that he does not want the book to be blamed for the inferior works of others or praised for the laudable works of others.<sup>224</sup> Furthermore, as Jean-Charles Monferran points out, “racler” might also be a reference to the erasure of manuscripts with a polishing or scraping tool (“Va mon Livre” 138). In this respect, the poem elevates the status of the printed book to that of the presentation manuscript, much like the poem on Montmorency’s collection in the *Suite*.<sup>225</sup>

In addressing his book, Marot is most likely referencing the *incipit* of Ovid’s *Tristia*, in which the Sulmonese poet, exiled to Tomis on the Black Sea in the wake of his “carmen et error,” sends his little book to Rome in his absence: “Parve – nec invideo – sine me, liber, ibis in urbem / ei mihi, quo domino non licet ire tuo” (“Little book, you will go without me – and I grudge it not – to the city, whither alas your master is not allowed to go”; 1-2; trans. Wheeler). This is where the similarity ends, however, as Marot writes from a situation completely opposite that of Ovid. Ovid writes from exile, and refuses to polish his book, wishing to leave it “incultus” to reflect its origin. Marot writes after having returned from exile, and the book’s polish reflects the fact that its author triumphs anew. In fact, the last stanza sees Marot claim immortality for the book:

Sans eulx (mon Livre) en mes Vers pourras prendre  
Vie apres moy, pour jamais ou long temps.  
Mes Oeuvres donc content te doibvent rendre:  
Peuples et Roys s’en tiennent bien contentz (*OC* I.386.9-12; *OPC* I.14.9-12).

The poet’s career is depicted as the inverse of Ovid’s. Whereas Ovid reached the height of his glory with the *Metamorphoses*, only to be banished, Marot presents his return from exile as the

---

<sup>224</sup> “Racler” becomes “Oster” in the Gryphe edition, likely in order to remove, in keeping with the sense of the poem, any trace of Dolet.

<sup>225</sup> See above, pp. 159-60.

prelude to his everlasting glory. The liminary poem achieves this effect by shifting from the *incipit* of the *Tristia* to the *explicit* of the *Metamorphoses*:

Iamque opus exegi, quod nec Iovis ira nec ignis  
 nec poterit ferrum nec edax abolere vetustas.  
 cum volet, illa dies, quae nil nisi corporis huius  
 ius habet, incerti spatium mihi finiat aevi;  
 parte tamen meliore mei super alta perennis  
 astra ferar, nomenque erit indelibile nostrum;  
 quaque patet domitis Romana potentia terris  
 ore legar populi, perque omnia saecula fama  
 (si quid habent veri vatum praesagia) vivam (bk. 15, ll. 871-79).

I have completed a work that neither Jove's wrath, nor fire, nor sword, nor gnawing age will be able to destroy. Let that day which only has power over this body put an end to the uncertain term of my life; I will still be borne above the high stars, immortal, in my better part, and my name will be indelible. Wherever Roman dominion extends over civilized lands, I will be read in the mouths of the people, and throughout the ages, if the predictions of poets are at all true, I will live through my fame.

While Ovid equates his work and his name with a part of his essence that will persist even after his body perishes, Marot distinguishes between himself and his work, granting the book and the text a life of their own: "[...] en mes Vers pourras prendre / Vie apres moy." In other words, the product of Marot's labors is all that matters in terms of literary glory, and while this refusal to claim literary immortality may have evangelical motivations, it is equally motivated by the reader who may well not know the author, but who holds the book in his very hands.<sup>226</sup> To wit, the stanza's other borrowing from Ovid comes in the form of the people. Ovid's immortality is tied to the Latin language: as long as Latin is spoken, he will be read aloud by the people (as, in antiquity, reading almost necessarily entailed reading aloud). The people reappear in Marot's poem, but whereas Ovid speaks of a work, Marot speaks of works contained in the book. The fact that these works are already on the lips of the people adds prestige to the printed book which

---

<sup>226</sup> Colard reads this disparity between book and author as Marot's recognition that the translation of the self can never be literal and unmediated ("Une parole de proximité" 555).

acts as a vector for the works. Some of these works may have reached the people by word of mouth and through song, and the king through recitation at court or presentation manuscripts, but the book offers them and others in a tangible form to all who want them.

The *Adolescence*'s original preface changes in a subtle, but significant way, as well. The preface, dated 1532 in the *princeps* edition, is dated 1530. Alduy describes this change as an instance of retroactive continuity that widens the gap between the *Œuvres* and the *Adolescence*, making the former seem all the more mature (13). Though one might object that a difference of merely two years would hardly achieve such an effect, it is worth noting that in the unauthorized 1537 and 1538 Janot editions of the *Adolescence* (Mayer 55, 63), the date has been changed to 1534, perhaps in order to make the book seem more recent. As such, it is possible that the date has been set further in the past in reaction to Janot's alteration.

The only remaining change to the paratext involves the inclusion of a dedication of the "Temple de Cupido" to Nicolas de Neufville, Marot's first protector, who commissioned the poem.<sup>227</sup> According to Marot's account, it was originally commissioned as a "queste de ferme Amour," and his explanation of the work that sprang from this commission implies that the poet, in keeping with Alduy's observation, seeks to distance himself from this youthful work: "Laquelle je trouvoy au meilleur endroit du temple de Cupido, en le visitant, comme l'age lors le requeroit" (*OC* I.387; *OPC* I.27). It also features the topos of the patron's immortality guaranteed by that of the poet's work, much like in "Marot à son livre": "[...] affin qu'en recompense de certain temps que Marot a vescu avecques toy en ceste vie, tu vives ça bas après

---

<sup>227</sup> Skenazi argues that the dedication to Neufville has less to do with the historical circumstances of Neufville's patronage than with his name: the *cueur* of the Temple becomes both a "neuve ville" and the "ville du roi" (Seigneur de Villeroy) due to the presence of Francis I and Claude inside it ("Eutopie et utopie" 19). See also *Le poète architecte en France*, pp. 104-11.

la mort avecques luy tant que ses oeuvres dureront” (*OC* I.388; *OPC* I.27).<sup>228</sup> Significantly, Marot only promises Neufville immortality “ça bas,” implying that true immortality is God’s alone to grant. The paratext tinges Marot’s literary glory with evangelical overtones, and, perhaps even more significantly, the overall order of the *Adolescence* and *Suite* bears out these overtones.

The *Suite* concludes with a section labeled “Oroisons.” Its contents are none other than Marot’s prayer translations which originally comprised the *Instruction et foy d’ung chrestien* and Psalm 6, which, as detailed above, reappeared in a number of unauthorized editions of the *Adolescence* and *Suite*. The section title has the added effect of establishing continuity between its contents and the “Oroison contemplative devant le crucifix,” itself a translation from the Latin. As we have seen, previous editions of Marot display a teleological orientation, ordering the *Adolescence* and often the *Suite* so as to create the sense that Marot’s poetic career builds toward these translations, and especially toward the translation of Psalm 6. The *Œuvres*, however, do not simply adopt the position of these works. There are also several telling additions to the text of the *Suite* which impose a different and more overarching narrative on the *Œuvres*, one which still culminates in the “Oroisons.”

The sickness narrative is not reincorporated into the *Suite*; of the ten poems that originally comprised the series, only three are added to the *Suite*, while six are added to the *Epigrammes*. However, there are two additional poems which subtly recount different narratives of Marot’s career, one *ab origine* and one which factors in his exile and subsequent return. Both of these poems comment upon the goals of Marot’s poetic career and the transformations that the

---

<sup>228</sup> According to Daniel Martin, Marot represents a turning point in the poetic celebration of glory: the prince becomes only one interlocutor among many, the most significant of which becomes posterity (37).

*Œuvres* have undergone to reflect the accomplishment of these goals. The first poem is the epistle “Au Roy” in which Marot famously requests that the king erase his father’s name on the salary roll and replace it with his (*OC* I.409-12; *OPC* I.327-30).<sup>229</sup> Jean’s deathbed speech to his son on why and how to pursue a poetic career reassures the reader of Marot’s good intentions and presents the *Œuvres* as the fulfillment of his father’s wish. Granting his son the inheritance of his “peu de sçavoir,” Jean reassures him that this knowledge is pure, innocent, and incapable of harming anyone, which distinguishes it from the sort of clerical and professional knowledge that might bring a more stable and lucrative career:

Par Preschemens, le Peuple on peult seduire;  
Par Marchander, tromper on le peult bien;  
Par Plaiderie, on peult menger son bien;  
Par Medecine, on peult l’homme tuer;  
Mais ton bel Art ne peult telz coups ruer (*OC* I.410.48-52; *OPC* I.329.48-52).

Whereas priests seduce, merchants trick, lawyers defraud and doctors kill, all in the name of profit, poets do no such thing.<sup>230</sup> In keeping with the prestige advertising so prevalent in the *Œuvres*, Marot disavows the profit motive by representing his career as the realization of his father’s advice against pursuing profit by taking up orders or a profession. The content of what his father tells him he should do constitutes a summary of Marot’s career and mirrors the structure of the *Adolescence*. The young poet is to start by presenting manuscripts to friends, colleagues and supporters, his “treschers freres”: “Tu en pourras dicter Lay ou Epistre, / Et puis la faire à tes Amis tenir, / Pour en l’Amour d’iceulx t’entretenir” (*OC* I.410-11.54-56; *OPC*

---

<sup>229</sup> This piece was first published in a 1533 edition of Jean Marot’s *Deux Voyages* (Mayer 239).

<sup>230</sup> The proximity of priests to merchants here might be a reference to the 1534 *Livre des marchans*, a polemical tract against the sale of indulgences which compares the clergy to merchants who are so crafty, they can sell things that remain invisible to the customer. It is usually attributed to Antoine Marcourt or Guillaume Farel. For more on Marcourt, see Gabrielle Berthoud, *Antoine Marcourt; réformateur et pamphlétaire du "Livre des Marchans" aux placards de 1534* (Geneva: Droz, 1973).

I.329.54-56). From here, he is to proceed to translations of works written by “les divines Plumes / Des vieulx Latins, dont tant est mention” (*OC* I.411.58-59; *OPC* I.329.58-59). The fact that the *Œuvres* still begin with Marot’s translation of Virgil establishes a parallel between the collection and Jean’s instructions, which go on to tell Clément to put God before the king, especially when publishing a work:

Après tu peulx, de ton invention,  
Faire quelcque Oeuvre à jecter en lumiere:  
Dedans lequel en la Feuille premiere  
Doibs invocquer le nom du tout puissant (*OC* I.411.60-63; *OPC* I.329.60-63).

The recurrence of the word “Oeuvre” here, as well as the rather precise codicological term “Feuille,” indicates the extent to which this passage acts as a commentary on the book and its publication, the phrase “jecter en lumiere” echoing Dolet’s command to the book to “exire in lucem.” At first glance, it would seem that the *Œuvres* do the opposite of what Jean advises as far as the praise of the Almighty is concerned: it does not come first, but last, and it is not of Marot’s “invention.” However, when we consider the source of this advice, we remember that Jean Marot had no experience of his own with printing, and that the publication of his works came about through the initiative of Clément. Given that Clément now composes the tale of his own poetic origins, he does so in such a way as to represent the *Œuvres* and their order not only as the realization of Jean’s wishes, but as an improvement upon them which more effectively praises God by placing the prayers prominently at the end of the *Suite*, prayers which, as both words directed to God and the Word of God, are more effective than a work of Marot’s “invention” would be.

The prayers are also equated with the Word of God in the “Chant de May,” an addition to the *Suite*. Rigolot has noted the ballad’s relevance to the Psalms as a hymn to the Creator and its exhibition of the poet’s literary self-consciousness, and these remarks truly deserve to be borne

out further (*OC* I.606, n. 104).<sup>231</sup> The imagery of the ballad's first stanza mirrors the structure of the *Œuvres*:

En ce beau Moys délicieux  
 Arbres, Fleurs et Agriculture,  
 Qui durant l'Yver soucieux,  
 Avez esté en Sepulture,  
 Sortez, pour servir de pasture  
 Aux Troupeaulx du plus grand Pasteur:  
 Chascun de vous en sa nature  
 Louez le nom du Createur (*OC* I.425.1-8; *OPC* I.366.1-8).

The "Arbres, Fleurs et Agriculture" clearly recall the metaphors which describe the entirety of the *Adolescence*, which is reborn in the form of prayers that spiritually nourish the faithful and praise the Creator all the more effectively for their accessibility to the vernacular public. As in the "Oroison contemplative," the raw material of the *Adolescence* eventually fuels the praise of God. The fact that, in the *Œuvres*, the "Oroisons" follow the "Cimetiere" ("Avez esté en Sepulture") makes the parallel even clearer. The imagery of the "Temple de Cupido" even recurs in this stanza in the form of the "Yver soucieux." It is the presence of "soulcie" among the Temple's incense which first rouses the speaker's suspicions, and upon gazing into the choir from the nave, he notes that "[...] hors de moy cheurent plainctes et pleurs, / Comme en yver seiches fueilles et fleurs" (*OC* I.53.361-62, 56.501-02; *OPC* I. 37.361-62, 41.501-02). The rebirth in the "Chant de May" thus reflects the discovery of Ferme Amour, whose Pauline connotations are confirmed by the parallel with the "Oroisons" and by the second stanza of the "Chant":

Les Servans d'Amour furieux  
 Parlent de l'Amour vaine et dure.  
 O vous, vrays Amans curieux,  
 Parlez de l'Amour sans laydure (*OC* I.425.9-12; *OPC* I.366.9-12).

---

<sup>231</sup> Similarly, Defaux compares the poem to a *contrafactum* in that it employs a genre usually used for love poetry for the purpose of praising God (*OPC* I.780).

Finally, the ballad's *envoi* contains a key choice of words which confirms the poem's metadiscursive nature and its parallel with the "Oroisons": "Et vous aussi, mon Escripture, / Louez le nom du Createur" (*OC* I.426.27-28; *OPC* I.366.27-28). The translations are indeed Marot's "Escripture" in that they are his translations of Scripture, which, in keeping with the evangelical and indeed Protestant concept of *sola scriptura*, ultimately constitutes the only proper way in which to praise God.

It would seem, then, that the order of the *Œuvres* and the metadiscourse of its texts confirm the evangelical arc of Marot's career, and as stated above, it is likely that it was inspired by that of previous editions which used order to encourage an evangelical reading. However, Marot, in the *Œuvres* as in all things, remains a chameleon, as revealed by one significant detail. The "Cimetiere," which directly precedes the "Oroisons," concludes with the epitaph "D'Alix," one of Marot's bawdiest pieces. When originally published in the 1535 Juste edition of the *Suite* (Mayer 34), it bore the title "Epitaphe d'Alys, fille de joye, extraict du second livre de la Priapee" (62r). This lady of pleasure is most likely inspired by the salacious Quartilla from Petronius's *Satyricon*, who cannot remember ever having been a virgin: "Nam et infans cum paribus inquinata sum, et subinde procedentibus annis maioribus me pueris adplicui, donec ad hanc aetatem perveni" ("Even as a young girl, I got down and dirty with boys my age, and then, as the years went by, I devoted myself to older boys, until I reached this age"; fragment 25).<sup>232</sup> Simply put, the poem which directly precedes Marot's translation of the *Pater noster* is an amplification of one of the raunchier passages of pagan literature and a celebration of a prostitute with an irrepressible propensity for shaking her ass. Even though Alix is no longer designated as a "fille de joye" in 1538, the description of her adult occupation makes it clear that she is a

---

<sup>232</sup> See Mayer, *Œuvres complètes*, vol. 4, p. 227.

skilled practitioner of the world's oldest profession: "Et inventa la bonne Dame / Mille Tourdions advenans / Pour culeter à tous venans" (*OC* I.432-33.16-18; *OPC* I.389.16-18).

The proximity of this poem to the "Oroisons" is jarring, and has not failed to astonish some *marotistes*.<sup>233</sup> Berthon, accounting for this juxtaposition, points to it as proof of Marot's commitment to aesthetic *varietas*, which is distinct from, but coexists alongside the constancy that defines the poet's ideology ("Intention" 604). Yet, the epitaph is actually more continuous with the *Oroisons* than critics have assumed, and, when located in such a prominent place, becomes a parody of the religious conversion narrative. The prestidigitation on the word "culeter" amounts to an implicit pun on *culte*, especially when the epitaph is juxtaposed with works more typical of *culte*. Alice's ability to "wag or stirre the buttockes up and down," as Cotgrave so eloquently puts it, becomes a religion in and of itself, complete with its own learned treatises in both Latin and the vernacular, the "Livre de Culetage" and the *De Culetis* (*OC* I.433.23-25; *OPC* I.389.23-25). The latter, not unlike the "Graces pour ung Enfant" in the ensuing section, is intended "Pour ceulx qui estoient plus petis," and is another echo of the *Satyricon*, which features Quartilla presiding over the singularly disturbing nuptials of Giton and the all-too-young Pannychis (*OC* I.433.26; *OPC* I.389.26). Furthermore, the epitaph recounts Alice's growth from her *adolescence*, as it were, to her mature expertise, which she feels compelled to publish "[...] affin que le Monde vist / Son grand sçavoir" (*OC* I.433.21-22; *OPC* I.389.21-22). Alice thus amounts to an absurd mirror image of the poet himself, but this

---

<sup>233</sup> Rigolot, pointing out the fact that the Lord's Prayer comes right after this poem, compares the succession to the anecdote of Francis I getting out of bed with his mistress to go to church (*OC* I.608, n. 122). Similarly, the Chantilly manuscript, which also contains the "Épitaphe d'Alix," ends with a series of bawdy epigrams, notably the *cinquain* "Janeton a du teton." This poem prompted Gustave Macon, the curator of the Musée Condé who first published an edition of the manuscript in 1898, to lament that "Cette pauvreté termine le volume" (*Recueil inédit* 304, n. 12).

potential Mary of Egypt undergoes no conversion whatsoever; she is just as fervent a devotee of “culetage” when she dies, and even after her death, as she was in the cradle. The implication is that perhaps Marot has not undergone a conversion, either; far from abandoning the profane for the sacred, the poet, based on this aspect of the *Œuvres*’ organization, seems to place both on equal footing.

Of course, the association of court poets with courtesans is an intuitive one, but I would draw a further parallel between Alice and Marot with respect to how accommodating they are. It is hardly by accident that the verb “inventer” is used to describe Alice’s expansion of her repertoire; her variations on ass-shaking belong to the division of rhetoric governing the selection of subject matter. Just as Alice devises thousands of comely contorsions to make her “culetage” more appealing to all interested parties, so too does Marot draw on a wide range of subjects, both profane and sacred, in an effort to appeal to readers with varying tastes, interests, and ways of reading. The “mille Tourdions” call to mind certain stylistic traits of Marot, as well, not least the famous *rimes équivoquées* of the “Petite epistre au Roy” or, closer at hand, the improvisations on “culeter.” The poet pokes fun at his own body of work by implicitly comparing it to the body of a particularly enthusiastic woman of loose morals, capping the epitaph with a parody of the survival of the poet’s voice after death:

Encor dit on, par grand merveille,  
Que si on veult mettre l’Oreille  
Contre la Tumbe et s’arrester,  
On oirra ses Os culeter (*OC* I.433.29-32; *OPC* I.389.29-32).

The epitaph insists not only on variety, as Berthon argues, but on adaptability, as well, the very adaptability that characterizes Marot’s production and poetic persona whether they are considered within or apart from the context of its publication. If the *Œuvres*, then, are a response to unauthorized editions stressing the conversion narrative, they respond by presenting a persona

that seems to embark on a similar narrative, only to reveal that this apparent turn toward God is but another of the “mille tourdions” executed to please as great a number of customers as possible. In this regard, to return to Delègue’s turn of phrase, Marot is perhaps closer to a *femme publique* than to a “marionette publique.”

As the result of a collective effort that owes as much to the printer as to the poet, this persona is the key to understanding how the *Œuvres* advertise for themselves so effectively, as do all the editions of Marot examined in this chapter. Any edition of Marot’s works was likely enough to attract plenty of buyers by virtue of the poet’s name alone, but to preserve and increase the interest of these readers for the additional works that would inevitably be produced by a poet as prolific as Marot, the edition had to make even further use of its single greatest asset: the image of the poet himself. In this sense, Marot’s protean nature may be seen less as an interpretive challenge to be resolved by scholars eager to make sense of his vast and varied body of work than as a form of advertising that solves the problem of the indefinite public, while simultaneously indicating how this solution might prove objectionable. Indeed, one could argue that by equating the protean quality of Marot’s poetry with prostitution, Alix’s epitaph denounces both the poet’s pretensions to worldly glory and the commercialization of his persona that overshadows everything he puts into print, even his translations of the word of God. In that they incorporate the *Oroisons* into a narrative of Marot’s career designed to appeal to as many potential buyers and readers as possible, the *Œuvres* are tantamount to the prostitution of the poet, and even worse, the prostitution of the Bible. If, as in Jean Marot’s dying words, preachers can seduce and merchants can trick, then perhaps Clément is not so different from them, after all.

Marot’s *Adolescence* and *Œuvres* are an instance where prestige advertising and ideal readership coexist, but contradict one another. In the preface of the *Adolescence*, ideal

readership is equated with a brotherhood of like-minded individuals with one another's best interests at heart (regardless of whether the critic chooses to see this brotherhood as a manifestation of humanism, Pauline *caritas*, or both), a perfect union of author, printer/bookseller, and reader. In this way, Marot's ideal readership is similar to Lemaire's, which bases production on generosity and reception on gratitude. But if Lemaire's prestige advertising raises questions about its elision of the profit motive, so too does Marot's, which posits a very different relationship from brotherhood founded on mutual love and respect. If prostitution is a travesty of love, a commercial transaction (money in exchange for services) masquerading as love, so, too, is prestige advertising. Alice's epitaph calls attention to the fictional nature not only of authorial and printerly personae, but also of ideal readership as an effort to influence reading by transforming the author/reader (and bookseller/book buyer) relationship into a friendship.

I am not suggesting that Marot's religious convictions were insincere. On the contrary, I am suggesting that we may perceive in the *Œuvres* a crisis of conscience in that the collection displays awareness both of the advertising techniques it so masterfully employs and the dire consequences of these very same techniques. This crisis comes to a head in Rabelais, who almost certainly shared most of Marot's views on religion. His editions feature the most forceful advertising strategies of the three authors examined in this study, but also the most profound questioning of the motives that subtend these strategies and the effects they may have on readers.

### Chapter Three

#### Rabelais: Advertising Undone

Marot and Rabelais have a lot in common, not only in terms of their views or the circles in which they moved, but in terms of their existence in print. Both enjoyed dazzling success, judging by the number of editions of their works published during and after their lifetimes, both often found themselves the victims of counterfeiting and false attributions, and both devoted a significant amount of effort to their paratexts. The key difference between their respective preoccupations with their own work, however, is that Marot enters the world of print as the king's poet whose vernacular works are already in circulation, whereas Rabelais first enters the world of print as a humanist editor and acquires a reputation incongruous with his vernacular works. This difference, in turn, explains why Rabelais's authorial persona, whether in the guise of Alcofrybas Nasier or of François Rabelais, medical doctor, is even more patently constructed around the reader than Marot's. Rabelais the author only manifests himself in terms of his preoccupation with the reader, with convincing the reader that the book at hand is useful and worth reading. Even when Rabelais protests against charges of heresy leveled at the *geste pantagruéline*, as he does in the dedicatory letter of the 1552 *Quart livre*, what is mainly at stake is less his reputation than the fact that censors are trying to deprive the reader of a good book.

In examining Rabelais's relationship with the reader, I do not pretend to paint a comprehensive picture of Rabelais's production, or of his publication history; such a task would exceed the scope of an entire dissertation, let alone a chapter. Rather, I have attempted to find a middle ground between taking the books individually and considering the *geste* as a whole. Each book has its own tale to tell, but these tales inform one another, and have been grouped, printed, and sold together since as early as 1542 (*NRB* 25-27, Plan 44, 42-43, and 86). As such, I have

opted to combine case studies with the study of a theme that runs across the four authorized books of the *geste* and into the *Cinquiesme Livre*, whose authenticity remains dubious.<sup>234</sup> I will begin with the first book of the *geste* to be published, *Pantagruel*, which appears to parody advertising, only to bring the reader to recognize that this parody has itself been a form of advertising. Its Erasmian intertext reveals how it then overcomes the potential incompatibility of vernacular literature with the evangelical tenet of *sola scriptura* by positing the book as an *adjuvant* to the reader's evangelical self-fashioning, which will come to define the relationship between book and reader in the remainder of the *geste*.

Stemming from texts now regarded as quintessential expressions of Renaissance humanism, such as Erasmus's *De pueris instituendis*, Pico's *Oration on the Dignity of Man*, or even Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, self-fashioning is commonly taken to be an expression of faith in man's limitless potential for improvement. However, Greenblatt explains that self-fashioning is defined by a number of boundaries, and though he focuses exclusively on English authors, the boundaries he delineates are especially applicable to Rabelais, as well. On the one hand, self-fashioning involves submission to an authority, whether God or a human institution. On the

---

<sup>234</sup> The authenticity of the *Cinquiesme Livre* has been a singular point of contention among *rabelaisants* since the early seventeenth century. In *Rabelais grammairien*, Huchon adopts and convincingly demonstrates the highly plausible theory that the *Cinquiesme Livre* is the result of an editor or editors assembling various unfinished drafts left behind by Rabelais after his death, though the chapter on the *Apedefstes*, present in some editions of the *Cinquiesme Livre* and absent in others, is not regarded as Rabelais's work. Though it is not my goal to argue about the *Cinquiesme Livre*'s authorship one way or the other, the fact that its prologue articulates with Rabelais's advertising strategies in previous books would, as far as the authenticity question is concerned, seem to lend credence to Huchon's theory. In this sense, one could see the *Cinquiesme Livre* as analogous to the posthumous editions of Lemaire's *Illustrations*, which maintain Lemaire's persona despite, in some cases, the addition of inauthentic material (see above, Chapter One, pp. 106-10). For a history of the various arguments for and against the authenticity of the *Cinquiesme Livre*, see Huchon, *Rabelais grammairien*, pp. 413-16, Glauser, pp. 25-40, and more recently, Cooper, "L'authenticité du *Cinquiesme Livre*: État présent de la question," pp. 9-22 in *Le Cinquiesme Livre: Actes du colloque internationale de Rome (16-19 octobre 1998)*, ed. Franco Giacone (Geneva: Droz, 2001).

other hand, self-fashioning must be achieved through definition against some kind of outsider or enemy, which Greenblatt refers to as “the alien” (9). Self-fashioning, as Rabelais defines it and situates it within the reception of his own works, conforms to Greenblatt’s definition. It involves submission to God through man’s relationship with God as prescribed by the Reformers, and it is defined against those who reveal their sinful natures through their reading, much like Lemaire’s self-fashioning involves submission to the French king and is defined against idleness, ingratitude, and especially profiteering.

Self-fashioning also portrays the human being as malleable in a way that particularly invites comparison with advertisement. As Jeanneret explains, self-fashioning does not grant man the freedom to fashion himself so much as it obligates him to do so: “L’homme idéal est un homme à faire, une matière malleable et susceptible de tous les moules. Paradoxalement, l’humanisme selon Pic repose sur l’absence d’une nature humaine spécifiquement définie. Il n’y a pas d’essence, pas de modèle contraignant, si bien que l’homme est un pur potentiel” (*Perpetuum mobile* 165). In the words of Erasmus, men are not born, but fashioned (*finguntur*). Self-fashioning represents the human identity in very much the same way that advertising does, which is perhaps why Baudrillard, in characterizing advertising as the “liberté précaire” of distinguishing oneself based on the objects one chooses to purchase, calls it a “nouvel humanisme” (215). Judith Williamson defines advertising in similar terms, though she compares it to Sartrean existentialism rather than to humanism: “We are both product and consumer; we consume, buy the product, yet we *are* the product. Thus our lives become our own creations, through *buying*; an identikit of different images of ourselves, created by different products”

(70).<sup>235</sup> Advertising offers freedom within the very constraints it defines, namely the freedom to distinguish oneself based on the products one chooses. Rabelais, as I intend to show, offers a similar sort of freedom by using ideal readership to impose the sort of constraints described by Greenblatt upon the reader's self-fashioning. As Cathleen Bauschatz argues, even those depictions of the author-reader relationship which seem at first glance to promote an active role for the reader actually place limits on that power ("Portrayal of Reading" 75).

If prestige advertising and ideal readership figure so prominently in Rabelais, so, too, do numerous instances in which each begins to come apart at the seams. In each installment of the *geste*, including the *Cinquiesme Livre*, Rabelais displays an awareness of the consequences of his advertising strategies for the reader. Roland Antonioli has shown how Rabelais grows increasingly skeptical toward the medical profession, especially in the *Quart Livre* and *Cinquiesme Livre*, and this skepticism extends to his writing, as well, given the connection between medicine and writing (209-210). Rabelais, with his keen sense of all things commercial and mercantile, is more sophisticated an advertiser than his predecessors, Lemaire and Marot. It is for this very reason, though, that of the three, he is also the most aware that the survival of both product and advertising depends upon the perpetuation of the problem they claim to solve.

As I stated in the introduction to this study, it comes as no surprise that Rabelais wants to be read, or that he wants to be read in a manner he deems favorable. The strategy he adopts to achieve these goals betrays a deep-seated anxiety similar to that displayed by Lemaire and Marot. Rabelais realizes that to keep oneself in business, one must create a need for one's books, but he also realizes that this need can only be brought about by the manipulation of the reader.

---

<sup>235</sup> Of course, existentialism as defined by Sartre has much in common with Renaissance humanism, or at least with the common modern conception of it, hence *L'existentialisme est un humanisme*.

By calling attention to this manipulation, Rabelais ends up in the paradoxical position of working to put himself out of business.

### ***Pantagruel: Alcofrybas Nasier and the Book as Adjuvant***

Prestige advertising is conspicuously absent from the *princeps* edition of *Pantagruel*, published in Lyons by Claude Nourry, alias “Le Prince,” in 1531 or 1532 (*NRB* 1, Plan 18).<sup>236</sup> What one finds are advertising strategies of a different variety, but advertising strategies all the same. The first manifests itself in the title, which is common, orthographic variants aside, to the first seven editions of *Pantagruel* (*NRB* 1-7): *Les horribles et espoventables faicts et prouesses du tresrenomme Pantagruel Roy des Dipsodes, filz du grand geant Gargantua; Composez nouvellement par maistre Alcofrybas Nasier*.<sup>237</sup> The first words to meet the reader’s eyes are “horribles” (literally “hair-raising”) and “espoventables”: readers are promised an experience and the sensations it inspires before all else, which corresponds to Éric Vernet’s assertion that advertising emphasizes the experience undergone through the consumption of the product rather than the product itself (35).<sup>238</sup> As in Vestergaard and Schröder’s application of Greimas’s

---

<sup>236</sup> Michael Kline and Bettina Rommel explain that Rabelais, who had previously worked with Gryphe, probably switched to Nourry for the publication of *Pantagruel* simply on the grounds of suitability: Gryphe was a humanist printer who did not favor vernacular works in the *usage vulgaire*, whereas Nourry did (Kline 11, Rommel 52). For more on Nourry, see Baudrier, vol. 12, pp. 72-150. Baudrier notes that Nourry’s body of production is similar to that of Olivier Arnoullet (74). Huchon’s editions of *Pantagruel* and *Gargantua* are based on the 1542 Juste editions (*NRB* 12, Plan 39; *NRB* 23, Plan 38), with variants noted for other states.

<sup>237</sup> Of the first seven editions, *NRB* 2 (Plan 22) is lost, and *NRB* 7 (Plan 23), the first edition published by François Juste, was thought to have been lost during the firebombing of Dresden in 1945, but was recently rediscovered in Moscow. See Annie Charon, Tatiana Dolgodrova, and Olivier Pédeflous, “Une découverte à la Bibliothèque d’État de Russie: un recueil du XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle d’éditions de Rabelais,” *Bulletin du bibliophile* 2009.1, pp. 56-78.

<sup>238</sup> Jeanneret makes a similar point vis-à-vis the comparison of the book to a marrow bone in the prologue of *Gargantua*, a metaphor that, in Jeanneret’s view, emphasizes the sensorial pleasures

actantial model, the book acts as *adjuvant* in the full title of *Pantagruel*. Nourry's *princeps* edition even heightens this emphasis by putting the majority of these first words in red ink: "Les horribles et espoventa / bles [...]." <sup>239</sup>

The second strategy may better be understood in relation to a particular form of premodern advertising: street cries, whether the *cris de Paris*, the cries in verse of street vendors that rang out in Paris well into the nineteenth century, or similar cries that Rabelais would have heard at fairs in Fontenay-le-Comte, Saint Maixent, Niort, and Lyons. <sup>240</sup> The most salient trait of *cris* is that they can become an attraction unto themselves, regardless of the products being cried, which might be described as an early modern correlative of people watching the Super Bowl just for the commercials. This phenomenon is particularly palpable in Clément Jannequin's "Voulez ouïr les Cris de Paris?" The rhythm and melody of Jannequin's *cris* are all that matters, not the products they ostensibly hawk, and the final lines of the song call attention to this fact: "Si vous en voulez plus ouïr / Allez donques querir" (215). Potential customers are not attracted by the product, but by the prospect of hearing even more *cris*; in this instance, the advertising is its own product. This is also the case in the prologue of *Pantagruel*, which

---

of reading by representing "le livre comme un plat qui se savoure et se mange: moins le travail de production que le plaisir de la consommation" (*Mets* 121).

<sup>239</sup> See *NRB*, p. 65 for a color facsimile. Note also that this edition's status as *editio princeps* is not universally accepted.

<sup>240</sup> Lazar Sainéan points out the similarity between several recorded *cris* and certain passages in Rabelais (274-75). There is substantial textual evidence, aside from the allusions indicated by Sainéan, that Rabelais was quite familiar with street vendors and charlatans of various sorts, as in Chapter 24 of *Gargantua*, which details how Gargantua spends rainy days during his education under Ponocrates: "Alloit veoir les basteleurs, trejectaires et theriacleurs, et consideroit leurs gestes, leurs ruses, leurs sobressaulx, et beau parler: singulierement de ceux de Chaunys en Picardie, car ilz sont de nature grands jaseurs et beaulx bailleurs de baillivernes en matiere de cinges verds" (72).

Mikhail Bakhtin compares to a *cri* (167).<sup>241</sup> It hinges upon the narrator's ability to weave a fantastic yarn more so than the content of the book itself.

This narrator goes by the name of Alcofrybas Nasier. He tells us very little about himself, only that he has been a paid servant of Pantagruel himself since adulthood, and has been given leave to visit his "pais de vache" (215). His remark tells us more about his audience than it does about him, as it hints that they are rustic churls, denizens of cow country. The most important clues to his identity may be found in his name. It is less important that "Alcofrybas Nasier" is an anagram of "Francoys Rabelais" than that both the first name and the surname carry a special significance. Rigolot notes the "physionomie arabisante" of "Alcofrybas," equating it with such highly-regarded Arabic and Persian authorities as Avicenna and Albumasar, and connecting it specifically with astrology (*Langages* 21).<sup>242</sup> The exoticism of this name, which attracts attention by virtue of its novelty, becomes critically important to the Erasmian intertext of the prologue and Chapter 8, which features Gargantua's famous letter to Pantagruel. One may also detect in "Nasier" a reference to Ovid's surname, Naso, which implies that the work to follow is a modern *Metamorphoses* that, like Ovid's poem, might be nothing more than a collection of fanciful tales, but might also lend itself to allegorical interpretation (La Charité, "Silenic Text" 80). As such, the interpretative controversy among *rabelaisants*, usually linked to the prologue of *Gargantua*, manifests itself even at the very beginning of the *geste*,

---

<sup>241</sup> Bakhtin also claims that long book titles like Rabelais's are composed in the form of popular advertisements like the *cris* (153).

<sup>242</sup> In this vein, the *Pantagrueline prognostication* is attributed to "Maistre Alcofribas, architriclin dudict Pantagruel" (923).

which, as we will see, works to invite freedom of interpretation all while guiding this interpretation through ideal readership.<sup>243</sup>

By and large, Alcofrybas plays P. T. Barnum to his audience's suckers, interpellating the latter as rubes. He ranges from flattery to outright threats, calling down plague, damnation, and even sodomy on those who refuse to believe what he says:

Pareillement le feu saint Antoine vous arde, mau de terre vous vire, le lancy, le maulubec vous trousse, la caquesangue vous viengne, le mau fin feu de ricqueracque, aussi menu que poil de vache, tout renforcé de vif argent, vous puisse entrer au fondement, et comme Sodome et Gomorre puissiez tomber en soulfhre, en feu et en abysme, en cas que vous ne croyez fermement tout ce que je vous racompteray en ceste presente chronicque (215).

Rigolot, referring to Alcofrybas's "style de domination," argues that just as we must distinguish between Alcofrybas the narrator and Rabelais the author, we must distinguish between the narratees addressed by Alcofrybas and the readers of *Pantagruel* ("Vraisemblance" 56-59).<sup>244</sup>

Readers, entertained by their ability to distance themselves from the narratees, are amused at

---

<sup>243</sup> As far as the prologue of *Gargantua* is concerned, the controversy, which occupied critics for the better part of the twentieth century, first pitted Leo Spitzer against what he derisively referred to as *rabelaisants*, or critics like Abel Lefranc and Claude Mayer who insisted on seeing a deeper meaning in the prologue and in the *geste* as a whole, whereas Spitzer thought Rabelais's evocations of a "plus haut sens" were meant to be humorous; see Spitzer's "Rabelais et les 'rabelaisants'," *Studi Francesi* 4 (1960), pp. 401-23, and "Ancora sul prologo al primo libro del *Gargantua* di Rabelais," *Studi Francesi* 9.3 (1965), pp. 423-34. In the 1980's, the debate came to reflect the controversial role of deconstruction in literary criticism; see Defaux, "D'un problème l'autre: herméneutique de l'*altior sensus* et *captatio lectoris* dans le prologue de *Gargantua*," *RHLF* 85.2 (Mar.-Apr. 1985), pp. 195-216, the response by Terence Cave, Jeanneret, and Rigolot in "Sur la prétendue transparence de Rabelais," *RHLF* 86.4 (Jul.-Aug. 1986), pp. 709-716, and Defaux's riposte in the same issue, "Sur la prétendue pluralité du Prologue de *Gargantua*: Réponse d'un positiviste naïf à trois 'illustres et treschevaleureux champions,'" pp. 716-22. See also Defaux's *Marot, Rabelais, Montaigne*, pp. 101-42, and *Rabelais agonistes*, pp. 362-82. As fierce as this debate was, both sides had more in common than perhaps they let on at the time, as detailed by Cornilliat in "On Words and Meaning in Rabelais Criticism," *ER* 35 (1998), pp. 7-28.

<sup>244</sup> Cf. Rigolot, *Texte*, pp. 137-53, Rommel, p. 62, and La Charité, "Lecteurs et lectures," p. 262. For more on the concept of the narratee, see Genette, *Figures III* (Paris: Seuil, 1972), pp. 265-67, and Gerald Prince, "Introduction à l'étude du narrataire," *Poétique* 14 (1973), pp. 178-196.

how the charlatan abuses his credulous audience, and are able to regard the prologue as a parody of hawking akin to Rutebeuf's *Dit de l'herberie*: reading the book can relieve syphilis or the pains of childbirth, and in fact, the book is such a miracle cure that it doesn't even need to be read to have an effect – when sprinkled with “poudre d'oribus” (spaghetti Latin for a worthless cure) and wrapped in warm linen, it becomes a compress to relieve toothache.<sup>245</sup>

As Deborah Losse and Paul Smith point out, the prologue is also a parody of Cicero's rules for *captatio benevolentiae* (*Rhetoric at Play* 36; “Le prologue du *Pantagruel*” 163). The overblown praise of the opening sentence does indeed correspond to Cicero's instructions to dwell upon the audience's courage and wisdom, and the nobility of their past judgments:

Tresillustres et Treschevalereux champions, gentilz hommes, et aultres, qui volontiers vous adonnez à toutes gentillesses et honnestetez, vous avez n'a gueres veu, leu, et sceu, les *grandes et inestimables Chronicques de l'enorme geant Gargantua*: et comme vrayes fideles les avez creues, gualamment, et y avez maintesfoys passé vostre temps avecques les honorables Dames et Damoyselles, leur en faisans beaulx et longs narrez, alors que estiez hors de propos: dont estez bien dignes de grande louange, et mémoire sempiternelle (213).

What makes these “champions” worthy of praise and eternal memory is not their feats of arms, but what they do when they are “hors de propos,” which amounts to reading the *Chronicques* and reciting them to their lady friends. The emphasis on relaxation, as well as the hyperbolic insistence on veracity, reveals as an intertext the prologue of Lucian's *True History*, itself a parody of sea voyage epics like the *Odyssey* or *Argonautica*. Lucian justifies his tale as a form of mental recreation:

Men interested in athletics and in the care of their bodies think not only of condition and exercise but also of relaxation in season; in fact, they consider this the principal part of training. In like manner students, I think, after much reading of serious works may profitably relax their minds and put them in better trim for future labor. It would be appropriate recreation for them if they were to take up the sort of reading that, instead of affording just pure amusement based on wit and humor, also boasts a little food for

---

<sup>245</sup> Cf. Huchon, p. 1236, n. 5.

thought that the Muses would not altogether spurn; and I think they will consider the present work something of the kind. They will find it enticing not only for the novelty of its subject, for the humor of its plan and because I tell all kinds of lies in a plausible and specious way, but also because everything in my story is a more or less comical parody of one or another of the poets, historians and philosophers of old, who have written much that smacks of miracles and fables (trans. Harmon 249-251).

Lucian promises profitability despite, or perhaps because of, the humorous nature of his tale.

Reading it can serve as a form of training for more serious literary pursuits, and Rabelais, too, is quick to assure the reader that the book contains: “[...] plus de fruit que paraventure ne pensent un tas de gros talvassiers tous croustelevez, qui entendent beaucoup moins en ces petites joyeusetés, que ne faict Raclet en l’*Institute*” (213). Yet, what is really at stake in this prologue is the performance of the narrator. This is the case in Lucian, as well, who promises to “tell all kinds of lies in a plausible and specious way.” Having admitted that his *True History* is a pack of amusing lies, the Samosatans distances himself from the poets and historians he parodies by way of the liar’s paradox: “But my lying is far more honest than theirs, for though I tell the truth in nothing else, I shall at least be truthful in saying that I am a liar. I think I can escape the censure of the world by my own admission that I am not telling a word of truth” (trans. Harmon 253). Lucian is not lying in order to pass off a made-up story as true; he is lying in order to entertain his audience, who has been made aware that he is lying, and who, having entered into this pact, will consequently wish to see just how well Lucian can lie. This is the very same pact established between reader and author when Alcofrybas praises narratees for having faithfully and gallantly “believed” the *Chroniques*. Rabelais advertises his narrator’s ability to advertise, to lie in a way that will be pleasing to his readers.<sup>246</sup>

---

<sup>246</sup> Bakhtin has similar remarks on what he calls “the language of the marketplace” in Rabelais: “Popular advertising is always ironic, always makes fun of itself to a certain extent (as does the advertising of our own peddlers and hawkers). At the fair even cupidity and cheating have an

Additionally, there is a very simple, yet very important point to be made about Alcofrybas's sales pitch: he spends the vast majority of it not on *Pantagruel*, the book in the reader's hand, but on a different book, the *Chronicques*, with which the reader may or may not be familiar.<sup>247</sup> Why would a prologue advertise for another book? Critics have devised a number of explanations for this conundrum. One of the most interesting, if rather far-fetched, is that of Peter Gilman and Abraham Keller, who argue that *Pantagruel*, especially in its prologue and first chapter, is a parody of none other than the *Illustrations* of Lemaire de Belges, and that the *Chronicques* are not the *Grandes et inestimables cronicques du grant et enorme geant Gargantua*, but the *Illustrations*.<sup>248</sup> Gray's explanation is much simpler, as he argues that the *Chronicques* are simply meant to stand for *Pantagruel* (*Rabelais et l'écriture* 15). Gray's interpretation seems to be confirmed by Alcofrybas's description of the book at hand: "Voulant doncques je vostre humble esclave accroistre vos passetemps dadvantage, vous offre de present un aultre livre de mesme billon sinon qu'il est un peu plus equitable et digne de foy que n'estoit l'autre" (215). The comparison follows in the wake of the prologue's oft-cited claim that printers have sold more copies of the *Chronicques* in two months than of Bibles in nine years. It is at this moment that the distinction between reader and narratee begins to break down. Whereas readers have previously been able to laugh at the gullible narratee taken in by Alcofrybas's sales pitch for a book like the *Chronicques*, they are here made aware that they are reading "un aultre livre de mesme billon." Through the prologue, readers of *Pantagruel* become

---

ironical, almost candid character" (160). For more on the capacity of advertising for irony, see Vestergaard and Schröder, p. 168, and Williamson, p. 178.

<sup>247</sup> The *Chronicques*, in which Rabelais may have had a hand, are reproduced in Huchon's edition, pp. 154-207.

<sup>248</sup> See their series of three articles: "Who Is Pantagruel?" *ER* 22 (1988), pp. 77-100, "Rabelais, the 'Grandes Chronicques,' and Jean Lemaire de Belges," *ER* 29 (1993), pp. 93-103, and "The 'Grosses Mesles,'" *ER* 29 (1993), pp. 105-26.

readers of the *Chronicques* (Gray, “First Readers”19-20). In other words, perhaps they are bigger suckers than they previously thought themselves to be.

It is the comparison to sales of the Bible that drives this realization home. Lars Schneider sees in the claim, and in the entire prologue, an ironic commentary on the state of the book market in Lyons and its concern with selling above all else (115). The printers of whom Alcofrybas speaks do indeed appear to be driven by the profit motive rather than religious fervor: they are only giving the people what they want, but this does not reflect well on them or the people. The prologue must be read alongside Chapter 8, in which Pantagruel, studying in Paris, receives a letter from Gargantua urging him to devote himself to his studies, as well as Erasmus’s *Paraclesis*, or “exhortation,” which first appeared as one of the three prefaces to his 1516 Greek/Latin edition of the New Testament, the *Novum Instrumentum*.<sup>249</sup> Erasmus’s influence on Rabelais cannot be understated, nor has it been by critics.<sup>250</sup> In a letter to Erasmus dated November 30, 1532, Rabelais makes his admiration for the Dutch humanist perfectly clear: “Patrem te dixi, matrem etiam dicerem, si per indulgentiam mihi id tuam liceret” (“I have said you are my father; I would also say you are my mother, if your indulgence permitted me”; 998). Raymond Lebègue lists Erasmus’s prefaces for the *Novum Instrumentum* as one of three categories of sources for Rabelais, the other two being compendia like the *Adages* and *Apophtegmata* and Erasmus’s original works (92-93). While Marcel Françon and Charles Béné point to the prefaces as sources for Chapter 8 of *Pantagruel*, they point only to the *Methodus* and its 1518 revised version, the *Ratio verae Theologiae*, not to the *Paraclesis* (Françon 43, 47; Béné

---

<sup>249</sup> Erasmus changed the name to the more conventional *Novum Testamentum* in 1519. The three prefaces are the *Paraclesis*, an exhortation to the more assiduous and widespread reading of the Bible, the *Methodus*, in which Erasmus lays out his views on theology and interpretation, and the *Apologia*, in which he justifies his approach to editing and translating the text of the New Testament.

<sup>250</sup> For a summary of Erasmus’s influence on Rabelais, see Lebègue.

53-54). In my estimation, this has been a critical oversight, as the *Paraclesis* is concerned with what people read as well as what they should read in the age of print; these are the very same concerns expressed by Gargantua in his letter. Moreover, certain aspects of both the prologue and Chapter 8 refer to the *Paraclesis*, but in such a way as to cast aspersions on Gargantua's view of printing, as well as on the superiority of readers of *Pantagruel* to readers of the *Chronicques*.

Traditionally, critics have seen Gargantua's letter as a quintessential humanist text, an expression of the thirst for knowledge characteristic of the Renaissance, and a celebration of the role of printing in the preservation of good letters and the dissemination of knowledge.<sup>251</sup> Other critics, however, have taken a less celebratory view of the letter: Defaux describes it as a torrent of commonplaces from rhetorical manuals, and Gerard Brault describes it as the "overblown rhetoric of a pretentious fool" (Defaux, *Sophistes* 73-74, *Rabelais agonistes* 312-21; Brault 631). I count myself among this latter category of critics, as I have located numerous instances in which the letter betrays the pettiness of Gargantua's intentions, makes claims that contradict the text of *Pantagruel* itself, and conveys the failure of printing to meet the goals Erasmus lays out for it in the *Paraclesis*.

The letter opens with Gargantua expressing his desire to achieve temporal immortality through his son:

Treschier filz, entre les dons, graces, et prerogatives desquelles le souverain plasmateur Dieu tout puissant a endouayré et aorné l'humaine nature à son commencement, celle me semble singuliere et excellente, par laquelle elle peut en estat mortel acquerir espece de immortalité, et en decours de vie transitoire perpetuer son nom et sa semence. Ce que est faict par lignée yssue de nous en mariage legitime (241-42).<sup>252</sup>

<sup>251</sup> Cf. Kline, p. 14; Screech *Rabelais*, pp. 64-68; and Stephens, S61-S62.

<sup>252</sup> As Huchon notes, the idea of temporal immortality through reproduction is a commonplace from Aristotle and Galen through the scholastics, but also figures prominently in Erasmus's *De pueris instituendis* (p. 1269, n. 1).

Gargantua's principal motivation in encouraging Pantagruel to devote himself to his studies is to find a way to cheat death by having his name and seed live on in his son. Pantagruel resembles his father in body, but the question is whether he will educate himself enough to act as "garde et tresor de l'immortallité de nostre nom" (242). The use of the term "tresor" reveals how Gargantua seems to regard his son more as an investment in his own perpetuation than as an independent being, as he continues to speak in monetary terms:

A laquelle entreprinse parfaire et consommer, il te peut assez souvenir comment je n'ay rien *espargné*: mais ainsi te y ay je secouru comme si je n'eusse aultre *thesor* en ce monde, que de te veoir une foys en ma vie absolu et parfaict, tant en vertu, honesteté et preudhommie, comme en tout sçavoir liberal et honeste, et tel te laisser après ma mort comme un mirouir representant la personne de moy ton père [...] (243; emphasis mine).

Gargantua is interested in Pantagruel only insofar as the latter can become another Gargantua, which is why he has been willing to invest so much money and resources in Pantagruel's education. Defaux, recognizing Gargantua's blatant egotism, describes the letter as a "danse devant le miroir" in reference to the description of Pantagruel as a mirror for Gargantua (*Sophistes* 76). His advice to Pantagruel seems almost *picrocholine* in its ambition, and instills a sense of foreboding: "Et quand à la congnoissance des faictz de nature, je veulx que tu te y adonne curieusement, qu'il n'y ayt mer, riviere, ny fontaine, dont tu ne congnoisse les poissons, tous les oyseaulx de l'air, tous les arbres, arbustes et fructices des foretz, toutes les herbes de la terre, tous les metaulx cachez au ventre des abysmes, les pierreries de tout Orient et midy, rien ne te soit incongneu" (245). The metals hidden in the bowels of the earth are a reminiscence of the Iron Age in the *Metamorphoses*, which marks the lowest point in humanity's decline from the Golden Age; it is in the Iron Age that men begin to tear metals from the earth's womb for the sake of wealth, which is the root of other evils (1.137-40). Gargantua's praise of the

advancement of knowledge and the advancement of the human condition that it supposedly entails conveys instead the image of mankind's degradation through acquisition.

Education, Gargantua continues, has much more potential now than in his youth, when “[l]e temps estoit encores tenebreux et sentant l’infelicité et calamité des Gothz, qui avoient mis à destruction toute bonne literature” (243). The notion of the Dark Ages and the damage done by them to *bonas litteras* is something of a commonplace in Renaissance thought, starting with Petrarch. However, as an edition, whether printed by Nourry or later by Juste, *Pantagruel* appears to belong to the very era which Gargantua condemns, as its characters are Gothic. Daniel Ménager, taking note of this contradiction, describes *Pantagruel* as a “Janus *bi-frons* regardant d’un côté vers l’époque gothique, de l’autre vers la Renaissance” (“Stratégie des titres” 14). Gargantua’s letter thus reveals *Pantagruel* to be an exemplar of the contradictions between economic necessity (printing vernacular literature in Gothic characters to conform to readers’ horizons of expectation) and humanist aspirations. If, in Gargantua’s words, “toutes disciplines sont restituées,” the market forces that contribute to their restoration also serve to hinder them.

Even more striking is Gargantua’s praise of “impressions tant elegantes et correctes en usance,” which he believes to have invented by divine inspiration, whereas artillery was a diabolical invention (243). The printed word gives life, whereas the cannon takes it. Yet, the fruits of printing that Gargantua proceeds to enumerate must give us pause: “Tout le monde est plein de gens savans, de precepteurs tresdoctes, de librairies tresamples, qu’il m’est advis que ny au temps de Platon, ny de Ciceron, ny de Papinian n’estoit telle commodité d’estude qu’on y veoit maintenant” (244). The “librairies tresamples,” in particular, are a red flag, especially in light of Chapter 7, which features Pantagruel’s visit to the library of Saint Victor and a list of the volumes held in it. The abbey of Saint-Victor, founded in 1113 during the Twelfth Century

Renaissance, likely made an easy target for Rabelais due to its association with the University of Paris and its perception as a bastion of medievalism in Francis I's Paris. Rabelais's description of its library, then, is anything but an accurate representation; it is an artful exaggeration that makes Saint-Victor into "[...] le symbole d'un passé honni, le cimetière où pourrissent sur un linceul de poussière toutes les idées mortes" (Ouy, *Manuscrits*, vol. 1, p. 61).

To begin with, the library is anything but "tresample": in the 1542 edition, there are 139 titles in all, and even fewer in previous editions.<sup>253</sup> The dearth of books implies that the monks of Saint-Victor devote precious little time to reading. The content of these books, moreover, leaves something to be desired, and prompts Kline to regard the chapter as an image of the potential perversion of the printing press (12). Some of these titles include *Moillegroin doctoris cherubici de origine patepelutarum et torticollorum ritibus lib. septem* (Seven Books on the Origin and Rites of Hairy-handed and Twist-necked Hypocrites by Wetsnout, Cherubic Doctor), *Reverendi patris fratris Lubini provincialis Bavardie, de croquendis lardonibus libri tres* (Three Books on the Munching of Bacon Bits by Friar Lubin, provincial Reverend Father of Gab) and *Des poys au lart cum commento* (237-240).<sup>254</sup> The few books housed at Saint-Victor are laughably useless, ranging from the utterly insignificant to the distinctly salacious. Even if we adopt Barbara Bowen's view of the chapter as overwhelmingly evangelical humanist in orientation, with its references to the hated syndic Béda (*Beda de optimitate triparum*) and the *Epistolae obscurorum virorum* written to mock the opponents of Johannes Reuchlin, the fact remains that one would be hard pressed to learn much of anything from these books (95-100). If

---

<sup>253</sup> According to the 1514 catalogue drawn up by the librarian of Saint-Victor, Claude de Grandrue, the reading room alone contained 1081 manuscripts, a remarkable 85% of which have survived (Ouy, "Saint-Victor" 86).

<sup>254</sup> The last title reappears in the prologue of *Gargantua* (6). As for the second, it may be a reference to the "Ballade, d'un qu'on appelloit Frere Lubin" from the *Adolescence clémentine* (OC I.116-17; OPC I.112).

these are the books Pantagruel has at his disposal, it may, in fact, explain why, in Chapter 9, he falls in with the trickster Panurge after devoting himself all the more to his studies.

Even more alarmingly, one of the titles in the library directly recalls the hyperbolic praise of the *Chronicques* in the prologue, where Alcofrybas boasts that they provide as much relief to syphilitics undergoing treatment in sweat baths as the life of Saint Margaret does to women in labor (214). Sure enough, in Saint Victor we find *L'apparition de sainte Geltrude à une nonnain de Poissy estant en mal d'enfant* (236). The *Chronicques* and this book have something in common: in solving one problem, they leave another unresolved, or to stick with Alcofrybas's medical terminology, they treat the symptom, but not the disease. After all, how do syphilitics come by their disease in the first place, and how does a nun become pregnant? Especially if we accept Bowen's reading of the library, it becomes clear that the disease is tantamount to spiritual sickness, brought on by the human condition and exacerbated by the forced celibacy so universally detested by evangelicals and Protestants alike.

The only cure for this disease is the word of God, which, ironically, is exactly what Gargantua urges Pantagruel to follow at the conclusion of his letter: "Et par lesquelles heures du jour commence à visiter les saintes lettres. Premièrement en Grec, *le nouveau testament et Epistres* des apostres, et puis en Hebrieu *le vieulx testament*" (245). Duval, who sees in the letter a sincere appeal to revise the trivium based on humanist principles, calls particular attention to how Gargantua stresses reading the Bible in its original language, Hebrew for the Old Testament and Greek for the New (245). It is here that Duval recognizes an expression of Erasmus's claim in the *Paraclesis* that everyone can be a theologian, since the Bible is accessible to all and is the ultimate authority in matters of theology ("Medieval Curriculum" 38). I agree that Gargantua's concluding exhortation (or *paraclesis*) should be read as sincere, and that it should be understood

in relation to Erasmus's *Paraclesis*, but the fact remains that the giant has taken until the very end of his letter to get to this point, and that much of what he has described before it reads like a failed version of Erasmus's exhortation.

The *Paraclesis*, in keeping with its title, urges the study of what Erasmus calls the philosophy of Christ through the reading of the Scriptures. Its tone is strikingly similar to Gargantua's letter in that it begins by praising the advancement of human knowledge. However, this praise is only meant to underscore the lack of attention to scriptural study that Erasmus feels has plagued Christendom, to the point where Christians pride themselves on not reading the Bible, either because they feel such things must be left to the educated or because they have devoted their attention to other pursuits:

At in ceteris disciplinis omnibus, quas humana prodidit industria, nihil est tam abditum ac retrusum, quod non pervestigarit ingenii sagacitas, nihil tam difficile, quod non expugnarit labor improbus. Qui fit autem, ut hanc unam philosophiam non his, quibus par est, animis amplectamur, quotquot ipso etiam cognimine Christi factionem profitemur? (140)

Moreover, in all other branches of learning which human industry has brought forth, nothing is so hidden and obscure which the keenness of genius has not explored, nothing is so difficult which tremendous exertion has not overcome. Yet how is it that even those of us who profess to be Christian fail to embrace with the proper spirit this philosophy alone? (trans. Olin 94)

In the case of Gargantua, it would seem that he, too, could stand to listen to what Erasmus has to say. While he advises his son to read the Bible, there is no indication that he does so himself. In fact, as he awaits "l'heure qu'il plaira à dieu mon createur me appeller et commander yssir de ceste terre," he delights in his newfound Greek, reading Plutarch's *Moralia*, the Platonic dialogues, Pausanias's *Description of Greece*, and Athenaeus's *Deipnosophists* (244). In other words, he reads anything in Greek except the New Testament.

The *Paraclesis* expresses optimism at the new opportunities presented by translation and print to remedy people's ignorance of Christ by spreading the word even among those who previously had no access to it: "Optarim, ut omnes mulierculae legant evangelium, legant Paulinas epistolas [...] Utinam hinc ad stivam aliquid decantet agricola, hinc nonnihil ad radios suos moduletur textor, huiusmodi fabulis itineris taedium lenet viator" ("I would that even the lowliest women read the Gospels and the Pauline Epistles [...] Would that, as a result, the farmer sing some portion of them at the plow, the weaver hum some parts of them to the movement of his shuttle, the traveler lighten the weariness of the journey with stories of this kind"; 142; trans. Olin 97). Gargantua expresses the societal changes brought about by print in terms so similar to those of Erasmus that it is difficult to imagine how they cannot be a reference to the *Paraclesis*. There are, however, several noteworthy changes: "Je voy les brigans, les boureaulx, les avanturiers, les palefreniers de maintenant plus doctes que les docteurs et prescheurs de mon temps. Que diray je? Les femmes et filles ont aspiré à ceste louange et manne celeste de bonne doctrine" (244). While women are common to both, Erasmus's farmers, weavers, and travelers become brigands, executioners, soldiers (or prowlers), and grooms.<sup>255</sup> They may be better-read than the doctors and preachers of Gargantua's day (which, incidentally, doesn't say much for them), but they are still brigands, executioners, and soldiers, which means that they continue to pilfer, put other people to death, and make war; one must wonder whether their learning has done them or Christendom any good whatsoever. Perhaps, like Gargantua, they have spent their time learning everything except what they most need to know, the philosophy of Christ. Indeed, Erasmus explains, if this philosophy actually were taught as it should be, "non sic perpetuis

---

<sup>255</sup> For "adventurier," Cotgrave gives "one that goes freely and without compulsion, or charge goes to the warres," but also "an idle loitering rogue; a hedge-creeper, henne-killer, sheet-stealer."

paene bellis tumultuaretur undique res Christiana, non tam insano studio per fas nefasque congerendi divitias ferverent omnia, non tot litibus ubique perstreperent sacra pariter ac profana, denique non titulo tantum et caerimoniis differremus ab iis, qui Christi philosophiam non profitentur” (“Christendom would not be so disturbed on all sides by almost continuous war, everything would not be boiling over with such a mad desire to heap up riches by fair means or foul, every subject, sacred as well as profane, would not be made to resound everywhere with so much noisy disputation, and, finally, we would not differ from those who do not profess the philosophy of Christ merely in name and ceremonial”; 144-45; trans. Olin 99). In other words, Christendom would free itself from the Iron Age, in which it currently finds itself bogged down with the pursuit of wealth and war, the very same Iron Age that so disconcertingly underpins Gargantua’s own *paraclesis* to his son and manifests itself in the learned thieves and warmongers he extols.

If this sorry state stems from people wanting to learn about anything but Christ and to read anything but the Bible, readers are forced to recall that they are in the process of reading a book similar to one that has sold many more copies than the Bible. If, in versions of the prologue through 1537, the suckers whom Alcofrybas addresses have believed in the *Chronicques* “tout ainsi que texte de Bible ou du saint Evangile,” the readers who laugh at them are in no better a position when considered in light of the *Paraclesis* (1234). In lamenting the apparent lack of interest in reading the Bible, Erasmus complains that too often, exoticism trumps worth:

Si quid a Chaldaeis aut Aegyptiis affertur, id ob hoc ipsum acrius avemus cognoscere, quod e peregrino sit orbe deportatum, et pretii pars est e longinquo venisse, et saepenumero in somniis homunculi, ne dicam impostoris, tam anxie distorquemur non solum nullo fructu, sed magno temporis dispendio (141).

If anything is brought to us from the Chaldeans or Egyptians, we desire more eagerly to examine it because of the fact that it comes from a strange world, and part of its value is to have come from far off; and oftentimes we are anxiously tormented by the fancies of an insignificant man, not to say an impostor, not only to no avail but with great loss of time (trans. Olin 99-100).

As previously mentioned, the name “Alcofrybas” has a distinctly Arabic ring to it, promising the very kind of novelty described by Erasmus. Moreover, readers know Alcofrybas to be a charlatan, an “impostor,” but still pay attention to what he says in the hopes of being amused; they have been “tormented by the fancies of an insignificant man” every bit as much as the narratees have. Though readers think that they have placed themselves in a position where they can look down at advertising and laugh, this supposed position of superiority reveals them to be all the more vulnerable to advertising. For them, advertising has itself become a “passetemps,” not only in the sense of “pastime,” but in the sense of time passing by idly with the aid of their obliging “humble esclave,” Alcofrybas.<sup>256</sup>

This “passetemps” extends to Chapter 34, the last of *Pantagruel*, in which the narrator promises to provide even more tales of Pantagruel, tying his promise to the fairground atmosphere from which he arises: “Vous aurez la reste de l’histoire à ces foires de Francfort prochainement venantes” (336). The Frankfurt fairs in spring and autumn were probably the single biggest bookselling events of the year in all of Europe, populated by printer/booksellers from Germany as well as from neighboring countries.<sup>257</sup> In reminding readers that he has not ceased to be a *bonimenteur*, Alcofrybas promises them even more Lucianic tales of how Pantagruel navigates the Atlantic Ocean and conquers the Cannibals, how he raids and pillages Hell, how he visits the moon, and “mille aultres petites joyeusetes toutes veritables” (336). At the beginning of a passage added in Juste’s 1534 edition, he also responds to those who think it

---

<sup>256</sup> For Colard’s explanation of the polysemy of “passetemps,” see above, Chapter Two, p. 128.

<sup>257</sup> For more on the Frankfurt fairs, see Febvre and Martin, pp. 323-29.

wasn't all that wise of him to write these "balivernes et plaisantes mocquettes" by replying that "vous ne l'estes gueres plus, de vous amuser à les lire" (336).<sup>258</sup> From Erasmus's standpoint, it would appear that what Alcofrybas says here is true, for once, and the phrase with which the chapter concluded prior to 1534 further confirms that in finding fault with the text, readers are only calling attention to their own flaws: "*Pardonnante my*, et ne pensez tant à mes fautes, que ne pensez bien es vostres" (336).

However, the grammatical structure of this question and answer provides a different perspective on the issue of wasted time. It is an if-then statement: "Si vous me dictes... Je vous responds, que..." If readers perceive the book as nothing but "balivernes et plaisantes mocquettes," then it is foolish of them to spend their time on something that they themselves have deemed foolish. To put it another way, Rabelais is not so much telling his readers that they shouldn't be reading his book when they could be reading the Bible as he is bringing *Pantagruel* back to Lucian's description of the *True History* as a form of training. *Pantagruel* proves to readers that they need to fashion themselves for the better by reading, using the reprobates in Gargantua's letter (and, to some extent, Gargantua himself) as anti-ideals, readers who have utterly failed to improve themselves through their reading. It grounds self-fashioning, the very kind of self-fashioning exemplified by the *De pueris instituendis* that serves as a principal source of Chapter 8, within man's relationship with the word of God. While the ultimate goal is, I think, to encourage the reading of the Bible, this does not mean that reading *Pantagruel* must be unprofitable. Just as Gargantua, despite his flaws, concludes his letter with his own *paraclesis* urging the reading of the Bible, *Pantagruel*, despite its resemblance to the *Chronicques*, a book that distracts from the Bible, can be beneficial if the reader approaches it in the right frame of

---

<sup>258</sup> Huguet defines "s'amuser" as "s'occuper à des choses vaines, perdre son temps, s'attarder" (1.203).

mind. *Pantagruel* presents itself, or rather a specific way of reading it, as an *adjuvant* to the reader's self-fashioning in that the emphasis is not on the virtues of the product itself; on the contrary, the product and its apparent producer are highly suspect. Yet, in spite of its questionable nature, the product can bring readers to make themselves more righteous through a firmer knowledge of Christ.

Rabelais thus acknowledges, as Marot does in the *Œuvres*, that writing, publishing, and selling a book like *Pantagruel* is, on many levels, incompatible with an ideological movement that stresses knowledge of the Scriptures in their unadulterated form above all else. Ideal readership grounded in evangelical ideals affords Rabelais a solution to this problem insofar as it places the onus upon readers to fashion themselves for the better by searching for evangelical truths as they read. In this vein, it is hardly coincidental that many of the textual and paratextual elements that further encourage an evangelical reading of *Pantagruel* stem from the 1534 edition published by Juste, who, as his editions of Marot amply demonstrate, is no stranger to imparting an evangelical flavor upon works that invite it.

This edition features two significant changes to the paratext. The title is somewhat altered to become *Les horribles faictz et prouesses espouventables de Pantagruel roy des Dipsodes, composez par M. Alcofribas abstracteur de quinte essence*. Gargantua has disappeared from the title, and no mention is made of the book's novelty, suggesting that it has already garnered enough notoriety to stand on its own. Additionally, Alcofryas has dropped his Ovidian surname of "Nasier" in favor of the title "abstracteur de quinte essence," which suggests an alchemist capable of extracting the most subtle parts from substances.<sup>259</sup> The title

---

<sup>259</sup> For more on the alchemical context of "quinte essence," see Léo Mérigot, "Rabelais et l'alchimie," *Les Cahiers d'Hermès* 1 (1947), pp. 50-64. It is impossible to know whether this addition was made to match Juste's first edition of *Gargantua*, since the only copy of the latter is

simultaneously begins to hint at the hidden mysteries so important to the prologue of *Gargantua* and further indicates the subtleness of a narrator who proves himself a clever spinner of lies and every bit as much a marketplace charlatan as the Alcofrybas of *Pantagruel*: quintessence was specifically associated with Mercury (the god and the element), whose ambiguity, as we have seen, is at the heart of Lemaire's Genius.<sup>260</sup> This edition is also the first to feature the "Dizain de M. Hugues Salel a l'auteur de cestui livre":

Si pour mesler profit avec douceur  
 On met en pris un aucteur grandement,  
 Prisé seras, de cela tien toy sceur:  
 Je le congnois car ton endendement  
 En ce livret soubz plaisant fondement  
 L'utilité a si tresbien descripte,  
 Qu'il m'est advis que je voy un Democrite  
 Rian les faictz de nostre vie humaine.  
 Or persevere et si n'en as merite  
 En ces bas lieux: l'auras au hault dommaine (211).<sup>261</sup>

This *dizain* is, of course, a transposition of the oft-cited lines from Horace's *Ars poetica* which recommend that literary or theatrical works be both useful and pleasurable. Horace's lines are worth quoting here, as they reveal that the Roman poet is concerned with more than just literary glory:

omne tulit punctum qui miscuit utile dulci,  
 lectorem delectando pariterque monendo.

---

missing its title page. Additionally, starting in 1537 (NRB 10, Plan 36-37), editions add "feu" before "M. Alcofribas," adding to the prestige of a work that has apparently survived its author.

<sup>260</sup> Cf. Dom Antoine-Joseph Pernety, *Dictionnaire mytho-hermétique* (Paris: Denoël, 1972), p. 306. Mercury was also used to treat syphilis, which invites a connection with the "Verolez tresprecieux" of the prologue of *Gargantua*.

<sup>261</sup> For more on Hugues Salel, a Quercinois poet like the better-known Marot, see Huchon, p. 1233, n. 2. For more on the dizain, see Sébillet's *Art poétique françois* (1548): "Le dizain est l'épigramme aujourd'hui estimé premier, et de plus grande perfection: ou pource que le nombre de dix, est nombre plein et consommé, si nous croyons aux Arithméticiens ou pource que la matière prise pour l'épigramme, y est plus parfaitement déduite, et le son de la rime entrelacée y rend plus parfaite modulation. Quoi que soit, c'est le plus communément usurpé des savants, et le doit être de toi" (bk. 2, ch. 1, p. 102).

hic meret aera liber Sosiis, hic et mare transit  
et longum noto scriptori prorogat aevum (ll. 343-46).

He has won every vote who has blended profit and pleasure, at once delighting and instructing the reader. That is the book to make money for the Sosii [well-known Roman booksellers]; this is the one to cross the sea and extend to a distant day its author's fame (trans. Fairclough 479).

For Horace, sales and eternal glory are not mutually exclusive, as they will be for, say, Ronsard or Du Bellay. The implication is the same in Salel's *dizain*, as the expression "en pris" can describe people or commercial goods.<sup>262</sup> Like Lemaire's *repos* and *guerdon*, the *dizain* justifies commercial profit by tying it to the reader's profit, which, as we have seen, must be sought "soubz plaisant fondement." Rigolot, reversing Paul Valéry's famous saying into "C'est la poésie de Rabelais qui marche et sa prose qui danse," has argued that the paratextual *dizains* in Rabelais's works attempt to impose a straightforward, univocal meaning upon the highly ambiguous and often circular language of the prologues (*Langages* 20). In light of the profitability at the heart of ideal readership in *Pantagruel*, this is precisely what Salel's *dizain* accomplishes.<sup>263</sup>

Finally, Juste's edition marks the first appearance after the *dizain* of the phrase "Vivent tous bons pantagruelistes," which would remain through 1537. This phrase marks the beginning of the association of the book, as well as of the character, with a term used to describe an attitude toward life and especially toward reading that recurs throughout the *geste*. The evangelical nature of this association is made clear in the addition to Chapter 34, which begins with Alcofrybas's if-then statement to skeptical readers. Even if they make the mistake of regarding

---

<sup>262</sup> "A haut prix" (Huguet 7.195).

<sup>263</sup> Bernd Renner takes a rather opposite view from Rigolot's, arguing that the paratextual *dizains* of *Pantagruel* and *Gargantua* combat the univocal tendencies of the respective prologues: Salel's *dizain* combats the farcical orientation of *Pantagruel*, and the *dizain* from *Gargantua* combats the serious orientation of the prologue ("Changes" 193).

the book as a simple “passe-temps joyeux,” they (and he) are still more pardonable than “[...] un grand tas de Sarrabovites, Cagotz, Escargotz, Hypocrites, Caffars, Frapars, Botineurs et aultres telles sectes de gens, qui se sont desguisez comme masques pour tromper le monde” (336-7).

The target is quite obviously the hypocritical members of the monastic orders, who feign poverty and chastity, but debauch themselves, stuffing their faces with food and drink. Their debauchery is revealed through a metaphor of reading, which compares their physical features to an illuminated manuscript: “Vous le pouvez lire en grosse lettre et enlumineure de leurs rouges muzeaulx, et ventres à poulaine, sinon quand ilz se parfument de Soulfhre” (337).<sup>264</sup> This reading may be characterized as eminently literal: a red nose is a drinker’s nose, and a pot belly is the result of gorging oneself. In this respect, it contrasts with the way in which these hypocrites themselves read books like *Pantagruel*: “Quant est de leur estude, elle est toute consummée à la lecture de livres Pantagrueliques: non tant pour passer temps joyusement, que pour nuyre à quelcun meschamment, sçavoir est, articulant, monorticulant, torticulant, culletant, couilletant, et diaboliculant, c’est à dire callumniant” (337).<sup>265</sup> As with Gargantua and the reader, the question is implicitly raised of why these holy men spend all their time reading “livres Pantagrueliques” instead of Scripture. Even worse, though, they read these books not for amusement, but with the more sinister purpose of bringing accusations, of twisting words to their own purposes (“torticulant”) and figuratively defecating on the work, as the recurrence of the syllable “cul” makes abundantly clear.

---

<sup>264</sup> The “ventres à poulaine” is likely another reference to the prominent gut of Béda, the whipping boy, and probably deservedly so, of evangelicals. See above, Chapter Two, p. 166, n. 207.

<sup>265</sup> Of the verbs in this sentence, “monorticuler” and “diaboliculer” are inventions. See Huchon, p. 1340, n. 10-14. The repetition of “culs” might be an implicit reference to *Matthew* 23:24, in which Jesus takes the Pharisees to task: “Duces caeci, excolantes culicem, camelum autem glutientes” (*KJV*: “Ye blind guides, which strain at a gnat, and swallow a camel”). Cf. Erasmus, “Culicem colant,” *Adages* 3.10.91.

The ensuing simile is also fecal in nature, as it compares these readers, in an amusing manifestation of the Latin proverb *Aurum ex stercore colligendum* (Gold may be collected from dung), to village scamps who pick through childrens' turds in order to find cherry stones to sell to druggists who use them to make mahlab ("huile de Maguelet") (337). Insofar as they know what they are looking for before they begin to search, they resemble readers of *Pantagruel*, who are similarly encouraged to put their reading to good evangelical use. The difference, however, is that whereas readers of *Pantagruel* are made to recognize their own infirmity through reading, these hypocrites transform their criticisms into sweet-smelling mahlab, which was typically used in perfume, and turn a profit to boot (Huguet 2.76). Their criticisms, then, are the perfume with which they mask their abuses: by accusing books of stinking of sulfur, they distract from their own infernal wickedness.

Any reader, as Rabelais knows, can easily come to resemble these. To return to Greenblatt's terminology, they are the "aliens" against which the reader must be defined for the purposes of self-fashioning through reading. To wit, the chapter concludes with an imperative directing readers not to imitate these hypocrites, but rather to adopt an entirely different set of principles: "Iceulx fuyez, abhorrissez, et haïssez aultant que je foyz et vous en trouverez bien sur ma foy. Et si desirez estre bons pantagruelistes (c'est-à-dire vivre en paix, joye, santé, faisans tousjours grand chere) ne vous fiez jamais en gens qui regardent par un partuys" (337). We should not pass over the "tousjours," as to suggest that *pantagruelistes* should always have a good time implies that they should even do it during Lent. Their "grand chere" contrasts sharply with that of the monks, who apparently have more than their share of good times, as well, but hide it, and attach far too much significance to the observances that they themselves are not capable of following. Serving as a foil to the ideal reader, they are reduced to "gens qui

regardent par un partuys,” an image which implies both the narrowness of their theological views and the sinister, voyeuristic pleasure they derive from scouring books for obscenity or heresy, much like peeping toms peering through windows hoping to see something naughty.<sup>266</sup>

Chapter 34 of *Pantagruel* thus equates *pantagruelisme* with ideal readership, defining it against readers inclined to find fault with the *geste*. Whereas fault-finding becomes a sign of reprobation, *pantagruelisme* becomes a sign of evangelical righteousness, and the book, no matter how trifling or even untrustworthy it or its narrator may seem, continues to serve as the *adjuvant* which helps readers to see themselves as righteous if they read it in a favorable, and indeed charitable way. Duval has described how Pantagruel’s relationship with Panurge acts as a model for the reader’s relationship with the books of the *geste*:

[T]hey must read the books for a serious meaning *and* take their frivolousness in good part, not amiss, by putting the best possible interpretation on them. What this means is nothing less than practicing *caritas* while reading, interpreting, and judging, and thereby accepting inclusion in the larger, nonhierarchical community that Pantagruel has established in Utopie and that the *Pantagruel* seeks to establish with and among its readers (*Design of Rabelais’s Pantagruel* 144).<sup>267</sup>

This community is composed, of course, of *pantagruelistes*. Defaux, picking up on Duval’s notion of charitable reading, implicitly equates it with *captatio benevolentiae*: Rabelais’s readers are asked to approach the text “[...] dans un esprit de bienveillance essentiellement évangélique”

<sup>266</sup> Cotgrave defines “gens qui regardent par un pertuis” as “Monkes, or Fryers (by reason of their Cowles).”

<sup>267</sup> Cf. Duval’s “Interpretation and the ‘doctrine absconce’ of Rabelais’s prologue to *Gargantua*,” p. 15, and *Design of Rabelais’s Tiers Livre*, pp. 190-91. A number of critics have echoed Duval’s “charitable” reading, notably in relation to the prologues of *Gargantua* and the *Tiers Livre*. See, for example, Jeanneret, “Signs Gone Wild,” Miernowski, “Literature and Metaphysics: Rabelais and the Poetics of Misunderstanding,” *ER* 35(1998), pp. 131-51, and James Helgeson, ““Ce que j’entends par ces symboles pythagoriques”: Rabelais on Meaning and Intention,” *ER* 42 (2003), pp. 75-100. More recently, Tristan Vigliano has taken exception with this kind of reading, calling it, in a very telling choice of words, “scandaleux.” In Vigliano’s view, nothing could be less charitable than putting the charity of others on trial.

(*Rabelais agonistes* 380).<sup>268</sup> *Pantagruelisme*, qua ideal readership, is precisely how Rabelais secures the reader's goodwill. At the same time, however, the ambiguity that the reader is asked to overlook never entirely disappears, in the same way that Genius and Alice respectively haunt the works of Lemaire and Marot. In each of the successive entries of the *geste*, readers are reminded of their own infirmity, and promised that a certain way of reading the book to follow will cure them of their ills. Yet, these same readers are also faced with the possibility that they are being duped.

***Gargantua: Silenus Alcibiadis or silenus praeposterus?***

Only one copy of Juste's *princeps* edition of *Gargantua* (NRB 19, Plan 31) exists, and unfortunately, it is missing its first folio, which means that we do not know its original title, exact date of publication, or whether it contains the *dizain* "Aux lecteurs." Beginning, then, with Juste's second edition of 1535 (NRB 20, Plan 32), the title picks up where *Pantagruel* leaves off, referencing both the work and the title eventually assigned to its narrator: *La vie inestimable du grand Gargantua, pere de Pantagruel, jadis composee par l'abstracteur de quinte essence / Livre plein de Pantagruelisme* (A1r). To my knowledge, no one has called attention to the choice of the adjective "inestimable" in the title, which becomes more than mere hyperbole when the reader is subsequently asked to "fleurer, sentir, et *estimer* ces beaulx livres de haulte gresse" (7; emphasis mine). The reader is asked to measure the immeasurable before even opening the book. The verso of the title page contains the *dizain*:

Amis lecteurs qui ce livre lisez,  
Despouillez vous de toute affection,  
Et le lisant ne vous scandalisez.

---

<sup>268</sup> Cf. Demerson: "[L]a bienveillance requise pour entrer dans le royaume du Livre est déjà une adhésion au Pantagruélisme" (332).

Il ne contient mal ne infection.  
 Vray est qu'icy peu de perfection  
 Vous apprendrez, si non en cas de rire :  
 Aultre argument ne peut mon cuer elire.  
 Voyant le dueil, qui vous mine et consomme,  
 Mieulx est de ris que de larmes escripre.  
 Pource que rire est le propre de l'homme (3).<sup>269</sup>

At first, it seems as if the *dizain* represents the author speaking to his “Amis lecteurs,” as opposed to the narrator who will address his naïve narratees like in *Pantagruel*. However, despite the language of *inventio* (“Aultre argument ne peut mon cuer elire”), the author speaks as a doctor examining and diagnosing his patients: “*Voyant le dueil, qui vous mine et consomme.*” He prescribes a book that is free from “mal” and “infection,” and that is meant to combat grief and its mental and physical toll with laughter.<sup>270</sup> But the healing process requires the patient’s cooperation, as well, and as seen in *Pantagruel*, those critical readers who look at the book “par un partuys” will worsen rather than improve themselves. Consequently, the line “Et le lisant ne vous scandalisez” is less a request than a warning: readers who do take offense at the work to follow are only worsening their own spiritual sickness.<sup>271</sup> The *dizain* thus sets up a

---

<sup>269</sup> Ménager, focusing on the oft-quoted “Pource que rire est le propre de l’homme,” contests the commonly-held notion that Rabelais derives the phrase from Aristotle’s *De partibus animalium*. In Ménager’s view, it is a parody of scholastic commentaries on Aristotle’s work (*Renaissance et le rire* 13-15). See also Ménager’s “Rabelais et le ‘propre de l’homme.’”

<sup>270</sup> Antonioli points out that medical humanism sought to treat both mind and body, or the one through the other: “Pour le vérolé, le gouteux, ou celui que tourmente la pierre, le meilleur remède, c’est encore la tranquillité d’esprit, la gaieté, l’espoir de guérison” (332-333).

<sup>271</sup> The term “scandal” derives from the Greek word σκάνδαλον, or “stumbling block,” and denotes actions which either are, or are perceived to be, injurious to faith in that they lead others to sin. In debates over the nature of scandal, especially among Reformers, a key distinction is drawn between offense given by a scandal, and offense taken by one. If a person perceives scandal where none has been intended, and where there is nothing that must necessarily induce sinful behavior, then it is this perceiver of scandal who proves to be reprobate. In Melancthon’s 1535 *Loci communes* and Calvin’s 1536 *Institutes*, this is known as *scandalum acceptum* (“offense taken”), as opposed to *scandalum datum* (“offense given”). Both likely draw on Aquinas’s similar distinction between active and passive scandal in the *Summa Theologica* (pt. 2.2, qu. 43, art. 1-2).

criterion similar to that in Hans Christian Andersen's *The Emperor's New Clothes*: just as the swindling weavers claim that the fabric is invisible to those who are unfit for their position or just plain stupid, the *dizain* claims that those who find fault with *Gargantua* are blinded by their own sinfulness.<sup>272</sup> In this vein, it is to be compared with the inscription on the door of the Abbey of Thélème, which tells "Hypocrites, bigotz, / Vieulx matagotz, marmiteux borsoufflez, / Torcaulx, badaulx" like the ones described in Chapter 34 of *Pantagruel* to keep out, while inviting those "qui le saint evangile / En sens agile annoncez" to come in (ch. 54, pp. 141-43).<sup>273</sup>

The prologue of *Gargantua*, one of the most commented-upon passages, if not the most commented-upon, in all of sixteenth-century French literature, features a narrator very similar to, if somewhat more subdued than, the Alcofrybas of *Pantagruel*. He employs some of the same tactics, and indeed the same vocabulary, as in the prologue of *Pantagruel*, concluding by cursing his audience with "que le maulubec vous trousse" (8, 215).<sup>274</sup> He also calls attention to his own strategies for *captatio* in a similar manner, describing the prologue as "ce prelude, et coup d'essay," combining a term taken from the preface of Marot's *Adolescence clémentine* with a term straight from Aristotle's *Rhetoric* (6). The latter is particularly disconcerting, as Aristotle is quick to remind us that introductions "[...] are popular with those whose case is weak, or looks weak; it pays them to dwell on anything rather than the actual facts of it" (3.14.2260; 1415b1).

---

<sup>272</sup> Renner remarks that making the reader responsible for his own interpretation means that readings "[...] donnent un sens au texte qui révèle le bagage intellectuel ou littéraire du lecteur sans nécessairement découvrir l'intention de l'auteur" (*Difficile* 300). Demerson, for his part, also remarks that "Nos jugements nous jugent" (325).

<sup>273</sup> For more on Thélème and its evangelical connotations of Christian liberty, see Screech, *Rabelais*, pp. 192-93, and *Challenge of the Gospel* 54-60. See also Weinberg, pp. 124-34.

<sup>274</sup> La Charité takes a similar view of what he calls Alcofrybas's "tyranny": "Il s'intronise dans la fiction en tant que petit tyran vantard, hostile et méfiant qui ne cherche qu'à imposer sa volonté" ("Projet narratif" 363).

Furthermore, through these references, as well as to other “livres de nostre *invention*,” the narrator calls attention to his poetical and rhetorical work, only to present himself later in the prologue as inspired by wine rather than the burning of midnight oil. In short, it is impossible to know who the narrator truly is, but the reader is certainly given ample reason to doubt what he says in the prologue.

One aspect of the prologue that critics have not dealt with at length is the centrality of self-fashioning to so clearly Erasmian a text. And yet, it is precisely what ties the reader to both the search for a “plus hault sens” and the central metaphor of the *silenus* taken from Plato’s *Symposium* and the Erasmian adage “Sileni Alcibiadis” (3.3.1). In the *Symposium*, Alcibiades compares Socrates to a statue of Silenus (an old, drunken satyr who serves as the preceptor of Dionysus) that looks amusingly ugly on the outside, but contains an image of a god on the inside. Erasmus extends this comparison to Antisthenes, Diogenes, Epictetus, the Prophets, the Apostles, and especially to Christ, all of whom reveal their godliness through their very humility. These *sileni* contrast sharply with vulgar, trivial things (and, it is implied, with most representatives of the Roman Church), which seem golden on the outside, but are leaden on the inside, which prompts Erasmus to call them inverted *sileni* (*praeposteri Sileni*). It is in this context that Alcofrybas addresses his readers, altering the “Tresillustres et treschevaleureux champions” of Pantagruel into “Beuveurs tresillustres, et vous Verolez tresprecieux” (5). In addressing readers of such lowly, even laughable appearances, Alcofrybas invites them to see themselves as *sileni*: not only is the original Silenus famed for his drunkenness, but Socrates is here represented as “tousjours beuvant d’autant à un chascun” (5). Inside every reader, then, is an image of a god just waiting to be released, which Alcofrybas equates with a “celeste et impreciable drogue” that, not unlike the *Chronicques*, will cure them of their ailments:

“entendement plus que humain, vertus merveilleuse, couraige invincible, sobresse non pareille, contentement certain, assurance parfaite, deprisement incroyable de tout ce pourquoy les humains tant veiglent, courent, travaillent, naviguent et bataillent” (6).<sup>275</sup>

The book, or rather a hermeneutic approach to reading the book, is then presented as the *adjuvant* that will help readers to attain to their godlike potential. This approach is conveyed by the celebrated metaphor of a dog breaking open a bone to suck out the marrow: “Puis par curieuse leçon, et meditation frequente rompre l’os, et sugcer la sustantificque mouelle. C’est à dire: ce que j’entends par ces symboles Pythagoriques avecques espoir certain d’estre faictz escors et preux à ladicte lecture” (7). The connection with self-fashioning, and perhaps specifically with the “homines non nascuntur, sed finguntur” of Erasmus’s *De pueris instituendis*, is made clear by the passive “estre faictz,” which equates reading with a natural process of transformation (Schneider 133). The text is not the end in and of itself, and indeed, neither is the “plus hault sens” that the reader might discover in it, as the reader, while encouraged to search for it, is never told what it is, and is effectively forbidden to equate it with authorial intention. Rather, the only “espoir certain” offered is the transformation of readers into ideal readers, idealized versions of themselves made more intelligent and worthy by the act of reading.

However, in promising readers this self-fashioning, Alcofrybas, in effect, degrades them. Bauschatz, describing this vocabulary of transformation as pedagogical (e.g. “leçon”), argues that it amounts to an attempt to gain control over readers by making them passive: “Rabelais seems purposely to use pedagogical vocabulary to describe the anticipated effect of his book on

---

<sup>275</sup> Tristan Dagron has a somewhat different explanation for why Rabelais replaces the statues on the inside of the *sileni* with drugs. In his view, it is to convey the magical powers of attraction Socrates wields in Plato, especially over Alcibiades (83).

readers. But in addition, like students, these readers are not really in control. They will be made ‘escors et preux’ by a process which they must submit to in a fairly child-like manner” (“Didacticism” 46). Indeed, making listeners or readers willing to learn, or docile, is one of the principal aims of *captatio*, and Alcofrybas appears to achieve this aim through the dynamics of ideal readership. To Bauschatz’s remark, I would add that readers are not only made docile, they are dehumanized through the comparison to trained dogs. In other words, to encourage readers to aspire to an “entendement plus que humain,” the narrator addresses them as less than human. Ideal readership *qua* advertising is predicated upon making readers aware of their own deficiencies so as to present an accepted form of reading as a way of addressing these deficiencies.

If the prologue reveals the manipulation inherent to ideal readership, it also calls attention to its narrator’s often contradictory advertising, above all in the application of the image of the *silenus* to *Gargantua* to prevent readers from concluding “[...] trop facilement ne estre au dedans traicté que mocqueries, folateries, et menteries joyeuses: veu que l’enseigne exteriore (c’est le tiltre) sans plus avant enquerir, est communement receu à derision et gaudisserie” (6).<sup>276</sup> In other words, one should not judge a book by its cover, or rather by its title page. A title like *Gargantau* may seem to promise nothing more than a bawdy vernacular romance, but this appearance belies the “tres haultz sacremens et mysteres horrificques, tant en ce que concerne nostre religion, que aussi l’estat politicq et vie oeconomique” to be found in the work (7). In Screech’s words, it is “a book ugly outside, profoundly and divinely wise below the surface” (*Rabelais* 128).

---

<sup>276</sup> It is interesting to note that “enseigne” can specifically denote a shop sign (Cotgrave).

First of all, these “mysteres” are another instance of Alcofrybas calling attention to his own *captatio*, as they correspond precisely to the instructions in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* on how to make hearers attentive: “Adtentos habebimus, si pollicebimur nos de rebus magnis, novis, inusitatis verba facturos, aut de iis quae ad rem publicam pertineant, aut ad eos ipsos qui audient, aut ad deorum immortalium religionem” (“We shall have attentive hearers by promising to discuss important, new, and unusual matters, or such as appertain to the commonwealth, or to the hearers themselves, or to the worship of the immortal gods”; 1.4.7; trans. Caplan 15).<sup>277</sup> The promise of godly images on the interior of the book/*silenus* is clearly designated as a ploy to capture the reader’s attention. Secondly, the language of the hawker, which persists in the prologue of *Gargantua*, conflicts with the *silenus* metaphor. While the aforementioned description of Socrates’s interior is a citation of Erasmus, it is rendered with internal rhymes (“humain/certain,” “travaillent/bataillent”) highly reminiscent of the *cris de Paris*, themselves in rhyming verse. Furthermore, if Alcofrybas compares *Gargantua* and similar books to containers whose homely, even comical appearances (“comique et laid,” as Baudelaire would say) contrast with their contents, he also speaks of them as “seigneurial,” denoting the fact that *Gargantua* is a prince, and “beaulx livres de haulte gresse,” using an expression which figuratively means “of

---

<sup>277</sup> I would also suggest the possibility that these “mysteres” are a reference to the prologue of Book One of Lemaire’s *Illustrations*, which Mercury promises is “[...] toute riche de grans mysteres et intelligences poëtiques et philosophales, contenant fructueuse substance souz l’escorce des fables artificielles” (Stecher I.4). The promise is echoed by Lavinius, himself an allegorizer of Ovid, who speaks in his epigraph to Lemaire of “Figmenti [...] sub cortice virtus” (“virtue beneath the shell of fiction”) in the *Illustrations* (Stecher IV.437). While I do not necessarily hold with Gilman and Keller’s theory that *Pantagruel* is a satire of the *Illustrations*, I do think their position is somewhat strengthened by the work of Walter Stephens, who shows the extent to which Lemaire is a mythographic source for Rabelais in *Giants in Those Days* (Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1989), and of Frédéric Tinguely, who equates Lavinius with the “frere Lubin, vray croquelardon” ridiculed for seeing the “sacremens de l’evangile” in Ovid (86). Additionally, Huchon suggests that Rabelais’s *Pantagruelistes* may be inspired by Lemaire’s “bende mercurienne” (“Pantagruelistes” 405-06).

great value,” but which is usually used to describe well-fattened livestock or poultry (Huguet 4.356).<sup>278</sup> Such praise would seem to conform less to the image of the authentic *silenus* than to that of the inverted *silenus*, itself evoked by Alcofrybas: “Car vous mesmes dictes, que l’habit ne faict poinct le moine: et tel est vestu d’habit monachal, qui au dedans n’est rien moins que moyne: et tel est vestu de cappe hespanole, qui en son couraige nullement affiert à Hespane” (6).<sup>279</sup> In a similar vein, Raymond La Charité points out that Socrates, typically known for his snub nose as described by Erasmus, is given a “nez pointu,” an aquiline nose worthy of the Romans or of Francis I, “Le Roi Grand Nez”; this substitution “scuttles the surface discourse on the distinction between seeming and being” (“Silenic Text” 82).<sup>280</sup> Even the description of Socrates’s (and ostensibly the reader’s) “entendement plus que humain” hints at the mercantile orientation of the prologue, as it is likely a reference to Lucian’s “Philosophies for Sale,” in which the Olympian gods put representatives of various philosophical schools on sale (not unlike at a slave market), with Hermes serving as the crier. He hawks the first philosopher, a Pythagorean, as follows: “The noblest of philosophies for sale, the most distinguished; who’ll buy? Who wants to be more than man? Who wants to apprehend the music of the spheres and be born again?” (trans. Harmon 453).

Like *Pantagruel*, *Gargantua* is suspect, and its narrator is unreliable. His presentation of the book only calls attention to this fact all the more. Like in *Pantagruel*, he may simply be

---

<sup>278</sup> La Charité argues that the adjective “seigneurial” has architectural connotations that reflect the book’s structure (“Framing” 3-4). Note also that this is not the first time that Rabelais describes a book in this way: the library of Saint-Victor contains *Soixante et neuf breviaires de haulte gresse* (240). Huchon glosses this expression as “graissés par un long usage” (1268, n. 22).

<sup>279</sup> Cf. La Charité, “Lecteurs et lectures,” p. 268.

<sup>280</sup> Richard Regosin is similarly attentive to conflicting discourses in the prologue, which he sees as a challenge to “the foundations of accepted hermeneutic practice, the binary opposition of outside and inside” (“Ins(ides) and Outs(ides)” 70).

abusing the suckers who have fallen for his routine, and when he concludes by commanding them to “[...] interpretez tous mes faictz et mes dictz en la perfectissime partie, ayez en reverence le cerveau caseiforme qui vous paist de ces belles billes vezées, et à vostre pouvoir tenez moy tousjours joyeux,” it is unclear whether the cheese-shaped brain feeding readers with trifles belongs to Alcofrybas or the readers who search for a “plus hault sens” (8).<sup>281</sup> But at the same time as readers are promised the opportunity to fashion themselves through their reading, they are made aware of their own vulnerability to being taken in by blandishments or to allowing advertising to define their identities for its own purposes. The prologue of *Gargantua* advertises to the reader, but it also warns the reader against trusting advertising. In a similar vein, Tournon points out that *pantagruelisme* does not entail being duped, as Pantagruel, despite the *caritas* he exhibits toward Panurge, is not fooled by his trickery: “Rester sourd aux accents prophétiques, refuser son assentiment au rêve de générosité universelle qui les inspire, marchander sa sympathie au visionnaire, c’est méconnaître le texte; c’est le méconnaître aussi que de ne pas voir la ruse du filou et les sophismes de son boniment” (9). In this sense, readers truly are made “escors” by reading *Gargantua*, as the term can mean “warie” or “heedie” in addition to “wise” (Cotgrave).

This simultaneous advertisement and warning against advertisement characterizes the rest of the *geste*, as well. The paratext of subsequent editions of *Pantagruel* and *Gargantua* sees both disavowals of profit in the tradition of prestige advertising and the increasing commodification of vernacular literature. The *Tiers Livre*, in which Rabelais drops the persona of Alcofrybas in favor of the persona of François Rabelais, medical doctor, incorporates prestige advertising

---

<sup>281</sup> Huchon notes that in the sixteenth century, cheese was associated with insanity (1066, n. 5). As for “billes vezées,” Cotgrave gives “Trash, trifles, toyes, nifles.”

through the comparison of author to doctor, as well as through an apparent insouciance as to whether the book is read, but also sets Rabelais up as the judge of his readers.

### **The *Tiers Livre* and Rabelais's Turn to Prestige Advertising**

In 1542, Dolet published his own editions of *Pantagruel*, the *Pantagrueline Prognostication*, and *Gargantua* (NRB 13, Plan 41 and 48; NRB 24, Plan 40). Dolet's *Gargantua* preserves the original title in its *faux-titre*, but its title page reads *La Plaisante, et joyeuse histoyre du grand Geant Gargantua. / Prochainement reveue, et de beaucoup augmentée par l'Authheur mesme* (1). It goes without saying that the claim of Rabelais's revision and approval does not reflect the truth, which ironically proves the prologue of *Gargantua* right about trusting titles. The title also seems to try and make the choice for the reader to laugh off the entire book, as opposed to Juste's titles, which are informed by the prologue and which more accurately reflect Rabelais's preferences. But the biggest *faux pas* committed by Dolet is the inclusion in his combined edition of *Pantagruel* and the *Pantagrueline Prognostication* of the apocryphal *Navigations de Panurge*, also known as the *Disciple de Pantagruel*, a Lucianic sea voyage tale first published in 1538.<sup>282</sup> An attempt to capitalize on Rabelais's success, it is most assuredly not his work, though he does draw on certain aspects of it, such as the giant Bringuenarilles, for the *Quart Livre*. Rabelais's response to its inclusion dominates the next two editions of the *geste*.

The next two editions not only combine *Pantagruel* and *Gargantua* into the *Grands annales*, starting a precedent by organizing according to the story's chronology and putting

---

<sup>282</sup> Its full title is *Le voyage et navigation que fist Panurge, Disciple de Pantagruel aux Isles incongneues et estranges*. For a modern edition, see *Le Disciple de Pantagruel*, ed. Guy Demerson and Christiane Lauvergnat-Gagnière (Paris: STFM, 1982).

*Gargantua* first, but include a significant addition to their paratext.<sup>283</sup> *NRB* 25 and 26, the first published in Lyons by Juste's successor, Pierre de Tours, in 1542 and 1543, and the second published in 1542 by an unidentified printer, both feature a lengthy letter from "L'imprimeur au lecteur" which appears in the same insert that bears the collective title.<sup>284</sup> The letter, imputed to Rabelais by modern critics, is a vitriolic attack on a "plagiaire, homme encliné à tout mal," none other than Dolet.<sup>285</sup> The complaint is directed at Dolet's hastily-printed and unauthorized editions, which fail to omit controversial passages that Rabelais had altered or struck, and which attribute other works (i.e. the *Navigations*) to him. The letter's vocabulary is strikingly similar to that of Marot's paratexts: "Affin que tu ne prennes la faulse monnoye pour la bonne (amy lecteur) et la forme fardee, pour la nayve: et la bastarde, et adulterine edition du present oeuvre, pour la legitime et naturelle: Soies adverty que par avarice a esté soustraict l'exemplaire de ce livre encores estant souz la presse [...]" (¢2r). The proximity of this caveat's vocabulary to that of Marot's epistles to the "Enfans d'Apollo" in the *Adolescence* and (ironically enough) to Dolet in the 1538 *Oeuvres* recalls Marot's protests in the former regarding the sales of a large part of his works, "[...] toute incorrecte, mal imprimée, et plus au proffit du Libraire, qu'à l'honneur de l'Auteur," and his disavowal of works excluded from the *Oeuvres* as "Bastardz" or "Enfans

---

<sup>283</sup> The title given to these first collective editions, *Grands Annales tresveritables des Gestes merueilleux du grand Gargantua & Pantagruel son filz, Roy des Dipsodes: enchroniquez par feu M. Alcofribas, abstracteur de quinte essence*, seems like a step back toward the earliest title pages of *Pantagruel*, as the emphasis is on "veracity" of the *True History* variety, and the participle "enchroniquez" would seem to recall the *Chronicques*.

<sup>284</sup> This letter does not appear in Huchon's edition, nor, to my knowledge, in any other recent editions of Rabelais. A facsimile of it is provided in *NRB*, pp. 151-53. For more on Pierre de Tours, see Gültlingen, vol. 9, pp. 6-13. 1542 marked a particularly intense year of competition between Dolet and Tours, with Dolet publishing his editions of Rabelais in response to Juste's 1542 editions (*NRB* 12, Plan 39; *NRB* 23, Plan 38), and Tours publishing the *Grands annales* and his own edition of Antoine Héroët's *Parfaicte Amye*, first published by Dolet in that same year.

<sup>285</sup> Citations are from *NRB* 26 (Plan 42-43). For more on Rabelais's authorship of the letter, see Kline, pp. 21-24, and Huchon, *Rabelais*, pp. 284-89.

gastez.” Even more strikingly, the letter goes on to accuse Dolet the charlatan of producing works that are “[...] par luy confusement amoncellées, ou elles estoient *bien ordonnées*” (¢2v; emphasis mine). Whether or not Rabelais actually is responsible for this letter, it is clear that its author is familiar with Marot and inclined to compare Rabelais with him. Like Marot’s paratext, the letter hinges on prestige advertising, accusing Dolet of sacrificing quality and honor for profit to such an extent that he is willing to sell the use of his comprehensive privilege for a fee and try to take credit for the work of others in so doing, “[...] pour donner a entendre que les Livres des bons auteurs, comme de Marot, de Rabelais, et plusieurs aultres, sont de sa facon” (¢3r).<sup>286</sup> The letter’s parting shot at Dolet’s abuse of the French language enhances this prestige advertising by claiming that his “viedazeries” in French are “[...] dignes d’estre baillees a mostardiens pour les publier par la ville” (¢4r). In other words, Dolet’s barbarisms bring him closer not only to the *écolier limousin* of Chapter 6 of *Pantagruel*, but to mustard criers, a class of people who debase language by using it to make money.<sup>287</sup>

If the first Pierre de Tours collective edition aims to distinguish literary production from merchandise, the second reassociates the two. The edition abandons the *Grands Annales* insert, but alters the title of *Pantagruel* to *Le second livre de Pantagruel, restitué à son naturel* to reflect its emendation in comparison to Dolet’s editions. It also adds another *dizain* after the prologue of *Pantagruel*, a *dizain* “nouvellement composé à la louange du joyeux esprit de l’auteur”:

Cinq cens dixains, mille virlais,  
Et en Rime mille virades,  
Des plus gentes, et des plus sades

<sup>286</sup> This is the first mention of Rabelais’s name (in non-anagram form) in his vernacular works.

<sup>287</sup> Criers are often associated with punishment in Rabelais, especially in *Pantagruel*. In Chapter 30, Epistemon, having recovered from his decapitation, recounts what he saw in Hell, which includes great princes and generals reduced to humble states. Among these is Xerxes, who is made to be a mustard crier (322). In Chapter 31, Pantagruel punishes Anarche, the king of the Dipsodes, by making him into a “cryeur de saulce vert” (329).

De Marot, ou de Saingelais,  
 Payez content sans nulz delais,  
 En presence des Oreades,  
 Des Hymnides [i.e. Lymnides], et des Dryades,  
 Ne suffiroient, ny Pontalais  
 A pleines balles de Ballades  
 Au docte, et gentil Rabelais (p. 240; *NRB*, pp. 305-06).<sup>288</sup>

Like the letter, it mentions Rabelais by name, and reinforces the idea of knowledge concealed by laughter by praising both his “joyeux esprit” and his learning (“docte”). Referring to Rabelais as noble (“gentil”) might be a reference to the description of *Gargantua* as a “livre seigneurial,” as well. More importantly, though, it describes *formes fixes* and the *tours de main* of rhyme as a form of currency, not unlike how the letter warns against mistaking counterfeit currency for genuine. Jean de Pontalais, the popular comedian whose sobriquet of “Songecreux” is often mentioned by Rabelais, is described as having bundles full of ballads, almost as if he were a *colporteur*. The effect of this *dizain* is thus not only to praise Rabelais, but to get the reader to conceive of the book in commercial terms: the book he has chosen to read is literally more valuable than other vernacular works.

Prestige advertising returns to dominate the *Tiers Livre*, first printed in Paris by Chrestien Wechel in 1546, editions of which (*NRB* 28-37) are rather consistent in their titles.<sup>289</sup> From 1546 to 1552, all of them read (orthographical variants aside): *Le Tiers livre des faictz et dictz Heroïques du noble Pantagruel, composez par M. François Rabelais docteur en Medicine, et Calloïer des Isles Hieres*.<sup>290</sup> The “faits et prouesses” of *Pantagruel*’s titles have here been

<sup>288</sup> This *dizain* is not reproduced in Huchon. Oddly enough, Rawles and Screech do not mention its presence in this edition, waiting until the 1553 first collective edition of the first four books (*NRB* 58, Plan 92) to include it. The author remains unknown.

<sup>289</sup> For more on Wechel, see Kline, p. 35, and Moreau, vol. 3, p. 675; vol. 4, pp. 468-69, and vol. 5, p. 603.

<sup>290</sup> The title of “Calloïer des Isles Hieres,” which also appears in the title of the 1548 *princeps* edition of the *Quart Livre*, is rather perplexing. The Hyères islands, off the coast of Var in the

replaced with “faits et dits,” reflecting the shift in orientation away from chronicles and toward dialogue, as well as evoking Erasmus’s *Apophthegmata* (Huchon p. 1359, n. 1). As has been noted, this title is the first time that Rabelais signs his given name to his vernacular works, but more significant than this is the fact that Rabelais presents himself in his capacity as a doctor of medicine, thereby introducing the connection between literature and healing that will be even further expounded upon in the two ensuing books.

The title is followed by an entreaty to the readers: “L’Auteur susdict supplie les Lecteurs benevoles soy reserver à rire au soixante et dixhuytiesme Livre.”<sup>291</sup> It asks something of readers that would be utterly absurd to do, and is in itself amusing; in the original prologue to the *Quart Livre*, published two years later, Rabelais graciously pardons readers for not having complied: “Vous excusans de ce, que vous n’avez obtemperé à ma priere, contenant qu’eussiez vous reserver à rire au septante huictiesme livre. Je le vous pardonne de bien bon cueur. Je ne suis tant farouche ne implacable que vous penseriez” (717). Yet, to play along with the request would be to distinguish author from narrator, as there is no ban on laughter in the prologue. As such, this subtitle calls attention to the distinction between author and narrator (the author’s

---

Mediterranean, seem to have been favored by outlaws and pirates, especially when made into an asylum under Francis I, and was also the site of several attempts at establishing monasteries (Huchon, pp. 1360-61, n. 2). The archipelago’s peculiar (or perhaps not so peculiar) blend of monasteries and iniquity, as well as its apparently remarkable avian population (two of its islands are currently national parks for this reason), may have inspired the Isle Sonante in the *Cinquiesme Livre* (chs. 1-8). As for “Calloïer,” I prefer Lestringant’s explanation, which tells of the existence of a symbolic “île du Caloyer” that lent itself to allegory or moral discourse, and which seemed readily interchangeable with Hesiod’s rock of Virtue: see “L’Insulaire de Rabelais ou la fiction en archipel: Pour une lecture topographique du *Quart Livre*,” *ER* 21 (1988), pp. 268-73. Whatever the case may be, the title disappears with the 1552 editions of both the *Tiers* and *Quart Livre*.

<sup>291</sup> Huchon notes that the number 78 might be a reference to the 78 tarot cards in a deck, as Rabelais introduced the term to French and seems to have had a predilection for the number 78 in his works (p. 1361, n. 5).

comic persona), and in convincing the reader to pay closer attention to the latter, it anticipates the metaphor of the doctor putting on a pleasant appearance from the paratext of the *Quart Livre*.

Another important aspect of the paratext from these editions of the *Tiers Livre* is the inclusion of the generous six-year privilege granted to Rabelais by Francis I, dated September 19, 1545.<sup>292</sup> Kline notes that this privilege smacks of Rabelais's own hand, or at least of his guiding spirit (26). He would appear to have a point, as the privilege contains a reference to Horace's *Ars poetica* that is extremely unusual for the text of a privilege, not to mention language strikingly similar to that of the letter against Dolet from *NRB* 25-26: "[...] deux volumes des faictz et dictz Heroïques de Pantagruel, non moins utiles que delectables, les Imprimeurs auroient iceulx livres corrompu et perverty en plusieurs endroictz, au grand déplaisir et detriment dudict suppliant, et praejudice des lecteurs" (1362).<sup>293</sup> Shoddy, unauthorized printings are as much to the readers' detriment ("praejudice") as they are to Rabelais's; quite a surprising argument to make in a privilege, which is supposed to be concerned with the protection of the author and printer/bookseller's interests. Through prestige advertising, a document that essentially exists to protect the business interests of Rabelais and Wechel is made instead to appear to protect the interests of the reader. The privilege, like the dedicatory *dizain* to Marguerite de Navarre, also lends distinctly humanist pretensions to this most erudite entry of the *geste*, claiming that Rabelais had decided not to publish the remaining "faictz et dictz," but was

---

<sup>292</sup> This original privilege is found in *NRB* 28-31. *NRB* 32 (Plan 72) has a much-truncated version, *NRB* 33 (Plan 86) has no privilege, and no copies of *NRB* 34-35 (Plan 73 and 70) have been located.

<sup>293</sup> Cf. prologue: "Et de la traicte (laquelle par deux praecedens volumes (si par l'imposture des imprimeurs n'eussent esté pervertiz et brouilleez) vous feust assez congneue) leurs tirer du creu de nos passetemps epicenaires un guallant tiercin, et consecutivement un joyeux quart de sentences Pantagrueliques" (350).

convinced to after being “importuné journellement par les gens scavans et studieux de nostre Royaulme et requis de mettre en l'utilité comme en impression la dicte sequence” (1362).<sup>294</sup>

Prestige advertising also governs the prologue of the *Tiers Livre*, which differs significantly from the previous prologues in that where they discuss the reader's relationship with the book, this one discusses the reader's relationship with the author (Cave 9). In fact, this prologue is best described as an apology which seeks to justify writing another book about Pantagruel while France is in a continual state of war against the Empire; the reference to Lucian's story about Diogenes during the siege of Corinth has been seen as a parallel to the fortification of Paris under the supervision of Jean du Bellay during Charles V's invasion of Provence in 1536 or the defensive measures taken after the fall of Saint-Dizier in 1544 during the Anglo-imperial invasion of France (Huchon, p. 1364-65, n. 5).<sup>295</sup> At the same time, however, critics have also seen it as a reflection on the creation and reception of the book, a text which “enacts the anxiety of its reception, its apprehension of being mistaken and misread” (Regosin, “Opening Discourse” 146). This anxiety over the gamble of publication is made clear by the reference to Lucian's anecdote of Ptolemy's camel and slave.<sup>296</sup> As in previous editions, however, Rabelais attempts to load the dice by setting himself up as a judge of his readers, and judging them on the criterion of whether they accept the gift of his writing favorably.

The Diogenes story central to the prologue derives from Lucian's brief treatise, “How to Write History”; Rabelais's account is essentially an amplified version of Lucian's. During the siege of Corinth by Philip II of Macedon, Diogenes, living on the Craneum, a steep hill next to the city, observes the Corinthians making their defensive preparations. Suddenly, he grabs his

---

<sup>294</sup> In this vein, Gray sees the warriors and workers Rabelais promises to refresh with his wine in the prologue as the humanist community (“Structure and Meaning” 59).

<sup>295</sup> For more on these events, see Knecht, pp. 334-41 and 490-94.

<sup>296</sup> See above, Introduction, pp. 1-2.

tub and starts rolling it up and down the hill, “[...] so as not to be thought the one idle man in the midst of all these workers” (trans. Kilburn 5). Diogenes’s Sisyphean gesture is clearly parodic of the Corinthians’ defensive preparations, and is likely meant to show them that their preparations are in vain.<sup>297</sup> Yet, determining Diogenes’s motivations is less important than reflecting on why Lucian and Rabelais would have turned to this story to justify their own authorial positions. The pressing issue for Lucian, writing during Rome’s war with the Parthians, is the writing of history, as chronicles and histories of the war are cropping up left and right. Not wanting to be “the only mute in such a polyphonic time,” Lucian decides to roll his own tub, “[...] not to produce a history or even merely chronicle the events – I’m not so bold as that: don’t be afraid that I should go that far. I know the danger of rolling it over rocks, particularly in a poorly baked little barrel like mine. Just as soon as it hits against a tiny piece of stone we shall have to pick up the pieces” (trans. Kilburn 7).<sup>298</sup> Lucian, who is himself incapable of writing good history, seems to be of no use in a time when history is in demand. However, he can make himself useful by stating what he has observed to be the principles behind writing sound and faulty histories. History, Lucian claims, is for posterity, and therefore must above all recount the truth; writers of history must be aware that they will not be judged only by the “common rabble,” but by fault-finders: “Nothing will get past their scrutiny: their eyes are keener than Argus’s and all over their body; they test each expression like a money-changer, rejecting at once what is false but accepting current coin

---

<sup>297</sup> Though Diogenes’s action is clearly reminiscent of Sisyphus’s punishment, Rabelais is explicit about it where Lucian is not: “[...] le devalloit de mont à val, et praecipitoit par le Cranie: puy de val en mont le rapportoit, comme Sisyphus faict sa pierre” (348). Bakhtin also sees Diogenes’s actions (in Lucian and Rabelais) as parodic, as does Duval, who sees in it an anticipation of the endless *chanson de ricochet* that Pantagruel embarks on with Panurge to make his own folly and *philautia* apparent to him (Bakhtin 178-79; Duval, *Design of Rabelais’s Tiers Livre* 219-20).

<sup>298</sup> Diogenes’s tub (which Kilburn varyingly renders as “crock” or “barrel”) was actually a large earthenware pot or cauldron, what Rabelais calls a “tonneau fictil” (347).

that is legal tender and correctly minted” (trans. Kilburn 15-17). While Rabelais is not concerned with writing (factual) history, he is concerned with who will be reading his book, and, much like in the addition to the end of *Pantagruel*, begins to distinguish those who should read it from those fault-finders who should not.

Rabelais goes against the prescriptions of Cicero in the prologue by refusing to praise the good judgment of his readers, and instead impugning it. He begins the prologue by continuing his practice of addressing his readers as infirm, this time not as “Beuveurs tresillustres, et vous Verolez tresprecieux,” but as “Beuveurs tresillustres, et vous Goutteux tresprecieux” (345).<sup>299</sup> He proceeds to “praise” the audience for being descended from King Midas, in a nod to the myth of the Trojan (here, Phrygian) origins of the French so dear to Lemaire: while they may not have as much gold as Midas, they have something else in common with him. These are, of course, the ass’s ears that Apollo gives Midas because of his poor judgment in a music contest between Apollo and the satyr Marsyas.<sup>300</sup> Shortly afterwards, Rabelais clarifies that Diogenes was a “philosophe rare, et joyeux entre mille” despite his apparent imperfections, so that his audience is not “en simplesse pippez comme gens mescreans,” implying that readers are incapable of interpreting correctly on their own (346).<sup>301</sup> The distrust of the reader’s judgment persists in Rabelais’s justification of his own project. Explaining how, like Diogenes, he is of no use in

---

<sup>299</sup> The substitution of “Goutteux” for “Verolez” is, I think, best explained by Huchon, who points out the double meaning of “goutteux” as “drop-drinkers” and “gout-sufferers” (p. 1363, n. 3). Gout and syphilis were both traditionally linked to excess or moral laxity, and gout was often attributed specifically to lasciviousness (Antonioli 331). In the 1552 *Tiers Livre* (NRB 36, Plan 74), “Bonnes gens” was added to the beginning of this sentence, perhaps as a conciliatory gesture toward readers less familiar with Rabelais’s usual terms of endearment.

<sup>300</sup> Cf. *Metamorphoses* 11.172-79.

<sup>301</sup> Regosin has a similar take on Diogenes’s interpretation of his tub-rolling for his bewildered onlookers: : “It is also Diogenes’s reading, since, as he performs for others in a play of pure spectacle, he also reads his own actions explicitly, interpreting and explaining what he is doing for a friend who apparently cannot read” (“Opening Discourse” 142).

either offensive or defensive measures, he expresses his fear of being seen as idle amongst all those who play out this “fable et Tragicque comedie” (349).<sup>302</sup> Then, in a heavily Erasmian passage, he turns the tables on the reader once again:

Car peu de gloire me semble accroistre à ceulx qui seulement y emploient leurs oeilz, au demeurant y espargnent leurs forces: celent leurs escuz, cachent leur argent, se grattent la teste avecques un doigt, comme landorez desgoustez, baislent aux mousches comme Veaulx de disme, chauvent des aureilles comme asnes de Arcadie au chant des musiciens, et par mines en silence signifient qu’ilz consentent à la prosopopée” (349).<sup>303</sup>

The fact that this passage begins with sight and ends with listening recalls Rabelais’s questions put to the readers at the beginning of the prologue as to whether they have seen Diogenes or heard of him, and the Arcadian asses twitching their ears to music directly recalls the “je ne scay quoy” that Frenchmen have in common with their supposed ancestor, Midas. The Erasmian intertext for this last simile, the adage *Asinus ad lyram* (1.4.35), is directed against those who pretend to understand something when they do not, in the same way that an ass twitches its ears to music.<sup>304</sup> In Rabelais, it is a challenge to those readers who, like Rabelais, are not directly occupied with France’s defense: instead of praising them, he subtly calls their faculties of judgment into question, thereby giving them something to prove in terms of how they receive the text, which is itself associated with the lyre through the comparison of Rabelais’s bottle to Helicon, the Hippocrene fountain, and Enthusiasm, and of his usefulness to fortification-building to Amphion’s construction of Thebes (349-50). Indeed, as well as providing figurative

---

<sup>302</sup> As Huchon explains, this expression does not mean “tragicomedy” here, but simply a play with the lofty personages proper to tragedy (1366-67, n. 1). The theatrical metaphor is likely taken from Lucian, who himself says that he does not wish to be shoved around like a non-speaking character in a play.

<sup>303</sup> Rabelais’s use of the term “prosopopée” elsewhere suggests that he understands *prosopopoeia* not in the strict rhetorical sense of “speaking through someone or something else,” but simply as a costume or assumed role. To wit, the “Briefve declaration” of the *Quart Livre* defines “Prosopopée” as “Desguisement. Fiction de persone” (703).

<sup>304</sup> The simile also seems to have been favored by Lucian (specifically in “On Salaried Posts” and “Against an Ignoramus”), whom Erasmus cites several times.

sustenance for the masons, he will “[...] au son de ma musette mesureray la musarderie des musars” (350).<sup>305</sup> Aside from its repetition of “muse,” this promise shows just how much Rabelais has turned the tables on the reader in terms of *captatio*: instead of addressing the audience as capable judges, he sets himself up as a judge of laziness (“musarderie”) and the foolish (“musars”), which creates a need for his approval of how the reader receives his text.

It is at this point that Rabelais introduces Lucian’s anecdote about Ptolemy, concluding with his worry that “en lieu de les servir, je les fasche: en lieu de les esbaudir, je les offense: en lieu de leurs complaire, je desplaise” (351).<sup>306</sup> He follows up this concern with a reference to the fate of Euclio’s rooster in Plautus’s *Aulularia*, “lequel pour en grattant avoir decouvert le thesaur, eut la coupe guorgée” (351). Euclio, the inspiration for Molière’s Harpagon, is so paranoid of his buried pot of gold being discovered that he kills a rooster who scratches at the ground above it:

condigne etiam meus med intus gallus gallinacius,  
qui erat anu peculiaris, perdidit paenissimum.  
ubi erat haec defossa, occipit ibi scalpurrere unguis  
circum circa. quid opust verbis? ita mihi pectus peracuit:  
capio fustem, obrunco gallum, furem manifestarium.  
Credo edepol ego illi mercedem gallo pollicitos coquos,  
si id palam fecisset. exemi ex manu manubrium (act 3, sc. 4, ll. 465-71).

And then of course that dunghill cock of mine in there, that used to belong to the old woman, had to come within an inch of ruining me, beginning to scratch and claw around where this was buried. Enough said. It just got me so worked up I took a club and annihilated that cock, the thief, the redhanded thief! By heaven, I do believe the cooks offered that cock a reward to show them where this was. I took the handle out of their hands! (trans. Nixon 283-85).

<sup>305</sup> Some critics have seen this reference to masons, as well as other passages in the *geste*, as evidence of Rabelais being a freemason. See Paul Naudon, *Rabelais franc-maçon* (Paris: La Balance, 1954), and Claude Gaignebet, *A plus hault sens: L'Ésotérisme spirituel et charnel de Rabelais* (Paris: Maisonneuve et Larose, 1986), vol. 1, pp. 97-108.

<sup>306</sup> Rigolot sees in Rabelais’s use of this anecdote an appeal to charitable reading, which he connects with the patristic notions of *synkatabasis* and *condescendentia* (“Hybridity” 212-14).

Euclio's action tells us nothing about the rooster, but plenty about Euclio. His avarice and paranoia are so extreme that he imputes ill will to an animal and cruelly butchers it. Mentioned in comparison to readers of Rabelais, Euclio becomes another anti-ideal to be disavowed, but one to which the reader, and hence the potential book-buyer, is assumed to be alarmingly close: the same readers who twitch their ass's ears despite their lack of understanding also "celent leurs escuz, cachent leur argent," which is precisely what Euclio does (349). Rabelais also makes a significant alteration to Plautus: Euclio bludgeons the rooster with a cudgel (*fustis*), but Rabelais's has his "coupe guorgée." Of course, this is one of Rabelais's many spoonerisms (or *contrepèteries*, as the French call them), a reversal of the expected "gorge coupée."<sup>307</sup> But this particular spoonerism turns a slit throat into an overflowing cup, which, I would argue, is a reference to the cup that runneth over in Psalm 23; in Marot's French, the verse reads: "Tu oings mon chef d'huyles et senteurs bonnes, / Et jusqu'aux bords pleine tasse me donnes" (*OC* II.166.13-14; *OPC* II.635.7). Rabelais places himself and his book under God's protection, and those who would do it harm by attacking it or failing to show it the proper appreciation are only revealing their own wickedness.

It is at this point that Rabelais has recourse once again to *pantagruelisme* as ideal readership, which he puts forth as something that will prevent the unfavorable reception he so deeply fears and abhors:

Je recongnois en eulx tous une forme specificque, et propriété individuelle, laquelle nos majeurs nommoient Pantagruelisme, moienant laquelle jamais en mauvaïse partie ne prendront choses quelconques, ilz congnoistront sourdre de bon, franc, et loyal couraige. Je les ay ordinairement veuz bon vouloir en payement prendre, et en icelluy acquiescer, quand debilité de puissance y a esté associée (351).

---

<sup>307</sup> Cf. *Pantagruel*, ch. 30: "Comment Epistemon qui avoit la *coupe testée*, feut guery habillement par Panurge" (321; emphasis mine).

While the use of scholastic terminology (“forme specificque,” “propriété individuelle”) and the reference to Roman *mos maiorum* (“nos majeurs”) are perhaps parodic, the equation of Pantagruelism with readerly indulgence is no less effective for it. Here, *pantagruelisme* entails not just indulgence, but a recognition of benevolent authorial intention (“bon, franc, et loyal courage,” “bon vouloir”) as in Lemaire’s conception of gratitude, and the metaphor of book as wine barrel is precisely an expression of the author’s benevolence and liberality in keeping with prestige advertising: “Tout beuveur de bien, tout Goutteux de bien, alterez, venens à ce mien tonneau, s’ilz ne veulent ne beuvent: s’ilz veulent, et le vin plaist au guoust de la seigneurie de leurs seigneuries, beuvent franchement, librement, hardiment, sans rien payer, et ne l’espargnent. Tel est mon decret” (351). Readers are invited to drink to their hearts’ content, freely, and perhaps most importantly, without paying. In issuing a decree, Rabelais compares his book to a royal banquet in the same way that Ronsard does in the “Discours à Loys des Masures”:

Mon livre est ressemblable à ces tables friandes  
 Qu’un Prince fait charger de diverses viandes:  
 Le mets qui plaist à l’un à l’autre est desplaisant,  
 Ce qui est sucré à l’un est à l’autre cuisant:  
 L’un aime le salé l’autre aime la chair fade:  
 L’un aime le routy l’autre aime la sallade:  
 L’un aime le vin fort l’autre aime le vin dous,  
 Et jamais le banquet n’est agreable à tous.  
 Le Prince toutefois qui librement festie,  
 Ne s’en offense point: car la plus grand’ partie  
 De ceux qui sont assis, au festin sont allez  
 De leur propre vouloir sans y estre appelez.  
 Ainsi ny par edict ny par arrest publique  
 Je ne contrains personne à mon vers poëtique:  
 Le lise qui voudra l’achete qui voudra:  
 Celuy qui bien content de mon vers se tiendra,  
 Me fera grand plaisir: s’il advient au contraire,  
 Masures, c’est tout un, je ne sçaurois qu’y faire (vol. 2, p. 1017, ll. 17-34).

Yet, a closer glance at both Rabelais and Ronsard reveals that this supposed liberality betrays a marked preference for readers who react favorably and an attempt to exclude those who do not;

in context, the citation from Ronsard is actually part of the poet's defense against charges by Huguenots that he wastes his talents on profane or pagan subjects, as the "Discours à Loys des Masures" is one of the *Discours des Miseres de ce temps*, Ronsard's great poetico-polemical defense of the crown and the Catholic Church in the midst of the Wars of Religion. The exclusionary nature of convivial invitations is made even clearer in the opening epigram "Ad Lectorem" from Du Bellay's *Regrets*:

Si gratum quid erit tuo palato,  
Huc conviva veni: tibi haec parata est  
Coena. Sin minus, hinc facesse, quaeso:  
Ad hanc te volui haud vocare coenam (ll. 4-7).<sup>308</sup>

If it will please your palate, then come hither, honored guest: this dinner was prepared just for you. If it will be less than pleasing, then please leave: you're not the one I wanted to invite to this dinner.

If Du Bellay politely asks his malcontented guests to leave the table, Rabelais, having specified "quelle maniere de gens je invite," drives away those "geants Doriphages" (gift-eating judges), "cerveaulx à bourlet grabeurs de corrections" (theologians of the Sorbonne), and "Caphars" (hypocrites) whom he has not invited in very much the same way that Diogenes, having called out for men, drives away those who approach him with his stick, saying he had called for men, not scoundrels (352).<sup>309</sup> These *personae non gratae* bear a striking resemblance to the denizens of Chapter 34 of *Pantagruel*, a point driven home by the recurrence of the wordplay on *cul*: the "Doriphages" have "au cul passions assez" to keep them busy, while the entire lot of them have come "culletans articuler mon vin et compisser mon tonneau" (352).<sup>310</sup> Thus, if the banquet or

<sup>308</sup> For more on this *topos*, see Jeanneret, "Banquets poétiques," p. 79.

<sup>309</sup> Cf. Diogenes Laertius, bk. 6, §32.

<sup>310</sup> Antónia Szabari, picking up on the theory of charitable reading, argues that the abuse and insults at the end of the prologue are a test of the reader's moral quality: "One can identify the following strategy of the narrator in this structure: by the time the reader has finished reading the Prologue, he or she should have identified himself as a 'Pantagruelist' reader who does not take

wine barrel metaphor expresses the author's good will toward the reader, it only does so in order to obligate the reader to recognize this good will and behave accordingly in his own reading. It is analogous to what Baudrillard calls the true imperative of advertising: "Voyez comme toute la société ne fait que s'adapter à vous et à vos désirs. Donc, il est raisonnable que vous vous intégriez à cette société" (206).

This limited freedom may fruitfully be compared with the "liberté précaire" of consumerism, and indeed, of self-fashioning. A consumer has freedom, insofar as freedom is defined as the ability to choose between different products and different brands of the same product, but the point of advertising is to make one choice in this already restricted freedom seem inevitable. The fact that advertising exists acknowledges that there is freedom in buying power, but advertising acknowledges this freedom only to rein it in, in the same way that there are always limits placed on self-fashioning. So, too, is the reader "free" to react negatively to a book or to put it down and never open it again, but when Rabelais appears to recognize this fact, he is excluding this freedom by judging that those who exercise it are convicting themselves of their own crimes.

### **The *Quart Livre* and *Cinquiesme Livre*: The Triumph of Medicine?**

As a postscript to the above remarks, I would like to consider briefly how self-fashioning and ideal readership are developed in the last authorized entry in the *geste*, the *Quart Livre*, as well as in its posthumous continuation, the *Cinquiesme Livre*. Both are tied increasingly to the persona of Rabelais as literary doctor first suggested in the *dizain* from *Gargantua* and

---

offense at the text – and therefore is not interpellated (literally, annoyed) by the insults pronounced in the end. If, however, he recognizes himself as insulted, if he takes offense, then he deserves it" (S117).

confirmed on the title page of the *Tiers Livre*. Both, however, subvert the prestige advertising inherent to this medical persona by alerting the reader to his manipulation at the hands of the author and the text. In this way, the *Quart Livre* and *Cinquiesme Livre* resemble *Pantagruel* and *Gargantua* in that they work against the very advertising strategies they employ.

The *Quart Livre* exists in two drastically different states. The first dates from 1548, published in Lyons, probably by Pierre de Tours (*NRB* 41, Plan 77), and the second from 1552, published in Paris by Michel Fezandat (*NRB* 45, Plan 78) along with a revised version of the *Tiers Livre* (*NRB* 36, Plan 74).<sup>311</sup> The 1548 edition is much shorter, comprising Chapters 1-2, 5-12, and 16-25 of the 1552 edition. The paratext also changes dramatically from 1548 to 1552, as the second offers a substantially longer prologue and a dedicatory epistle to Cardinal Odet de Châtillon, whose intervention with Henri II probably secured a new ten-year royal privilege for Rabelais in 1550, and without whose protection the *Quart Livre* may not have been published at all (Huchon, *Rabelais* 341-44).<sup>312</sup> The other paratextual changes are similar to the ones between the 1546 and 1552 editions of the *Tiers Livre*: for example, Rabelais's title of "Calloïer des Isles Hieres" is abandoned. The titles of both editions are similar to those of the *Tiers Livre*: *Le Quart livre des faictz & dictz Heroïques du noble Pantagruel / Composé par M. François Rabelais Docteur en Medicine*.

The "Briefve declaration d'aulcunes dictions plus obscures continues on quatriesme livre des faicts et dictz Heroïques de Pantagruel," which first appears in Fezandat's *Quart Livre*, is

---

<sup>311</sup> For more on Fezandat, see Moreau, vol. 5, nos. 1175, 1365, 1613, 1660, 1661, 1663, 1694, 1815, 1948, 1957, and 1973.

<sup>312</sup> The 1552 edition includes, as does the 1552 edition of the *Tiers Livre*, a copy of the 1550 privilege in between the dedicatory epistle to Châtillon and the prologue. The 1552 Baltasar Aleman edition (*NRB* 48, Plan 81) also includes the privilege, but gives it a duration of six years instead of ten. This is likely the result of a typographical error ("six" instead of "dix").

also of note.<sup>313</sup> Some refuse to attribute this glossary to Rabelais based on questionable definitions it provides for certain terms, though Huchon is assured of its authenticity (*Rabelais grammairien*, pp. 406-11). Whatever the case may be, it articulates with both the humanist pretensions and the attempts to control the reader's reception that characterize the *Tiers Livre*. The first and most obvious effect of the "Briefve declaration" is that it underscores the book's utility by aiding the reader's comprehension of Rabelais's vocabulary, difficult even for his contemporaries. Like any supplement, though, it gives the impression that the main body needed to be supplemented in the first place. In the case of Rabelais, it gives his vernacular text the status of a classical one where a glossary would be more expected, in very much the same way that Marc-Antoine Muret's commentaries appended to the 1553 edition of Ronsard's *Amours* elevates both poet and commentator by having Muret play Servius to Ronsard's Virgil, explaining his sometimes obscure mythological references and borrowings from Greek and Latin. While the "Briefve declaration" serves a similar purpose to Muret's commentary, it differs from it in that it is presented not as the work of an external commentator, but as that of the author. The paratext thus reinforces the author's claim to authority over how his work is to be interpreted, and this renewed effort to assert exclusive rights to interpretation most assuredly stems from the growing number of attacks on Rabelais's work, not only from the Sorbonne, but from Calvin, who accuses Rabelais and other writers of his ilk (notably Bonaventure des Périers) of irreligion in the 1550 treatise *De scandalis*.<sup>314</sup>

---

<sup>313</sup> Only Baltasar Aleman's 1552 *Quart Livre* and an anonymous Parisian edition of 1552 (*NRB* 52, Plan 83) mention the "Briefve declaration" on their title pages.

<sup>314</sup> Rabelais probably piqued Calvin's ire in the 1542 version of the prologue of *Pantagruel*, where he has Alcofrybas insult the "abuseurs, prestinateurs, emposteurs, et seducteurs" who doubt the virtues of the *Chronicques* (214; emphasis mine). Note also that Odet de Châtillon, a member of the Coligny family, eventually became a Calvinist in 1560. For more on Rabelais's feud with Calvin, see Grève, pp. 77-78.

As such, both states of the *Quart Livre* share the same essential focus on defending Rabelais's works against their detractors through extended comparisons to medicine. The 1548 prologue begins much like the original prologue of the *Tiers livre*, addressing readers as "Beuveurs tresillustres, et vous goutteurs tres precieux," with the difference that "goutteurs" cannot denote sufferers of gout, as can "goutteux" (Huchon, p. 1592, n. 2). The medical side of things is introduced in the latest installment of Rabelais's diatribe against his critics and censors. They are first compared to devils (through the etymological connection between Διάβολος and calumny), then to gluttons who spit in other people's food so that they can have it all to themselves, and finally to the "medecin d'eau douce" (a doctor who prescribes nothing but plain old water) who only allows patients to eat chicken necks so as to keep all the good parts for himself (718). Those who would have Rabelais's books prohibited are presented not only as obstacles to the reader's enjoyment, but as *opposants* to the reader's healing through the self-fashioning of reading, as they are accused of stealing medicine intended for Rabelais's patients: "Ilz les ont tolluz es malades, es goutteux, es infortunez, pour lesquelz en leur mal esjouyr, les avois faictz et composez. Si je prenois en cure tous ceux qui tomboient en meshaing et maladie, jà besoing ne seroit mettre telz livres en lumiere et impression" (719). This is the point at which the medical metaphor is fully integrated both with the Horatian *utile dulci* and with prestige advertising.<sup>315</sup> Rabelais accomplishes this fusion through a reference to Hippocrates's instructions to doctors to make a favorable and pleasing impression on patients so as to win their trust and cooperation, or in other words, to have a good bedside manner: "il commande rien n'estre au medecin (voyre jusques à particulariser les ongles) qui puisse offenser le patient: tout

---

<sup>315</sup> Horace is cited earlier in the prologue, as is the fact that readers have invited Rabelais to continue the *geste Pantagrueline*, "allegans les utilitez et fruitz parceuz en la lecture d'icelle" (717).

ce qu'est au medecin, gestes, visage, vestemens, parolles, regardz, touchement, complaire et delecter le malade" (719).<sup>316</sup> The book, insofar as it represents the benevolent, caring persona of the author so crucial to prestige advertising, is less a form of medicine than the long-distance substitute for the doctor himself, bedside manner and treatment all rolled into one.

In the 1552 edition, this metaphor is taken up again in the dedicatory epistle to Odet de Châtillon before the revised prologue. Here, Rabelais insists that he did not compose his works for his own glory or praise, but: "[...] seulement avois esguard et intention par escript donner ce peu de soulagement que pouvois es affligez et malades absens, lequel volontiers, quand besoing est, je fays es presens qui soy aident de mon art et service" (517). As before, the reader's need for the book is put front and center, with the book once again taking the place of the distant practitioner. Rabelais also calls attention to the theatrical nature of his medical persona by referring to it as a "prosopopée," which he reinforces with a citation of Johannes Alexandrinus's 1523 commentary on Hippocrates's *Epidemics*: "Ainsi me suis je acoustré, non pour me guorgiaser et pomper: mais pour le gré du malade, lequel je visite: auquel seul je veulx entierement complaire: en rien ne l'offenser ne fascher" (518).<sup>317</sup> This citation articulates with the one directly preceding it, an anecdote from Macrobius about how Augustus's notorious daughter Julia dresses provocatively for her husband and decently for her father.<sup>318</sup> Julia and her "habiz pompeux, dissoluz, et lascifz" bear a striking similarity to the accommodating *culetage* of Marot's Alice, and are even more explicitly tied to Rabelais's authorial persona than the "fille de joye" is to Marot's. However, whereas Alice seems to betray Marot's misgivings with the flexibility of his persona, Julia and the doctor's "prosopopée" obligate the patient/reader to take

---

<sup>316</sup> For more on this reference to Hippocrates, see Antonioli, pp. 266-69.

<sup>317</sup> See above, p. 235, n. 303 for the theatrical connotations of "prosopopée."

<sup>318</sup> Cf. *Saturnalia*, bk. 2, §5.

an active interest in his own recovery (“*qui soy aident de mon art et service*”) and to play along in keeping with the comparison, attributed (mistakenly) to Hippocrates, of medicine to a farce with three characters: patient, doctor, and disease (518). To quote Agrippa d’Aubigné, Rabelais reminds readers that “Vous n’estes spectateurs, vous estes personnages” (p. 63, l. 170).

This is perhaps why the revised prologue ceases to address readers as drinkers or syphilitics, addressing them only as “lecteurs benevoles” and “Gens de bien” (523).<sup>319</sup> The reader’s benevolence is a prerequisite to his participation in the play. Though Rabelais does not initially address readers as sick patients, he does so at the end of the prologue: “C’est, Goutteux, sus quoy je fonde mon esperance, et croy fermement, que (s’il plaist au bon Dieu) vous obtiendrez santé: veu que rien plus que santé pour le present ne demandez” (535). Health (physical and spiritual) is all that the book has to offer, but readers are to understand that this is all that they really need. To put it another way, what they are going to get should be all they want in the first place, in keeping with the myth of Couillatris and his missing axe. Consequently, they must accept their role as patients and submit to their treatment.

Yet, the prologue subtly signals its manipulation of the reader through the medical metaphor in Rabelais’s final instructions to readers: “Or en bonne santé tousez un bon coup, beuvez en trois, secouez dehait vos aureilles, et vous oyrez dire merveilles du noble et bon Pantagruel” (535). Readers are acknowledged to be in good health, but are then asked to cough deeply as if they were sick, almost as if Rabelais were diagnosing them before proceeding to the treatment, the “merveilles du noble et bon Pantagruel.” Is the good doctor diagnosing a preexisting illness, or manufacturing one in order to be able to treat it? This ambiguity crops up again, even more explicitly, in the *Cinquiesme Livre*.

---

<sup>319</sup> Cf. the contemporary addition of “Bonnes gens” to the prologue of the *Tiers Livre* (345).

There are but a few separate editions of the *Cinquiemesme Livre*, first published anonymously in 1564 (NRB 54, Plan 88), as most appear in collective editions of Rabelais's complete works. These must be distinguished from the *Isle Sonante*, also published anonymously in 1562 (NRB 53, Plan 87). The *Isle* contains the first 15 chapters of the standard *Cinquiemesme Livre*, plus the apocryphal chapter on the Apedefstes, with no prologue.<sup>320</sup> It is interesting to contrast this conspicuous lack of paratext with the abundance thereof in editions of the *Cinquiemesme Livre* proper, as well as to note that this edition does not claim to complete the *geste pantagrueline*, its title insisting only on the novelty of its contents and on a continuation of the *Quart Livre*: *L'Isle Sonante par M. François Rabelays, qui n'a point encores esté imprimée ne mise en lumière: en laquelle est continuée la navigation faicte par Pantagruel, Panurge & autres ses officiers*. In Huchon's estimation, the editor of the *Isle Sonante* is perhaps the most scrupulous of Rabelais's posthumous editors in that he does not try to pass off the edition as a definitive fifth and final book (*Rabelais grammairien* 488-89). The editor of the 1564 *Cinquiemesme Livre*, however, takes a much more active role in editing the original to suit his purposes, and succeeds in producing the version that will go down to posterity. The title alone reveals just how much this version is geared toward satisfying an audience eager for more Rabelais: *Le Cinquiemesme et dernier livre des faicts et dictz Heroïques du bon Pantagruel, composé par M. François Rabelais, Docteur en Medecine. Auquel est contenu la visitation de l'Oracle de la Dive Bacbuc, et le mot de la Bouteille pour lequel avoir, est entrepris tout ce long voyage*. It is clear that the editor has constructed the title so as to establish continuity with previous entries, and that he has the reader in mind: this "long voyage" is not only that of

---

<sup>320</sup> The non-autograph manuscript of the *Cinquiemesme Livre* (BNF ms. fr. 2156) is not much help in determining whether there was an alternate version of the prologue, as its version of the prologue breaks off shortly after the prophetic verses.

Pantagruel, Panurge, and company, but that of the reader eager for the resolution of Panurge's marriage question, as well.

The prologue of the *Cinquiesme Livre* features significant amounts of material from the prologues of the two previous books, so much so that Huchon sees it as a draft of the prologue of the *Tiers Livre* (*Rabelais grammairien* 450-56). However, a few of its unique aspects are worth our consideration. The prologue is addressed "Aux lecteurs benevoles," as is the 1552 prologue of the *Quart Livre*. The "Bonnes gens," however, are nowhere to be found, and readers are addressed as "Beuveurs infatigables, et vous verollez tresprecieux" (723). The introduction of "infatigables," much like the "long voyage" of the title, indicates an awareness of the reader's insatiable demand, placing the prologue squarely in the domain of prestige advertising. It also sets up the ensuing reflection on the proverb "Le monde n'est plus fat." The narrator attributes a polysemy to the term "fat," making it mean either bland (*fade*) or foolish: "Fat est un vocable de Languedoc: et signifie non sallé, sans sel, insipide, fade, par metaphore, signifie fol, niais, despourveu de sens, esventé de cerveau" (723). The connotation of "bland" recalls the original etymology and character of Pantagruel as an imp who pours salt in sleeping people's throats, and if the world is no longer bland, and readers are "*infatigables*," it is an indication that Pantagruel and his *geste* will never cease to leave readers thirsty for more. The narrator then rhetorically asks readers what this proverb might mean, and one of the questions he poses is reminiscent of Gargantua's letter in *Pantagruel*: "Voudriez vous dire, comme de faict on peult logiquement inferer, que par cy devant le monde eust esté fat, maintenant seroit devenu sage?" (723). In answering his own question, the narrator predicts an end to all sorts of foolishness, and specifically to foolish books: "Un tas de livres qui sembloient florides, florulens, floris comme beaux papillons, mais au vray estoient ennuyeux, fascheux, dangereux, espineux et tenebreux,

comme ceux d'Heraclitus, obscurs comme les nombres de Pythagoras, qui fut roy de la febve tesmoin Horace" (725). The books and the "nombres de Pythagoras" directly recall the *sileni* of *Gargantua*: they are inverted *sileni* in that they appear pleasant and elegant, but prove aggravating, obscure and even dangerous. To such books, the narrator, not surprisingly, opposes the *silenus Alcibiadis* that is the *geste*, employing the metaphor of beans in the pod: "Au lieux d'iceux ont succedé les febves en gousse. Ce sont ces joyeux et fructueux livres de pantagruelisme, lesquels sont pour ce jourd'huy en bruit de bonne vente, attendant le periode du Jubilé subsequent, à l'estude desquels tout le monde s'est adonné, aussi est-il sage nommé. Voilà vostre problemesme solu et resolu, faictes vous gens de bien là dessus" (725). Much like Alcofrybas in the prologue of *Gargantua*, the narrator advertises for a way of reading the book and the effects this way of reading will have on the reader, who can become a good person by reading. Whereas self-fashioning is passive in *Gargantua* ("estre faictz"), it is active here ("faictes vous gens de bien").

Yet, even though readers appear to be granted more agency in their self-fashioning, they are still reduced by it in the same way that readers of *Gargantua* are reduced to dogs: if they must make themselves good people by breaking open the pod to reach the peas, it is implied that they are not good people to begin with. This manipulation is underscored by the prologue's similarities with the episode featuring the visit with the Fredon friar and the crew's reaction to it (Chs. 26-28). The friar, despite the fact that he responds only in monosyllables to Panurge's questions, manages to provide an all-too-detailed account of what kind of wenches he prefers, what he likes to do with them, and where, when, and how he likes to do it. Undeniably comedic though it may be, the passage leads to a serious reflection on Lent, as it is revealed that the friar is at his randiest in March, a time of year that is supposed to be devoted to remorse and penance.

In Chapter 28, Epistemon and Pantagruel express their disgust with this paradox, but admit that it does not surprise them: Lent is meant to have a mortifying effect on sensuality, but it occurs at the time of the year when heat begins to circulate more freely around the body after staying put in winter, and, worse still, it exacerbates the effects of this condition by imposing a diet consisting mainly of aphrodisiacs (797).<sup>321</sup> The practice of Lent, upheld by the Council of Trent, represents a failure on the part of the Church to account for human nature, an argument commonly leveled by reformers against Catholic institutions like celibacy (Antonioli 211-212).<sup>322</sup>

In spite of the fact that Lent, as it has been conceived, is doomed to produce the opposite effect from the one it tries to achieve, Epistemon's advises his companions to resign themselves to the institution. What he says next is somewhat shocking: the real problem is not that Lent is backed by the Church, but that it is tacitly approved of by the medical doctors who should oppose it on the grounds that it contributes to infirmity. They do not oppose it, however, "Car sans le quaresme seroit leur art en mespris, rien ne gaigneroient, personne ne seroit malade" (798). An oath to do no harm may ultimately mean less to a practitioner than a steady source of income: no illness means no more need for cures. This problem goes beyond the medical field and into the realm of publishing when we consider the comparison of books written by "M. François Rabelais, Docteur en medicine" to cures or to surrogates for the doctor himself. Closer to home, the prologue of the *Cinquiemesme Livre* itself suggests that Rabelais might not be so different from the doctors described by Epistemon, which becomes apparent in the list of foods

---

<sup>321</sup> Antonioli notes that these remarks on Lent are similar to ones found in Jean Riolan's *Methodus medendi* (Lyons, 1576, written 1548) or Rondelet's *Methodus curandorum omnium morborum* (Lyons, 1576, written 1556).

<sup>322</sup> The decision to uphold Lent at the Council of Trent (Canon 20, ch. 13-14) was a relatively recent one, occurring on Jan. 13, 1547.

that Epistemon blames for Lenten lubricity. Some, like oysters, are still thought to have an effect on sexual potency, but the first four he lists are all beans: “febves, poix, phaseols, chiches” (797). In the prologue, eating “febves en gousse” as a metaphor for reading is what allows readers to make themselves “gens de bien,” but here, a diet of beans is revealed to keep patients sick and in need of treatment. Perhaps this is why readers of the *geste* are so “infatigables”: they are compelled to keep coming back for more by an authorial persona that continually works to convince them they are sick. His “livres de pantagruelisme” do not quench thirst, but only make their readers thirstier.

Medicine in the *Quart Livre* and *Cinquième Livre* thus serves as a warning about how prestige advertising and ideal readership ultimately serve their own purposes at the reader’s expense. To illustrate this point, a comparison may be made between Rabelais’s medical persona and the infamous Docteur Knock of Jules Romains, who adopts as his motto the maxim “Les gens bien portant sont des malades qui s’ignorent” (act 1, sc. 1, p. 46). Knock manages to convince nearly an entire provincial canton’s worth of people that they are gravely ill and in need of his consultations – which he initially offers *gratis*. Having taken control of his patients, he comes to see himself as a sort of God who confers existence upon people by diagnosing them:

Vous me donnez un canton peuplé de quelques milliers d’individus neutres, indéterminés. Mon rôle, c’est de les déterminer, de les amener à l’existence médicale. Je les mets au lit, et je regarde ce qui va pouvoir en sortir: un tuberculeux, un névropathe, un artério-scléreux, ce qu’on voudra, mais quelqu’un, bon Dieu! quelqu’un! Rien ne m’agace comme cet être ni chair ni poisson que vous appelez un homme bien portant (3.6.114).

In Knock’s view, people do not exist until he defines them by one illness or another. It is not surprising, then, that Gérard Gatinot, in an article for *L’Humanité* on a 1960 revival of Romains’s play, claims that Knock was the first public-relations man, and that, forty years after its debut, “[...] ce ‘triomphe de la médecine’ semble plutôt être celui de la publicité bien

comprise” (2).<sup>323</sup> Like Knock, advertising aims to define the consumer according to its own purposes, though, unlike Knock, it offers consumers the illusory freedom to define themselves. Rabelais also exerts control over the definition of the reader’s existence by pretending to grant the reader the freedom to define himself. Like Knock’s consultations, his books are designed to make readers feel that they need the services he offers freely, and to make them realize that if they define themselves through how they read, they can only fashion themselves for the better by complying with his treatment and following his instructions.

But there is another important difference between Rabelais and Knock. Knock’s strategy may be apparent to the spectator, but it is not to his patients, whom he continually flummoxes with medical (and pseudo-medical) terminology that fills them with a sense of dread precisely because they do not understand it. Rabelais, on the other hand, reveals his strategies to the very readers targeted by them. His advertising trains the reader to beware of advertising, to recognize not only how effective it can be at achieving its rhetorical goals, but how susceptible a reader can be to it. This is, I think, what Barry Lydgate hints at when he says that the goal for the reader of *Gargantua* is to become a reader, “with all that implies in terms of discouragements, constraints, perplexities and ambiguities,” and that his reward is neither initiation into mysteries or simple diversion, but “the middle ground of an inner life enriched by his complex skills as performer, skeptic, evaluator, expounder, accomplice” (373). Jerome Schwartz, focusing on the *Quart Livre*, describes Rabelais’s persona and its relationship with the reader even more succinctly: “For he is, ultimately, a charlatan, a conjurer, a specialist in the art of illusion whose intention is not to sermonize but render us immune to sermons. Rabelais’s rhetoric is not the rhetoric of persuasion but the rhetoric of irony” (34).

---

<sup>323</sup> Were I less mean-spirited, I might decline to point out that *L’Humanité*, the official newspaper of the French Communist Party, was itself littered with ads.

## Conclusion

### The Ineluctability of Advertising

In the preface to the *Franciade*, Ronsard states that “Il y a autant de difference entre un Poëte et un versificateur, qu’entre un bidet et un genereux coursier de Naples, et, pour mieux les accompagner, entre un venerable Prophete et un Charlatan vendeur de triacles” (1.1164). In distinguishing poet from *rimeur* on the basis of the distinction between a prophet and a charlatan selling miracle cures, Ronsard disavows not only poor technical execution, but the profit motive along with it. In order to be a true poet, one cannot be a *poète à gages*. On the contrary, the poet must be defined in opposition to the wage poet. Authorship, and indeed printership, operate according to similar principles in sixteenth-century France, as seen in the cases of Lemaire, Marot, and Rabelais. Prestige advertising is so prevalent, and indeed so ineluctable, in their editions precisely because it defines production in opposition to profit, or more specifically, in opposition to the producer’s profit. A printed book meant for mass distribution is a commercial object *par excellence*. It is created and assembled with the express purpose of being sold. Prestige advertising conceals the book’s commercial nature, presenting it not as merchandise being sold, but as a gift given in the spirit of generosity and brotherly love. Just as the author or printer adopts a persona in addressing the reader, or the doctor a pleasant “prosopopée” in addressing the patient, the book inevitably takes on the dimensions of a gift.

Prestige advertising also goes hand-in-hand with ideal readership, in that ideal readers are, in effect, a creation of prestige advertising: the producer cannot be represented as a generous donor without being coupled with an appreciative receiver. Lemaire’s persona needs its grateful French patrons and subjects to show their appreciation for how essential historiography is to national interests. Marot’s persona needs its community of “treschers freres” who will only

accept editions that organize his works the way he says they are meant to be organized. And Rabelais, whether in the guise of Alcofrybas or Doctor Rabelais, needs his readers to believe that his books were put there to give them an opportunity to better themselves by reading them.

But these strategies, as we have seen, end up working against themselves. Try as he might to distinguish himself from Genius, Lemaire raises the possibility that he is perhaps not so far from the “*prelat venerien*” as he would like the reader to believe. Marot raises doubts as to the sincerity of his membership in a community of brothers by suggesting, through the figure of Alice, that this particular manifestation of his chameleonic persona might just be another of the thousand twists and turns he employs to turn literary tricks. Rabelais, perhaps the most self-reflexive of the three, reveals that he perpetuates the very problems he claims to solve through his books. Advertising attempts to present the author/reader (or printer/reader) relationship as symbiotic, a relationship in which both parties benefit from the arrangement. However, the cases of Lemaire, Marot, and Rabelais reveal that this relationship can prove more parasitic (one party benefits, the other is harmed) than symbiotic upon close inspection, or at the very least commensalistic (one party benefits, the other is unchanged). To put it differently, if advertising, and especially prestige advertising, exists to assuage the consumer’s fears, its existence suggests that those fears are probably justified in the first place. It is always clear that authors (and printer/booksellers) need readers, but it is never clear that readers need them, though the point of advertising strategies is to convince the reader that this is the case. To return to the gambling metaphor with which I introduced this study, advertising is playing with loaded dice, but playing with loaded dice does not guarantee victory.

This ineluctable reliance on advertising may be seen as a manifestation of what Rigolot calls the “*sentiment de culpabilité*” that accompanies literary self-awareness in the sixteenth

century (“Conscience littéraire” 34). In this period, writers are often wracked by internal conflicts that define their literary production: Lemaire has both French and Burgundian loyalties; Marot is simultaneously the poet of the French king and of the King of Kings; Rabelais has “le cul entre deux selles,” the one philosophy, the other romance. In these conflicts, one must inevitably privilege one side to the detriment of the other, and the guilt stemming from this choice manifests itself in both text and paratext. Advertising strategies are, in this respect, evidence of the guilt that results from trying to interest the unknown multitude in one’s work. This attempt entails adopting rhetorical strategies which, as Rabelais amply demonstrates, are not so different from those of marketplace hawkers and criers, and which inevitably entail the manipulation of one’s readership and one’s own image: to secure goodwill, as Aristotle and Cicero make perfectly clear, is to conform and to make others conform to ideal constructs.

Yet, the self-awareness attested to by this guilt is also what allows literature to train its readers to be skeptical, to be “escors et preux,” as Rabelais would say. This capability simultaneously does and does not distinguish literature from advertising. It does not distinguish literature from advertising in that advertisements, too, are capable of taking the consumer’s side against misinformation in advertising – which is itself an advertising strategy (Vestergaard and Schrøder 167). This is precisely what Montaigne does, for example, when he disavows prestige advertising altogether, promising in the “Avis au lecteur” at the beginning of the *Essais* that “C’est icy un livre de bonne foy, lecteur. Il t’advertit dès l’entrée, que je ne m’y suis proposé aucune fin, que domestique et privée. Je n’y ay eu nulle consideration de ton service, ny de ma gloire” (3). It does distinguish literature from advertising in that whereas a product is manufactured in order to serve its purpose for a given period of time and then be replaced, reading a book is a formative experience with the potential to leave a permanent impression or to

teach a lasting lesson. Advertising for products is, without exception, geared only toward selling. Advertising in and for literature can provide what Kenneth Burke calls “equipment for living,” which designates the capability of literature to evaluate social situations and suggest strategies for dealing with them (304). If the *cris de Paris* are any indication, advertising and its rhetoric abounded as much in the sixteenth century as they do today. Perhaps one of the main benefits that both sixteenth-century and present-day buyers and readers of Lemaire, Marot, and Rabelais can come away with, aside from the book itself, is a greater level of preparedness to face this onslaught of advertising by understanding how it works.

## Bibliography

### Reference Works

- Cotgrave, Randle. *A Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues*. Columbia: U of South Carolina P, 1950.
- Du Cange. *Glossarium mediæ et infimæ latinitatis*. 6 vols. Paris: Didot, 1840-50.
- Estienne, Robert. *Dictionnaire françois-latin*. Paris: R. Estienne, 1549.
- Huguet, Edmond. *Dictionnaire de la langue française du seizième siècle*. 7 vols. Paris: Champion, 1925-67.
- Lewis, Charlton T. and Short, Charles. *A Latin Dictionary Founded on Andrews' Edition of Freund's Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1975.

### Bibliographies

- Abélard, Jacques. *Les Illustrations de Gaule et Singularitez de Troye de Jean Lemaire de Belges: Etude des éditions – Genèse de l'œuvre*. Geneva: Droz, 1976.
- Baudrier, H.-L. *Bibliographie lyonnaise*. Lyons: Librairie ancienne d'Auguste Brun, 1895-1921. 12 vols.
- Clive, H. P. *Clément Marot: An Annotated Bibliography*. London: Grant and Cutler, 1983.
- Epistre du roy à Hector et autres pièces de circonstances (1511-1513). Ed. Adrian Armstrong and Jennifer Britnell. Paris: STFM, 2000.
- Gültlingen, Sybille von. *Répertoire bibliographique des livres imprimés en France au seizième siècle*. 12 vols. to date. Baden-Baden and Bouxwiller: Valentin Koerner, 1992-.
- Hämel, Adalbert. "Clément Marot und François Juste," *Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur* 50 (1927): 131-34.
- Johns, Francis A. "An unrecorded set of works by Clément Marot of 1535: some corrections to C.A. Mayer's critical edition," *BHR* 47.2 (1985): 389-94.
- . "Notes on two unreported editions of Clément Marot by Denys de Harsy, 1534-1535," *BHR* 50.1 (1988): 87-93.
- Lacroix, Paul (Le Bibliophile Jacob). "François Juste: Libraire et Imprimeur à Lyon," *Bulletin du Bibliophile* (1869): 632-41.

- Mayer, C. A. *Bibliographie des Œuvres de Clément Marot*. 2 vols. Geneva: Droz, 1954.
- , *Bibliographie des éditions de Clément Marot publiées au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle*. Paris: Nizet, 1975.
- Moreau, Brigitte. *Inventaire chronologique des éditions parisiennes du XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle, d'après les manuscrits de Philippe Renouard*. 5 vols. to date. Paris: Imprimerie municipale, Service des travaux historiques de la ville de Paris, 1972-.
- Munn, Kathleen M. *A Contribution to the Study of Jean Lemaire de Belges*. Scottdale: Mennonite Publishing House, 1936.
- Plan, P.-P. *Bibliographie rabelaisienne: Les éditions de Rabelais de 1532 à 1711*. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1904.
- Rawles, Stephen, and Michael Screech. *A New Rabelais Bibliography*. ER 20. Geneva: Droz, 1987.
- Renouard, Philippe. *Répertoire des imprimeurs parisiens, libraires, fondateurs de caractères et correcteurs d'imprimerie depuis l'introduction de l'Imprimerie à Paris (1470) jusqu'à la fin du seizième siècle*. Paris: Minard, 1965.
- Villey, Pierre. *Tableau chronologique des publications de Marot*. Paris: Champion, 1921.
- , "Recherches sur la chronologie des œuvres de Marot," *Bulletin du Bibliophile et du Bibliothécaire* 1920: 185-209, 238-49; 1921: 49-61, 101-17, 171-88, 226-52, 273-87; 1922: 263-71, 311-17, 372-88, 423-32; 1923: 48-54.
- , "Errata au Tableau chronologique," *Revue du Seizième Siècle* 11 (1924), 257-58.
- , "A propos d'une édition de Marot," *Revue du seizième siècle* 15 (1928), 156-60 and 388-89.

## **Lemaire (Chapter One)**

### **Critical editions**

- La Concorde des deux langages*. Ed. Jean Frappier. Geneva: Droz, 1947.
- La Concorde du genre humain*. Ed. Pierre Jodogne. Brussels: Académie royale de Belgique, 1964.
- Epistre du roy à Hector et autres pièces de circonstances (1511-1513)*. Ed. Adrian Armstrong and Jennifer Britnell. Paris: STFM, 2000.
- Les épîtres de l'amant vert*. Ed. Jean Frappier. Geneva: Droz, 1948.

*La Légende des Vénitiens*. Ed. Anne Schoysman. Brussels: Académie royale de Belgique, 1999.

*Œuvres*. Ed. J. Stecher. 4 vols. Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1969.

*Le Temple d'Honneur et de Vertus*. Ed. Henri Hornik. Geneva: Droz, 1957.

*Traicté de la différence des schismes et des conciles de l'Église*. Ed. Jennifer Britnell. Geneva: Droz, 1997.

## Manuscripts

BNF ms. fr. 24038

Österreichische Nationalbibliothek Cod. 3391, 2612

Carpentras, Bibliothèque Inguimbertaine ms. 412

## Original editions

### *Illustrations*

Alphanumeric designations are those of Abélard; Munn's alphanumeric designations are also given wherever applicable. Call numbers of copies consulted are given in brackets.

A1 (Munn 8): *Les Illustrations de Gaule et Singularitez de Troye*. Lyons: Étienne Baland for Jean Richier, n.d. (May 1511). [BNF Rés. La<sup>2</sup> 1]

B1 (Munn 10): *Les Illustrations de Gaule et Singularitez de Troye*. Lyons: Étienne Baland for Jacques Maillet, n.d. (May 1511 – Nov. 12 1512). [BNF Rés. 4° La<sup>2</sup> 4A(I); BNF Arsenal 4° H 3663]

C1 (Munn 14): *Les Illustrations de Gaule et Singularitez de Troye*. Paris: Geoffroy de Marnef, Jan. 1512. [BNF Rés. 4° La<sup>2</sup> 3A]

D1 (Munn 12a): *Les Illustrations de Gaule et Singularitez de Troye*. Paris: Geoffroy de Marnef, Sept. 1512. [BNF Rés. 4° La<sup>2</sup> 4 (I); BNF Rés. 4° La<sup>2</sup> 4a (I)]

E1 (Munn 13a): *Les Illustrations de Gaule et Singularitez de Troye*. Paris: Geoffroy de Marnef, Sept. 1512. [BL G.10249 (1)]

G1 (Munn 18): *Les Illustrations de Gaule et Singularitez de Troye*. Paris: Enguilbert et Jean de Marnef, 1519. [BL 634.k.6]

H1 (19a): *Les Illustrations de Gaule et Singularitez de Troye*. Paris: Enguilbert et Jean de Marnef, 1521. [BNF Rés. La<sup>2</sup> 5 (I)]

- I1 (21a): *Les Illustrations de Gaule et Singularitez de Troye*. Paris: François Regnault (Shared edition), 1523. [BNF Rés. La<sup>2</sup> 6]
- J (Munn 23a): *Les illustrations de Gaule et Singularitez de Troye*. Paris: Philippe Le Noir, July 1524. [BNF Rés. La<sup>2</sup> 8]
- L (Munn 27a): *Les Illustrations de Gaule et singularitez de Troye*. Lyons: Antoine du Ry, 1528. [ENS LF p 256 8°]
- M (Munn 28a): *Les Illustrations de Gaule et singularitez de Troye*. Paris: François Regnault, 1528. [BNF La<sup>2</sup> 8 A; BNF Rés. Ye 998]
- N1 (Munn 29a): *Le premier livre des Illustrations de Gaule et Singularitez de Troye*. Paris: (Julien Hubert for) Ambroise Girault, 1529. [BL C 39 g 4]
- O (Munn 30): *Les troys Livres des Illustrations de Gaule et singularitez de Troye*. Paris: Pierre Vidoue for Galliot du Pré, 1531. [BNF Rés. La<sup>2</sup> 10]
- Z (Munn 49): *Les illustrations de Gaule et Singularitez de Troye*. Paris: François Regnault, n.d. (1533-34?). [BNF Rés. La<sup>2</sup> 7]
- P (Munn 33): *Le premier livre des Illustrations de Gaule et Singularitez de Troye*. Paris: Nicolas Higman for Ambroise Girault, 1533. [BNF Rés. La<sup>2</sup> 11]
- Q (Munn 37): *Les Illustrations de Gaule et Singularitez de Troye*. Paris: Jean Longis (Shared edition), 1540. [PUL 3217.58.349]
- R (Munn 45): *Les Illustrations de Gaule et Singularitez de Troye*. Paris: Jean Réal for Jean Bonfons (Shared edition), 1548. [BNF Rés. 4° La<sup>2</sup> 12]
- S (Munn 47): *Les Illustrations de Gaule et Singularitez de Troye, par maistre Jean le Maire de Belges. Avec la Couronne Margaritique, et plusieurs autres oeuvres de luy, non jamais encore imprimees*. Lyons: Jean de Tournes, 1549. [ENS H F omc 1 F°]

#### Recueil-Epistre

Letter designations are those of Armstrong and Britnell; Munn's alphanumeric designations are also given wherever applicable. Call numbers of copies consulted are given in brackets. Note that J-S, which all designate collective editions of the *Illustrations* published from 1524 to 1549, are the same designations as in Abélard; see Armstrong and Britnell, p. LXXIII.

- A (Munn 12e): *Lepistre du Roy a Hector de Troye. Et aucunes aultres oeuvres Assez dignes de veoir*. Paris: For Geoffroy de Marnef, Aug. 1513. [BNF Rés 8° Z Don 594(566); BNF Vélins 1175; Folger Shakespeare Library 234-555q]

- B (Munn 12e): *LEpistre du Roy a Hector de Troye. Et aucunes aultres oeuvres Assez dignes de veoir.* Paris: For Geoffroy de Marnef, Aug. 1513. [BNF Arsenal 4° H 3663].
- C (Munn 13/16): *Lepistre du Roy a Hector de Troye. Et aucunes oeuvres Assez dignes de veoir.* Paris: (Nicolas Higman for) Geoffroy de Marnef, July 1516. [BL G.10249(6)]
- E (Munn 18): *Lepistre du Roy a Hector de Troye. Et aucunes aultres oeuvres Assez dignes de veoir.* Paris: For Enguilbert and Jean de Marnef, Aug. 1519. [BL 634.k.6]
- F (Munn 19e/20e): *LEpistre du Roy a Hector de Troye. Et aucunes autres oeuvres assez dignes de veoir.* Paris: For Enguilbert and Jean de Marnef, Aug. 1521. [BNF Rés. La<sup>2</sup> 5(5)]
- G (Munn 21e): *LEpistre du Roy a Hector de Troye. Et aucunes autres oeuvres assez dignes de veoir.* Paris: For François Regnault, 1523. [BNF Rés. La<sup>2</sup> 6(4)]
- J (Munn 23d): *LEpistre du roy a hector de troye et aucunes autres oeuvres assez dignes de veoir.* Paris: Philippe Le Noir, July 1524. [BNF Rés. La<sup>2</sup> 8]
- L (Munn 27d): *Lepistre du roy a Hector de troye. Et aulcunes aultres oeuvres assez dignes de veoir.* Lyons: Antoine du Ry, 1528. [ENS LF p 256 8°]
- M (Munn 28e): *Lepistre du Roy a Hector de Troye et aucunes autres oeuvres assez dignes de veoir.* Paris: François Regnault, 1528. [BNF Rés. Ye 998]
- N (Munn 29d): *LEpistre du roy a Hector de troye. Et aucunes aultres Oeuvres assez dignes de veoir.* Paris: (Julien Hubert for) Ambroise Girault, 1529. [PUL 3217.58.349.1528]
- Z (Munn 49d): *LEpistre du roy a Hector de troye.* Paris: François Regnault, n.d. (1533-34?). [BNF Rés. La<sup>2</sup> 7]
- P (Munn 33e): *Lepistre du roy a Hector de Troye et aucunes autres oeuvres assez dignes de veoir.* Paris: Nicolas Higman for Ambroise Girault, 1533. [BNF Rés. La<sup>2</sup> 11]
- Q (Munn 37e): *Sensuit Lepistre du roy a Hector de Troye, et aulcunes aultres oeuvres assez dignes de veoir.* Paris: Jean Longis (Shared edition), 1540. [PUL 3217.58.349]
- R (Munn 45): *Sensuit Lepistre du roy, envoyee a Hector de Troye, et aulcunes aultres oeuvres assez dignes de veoir.* Paris: Jean Réal for Jean Bonfons (Shared edition), 1548. [BNF Rés. 4° La<sup>2</sup> 12]
- S (Munn 47): *Les Illustrations de Gaule et Singularitez de Troye, par maistre Jean le Maire de Belges. Avec la Couronne Margaritique, et plusieurs autres oeuvres de luy, non jamais encore imprimees.* Lyons: Jean de Tournes, 1549. [ENS H F omc 1 F°]

## Marot (Chapter Two)

### Critical editions

*L'Adolescence clémentine*. Ed. Frank Lestringant. Paris: Gallimard, 1987.

*Œuvres complètes*. Ed. C.A. Mayer. 6 vols. London: Athlone Press, 1958-80.

*Œuvres complètes*. Ed. François Rigolot. 2 vols. Paris: Flammarion, 2007-09.

*Œuvres poétiques complètes*. Ed. Gérard Defaux. 2 vols. Paris: Bordas, 1990-93.

*Recueil inédit offert au Connétable de Montmorency en mars 1538*. Ed. François Rigolot. Geneva: Droz, 2010.

### Manuscripts

Chantilly ms 524 (748)

BNF Rothschild 2964

BNF ms. fr. 1721, 2206, 2335, 12489, 12795, 17527, 19183, 23289, 24020, 24029

BNF n.a.f. 477, 10262

Soissons ms 202, 203

### Original editions

Numbers are those found in Mayer's *Bibliographie des éditions de Clément Marot publiées au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris: Nizet, 1975). The Rutgers editions, not listed in Mayer, are designated R1 and R2 (Johns, "Notes on Two Unreported Editions" 87). Call numbers of copies consulted are included in brackets.

1. *Le temple de cupido*. N.p., n.d. [BNF Rés. Ye 1574]

2. *Epistre de Maguelonne*. N.p., n.d. [BNF Rés. Ye 1575]

6. *Les Opuscules et petits Traictez*. Lyons: Olivier Arnoullet, n.d. (1530-31). [BNF Rés. p Ye 736]

9. *L'adolescence clémentine*. Paris: Geoffroy Tory for Pierre Roffet, Aug. 12 1532. [BNF Rés. Ye 1532]

11. *L'adolescence clémentine*. Paris: Geoffroy Tory for Pierre Roffet, Nov. 13 1532. [BNF Rés. Ye 1533]

12. *Ladollescence clementine*. Paris: Geoffroy Tory for Pierre Roffet, Feb. 12 1533. [BNF Rés. Ye 1535]
13. *Ladollescence clementine*. Lyons: François Juste, Feb. 23 1533. [BNF Rothschild 597 (IV.5.41)]
14. *Ladollescence clementine*. Paris: Geoffroy Tory for Pierre Roffet, June 7 1533. [BNF Rés. Ye 1537]
- 14bis. *Ladollescence clementine*. Lyons: François Juste, July 12 1533. [Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Rar. 1780]
15. *La Suite de l'adolescence Clementine*. Paris: (Louis Cyaneus for) the widow of Pierre Roffet, n.d. (late 1533 – early 1534). [BNF Rés. Ye 1534; BNF Rés. Ye 1536]
16. *L'Adolescence clementine*. Paris: Louis Cyaneus for the widow of Pierre Roffet, March 7 1534. [BNF Arsenal Rés. 8° BL 8712; BNF Rothschild 601 (II.5.37)]
17. *La Suite de l'Adolescence Clementine*. Paris: Louis Cyaneus for the widow of Pierre Roffet, n.d. (1534). [BNF Rothschild 601 (II.5.37)]
19. *L'Adolescence clementine*. Paris: Louis Cyaneus for the widow of Pierre Roffet, Aug. 19 1534. [BNF Rés. Ye 1561]
20. *La Suite de l'Adolescence Clementine*. Paris: (Louis Cyaneus for) the widow of Pierre Roffet, 1534. [BNF Rés. Ye 1562]
- R1. *Ladollescence Clementine*. N.p. (Lyons: Denis de Harsy), 1534. [Rutgers University Library SPCOL X PQ1635.A6 1534]
22. *La suite de ladollescence clementine*. Lyons: Guillaume Boullé, 1534. [BNF Rés. Ye 1538; BNF Rothschild 599 (IV.5.88)]
23. *Ladollescence clementine*. Lyons: Guillaume Boullé, 1534. [BNF Rothschild 599 (IV.5.87)]
24. *Ladollescence clementine*. Lyons: François Juste, Dec. 12 1534. [BNF Rothschild 600 (II.7.28)]
25. *La suyte de ladollescence Clementine*. Lyons: François Juste, 1534. [BNF Rothschild 600 (II.7.28)]
28. *Ladollescence clementine*. Avignon: Jean de Channey, n.d. (1533-36). [Chantilly, Musée Condé 1187 (Rés. III.C.51)]
29. *La suite de ladollescence de Clement Marot*. Avignon: Jean de Channey, n.d. (1533-36). [Chantilly, Musée Condé 1187 (Rés. III.C.51)]

31. *Ladolecence clementine*. Lyons: François Juste, Feb. 6 1535. [BNF Rothschild 602 (II.7.27)]
32. *L'Adolecence clementine*. Paris: The widow of Pierre Roffet, June 20 1535. [BNF Arsenal Rés. 8° BL 8713]
33. *La Suite de l'Adolecence Clementine*. Paris: The widow of Pierre Roffet, 1535. [BNF Arsenal Rés. 8° BL 8713]
34. *La suyte de ladolecence Clementine*. Lyons: François Juste, 1535. [BNF Rothschild 602 (II.7.27)]
- R1. *La suyte de ladolecence Clementine*. N.p. (Lyons: Denis de Harsy), 1535. [Rutgers University Library SPCOL X PQ1635.A6 1534]
- R2. *Ladolecence Clementine* and *La Suyte de Ladolecence Clementine*. N.p. (Lyons: Denis de Harsy), 1535. [Rutgers University Library SPCOL X PQ1637.M3A6 1535]
36. *Ladolecence clementine* and *La Suite de ladolecence Clementine*. Paris: The widow of Pierre Roffet, 1536. [BNF Rés. p Ye 664]
38. *Ladolecence clementine*. Paris: Antoine Bonnemère, 1536. [BNF Rés. Ye 1539]
39. *La suite de ladolecence clementine*. Paris: Antoine Bonnemère, 1536. [BNF Rés. Ye 1540]
42. *L'adolescence clementine*. Paris: François Regnault and Jean Petit, 1536. [BNF Rés. p Ye 2409]
43. *La suite de l'adolescence Clementine*. Paris: François Regnault and Jean Petit, 1536. [BNF Rés. p Ye 2409]
55. *Ladolecence Clementine*. N.p. (Paris: Denis Janot), 1537. [BNF Rés. Ye 1542]
56. *La suyte de Ladolecence Clementine*. N.p. (Paris: Denis Janot), 1537. [BNF Rés. Ye 1543]
58. *Ladolecence Clementine*. N.p. (Lyons: Denis de Harsy), 1537. [BNF Rés. Ye 1547]
59. *La suyte de Ladolecence Clementine*. N.p. (Lyons: Denis de Harsy), 1537. [BNF Rés. Ye 1548]
63. *Ladolecence Clementine*. Paris: Denis Janot, 1538. [BNF Rés. Ye 1551]
64. *La suyte de l'adolescence Clementine*. Paris: Denis Janot, 1538. [BNF Rés. Ye 1552]
66. *Ladolecence clementine*. Paris: Antoine Bonnemère, 1538. [BNF Rothschild 604 (II.5.44)]

67. *La suite de ladolence clementine*. Paris: Pierre Sergent, 1538. [BNF Rothschild 604 (II.5.44)]
70. *Les Oeuvres de Clement Marot*. Lyons: (François Juste for) Étienne Dolet, 1538. [BNF Rés. Ye 1457-1460]
71. *Les Oeuvres de Clement Marot*. Lyons: (François Juste for) Sébastien Gryphe, 1538. [BNF Rés. Ye 1461-1464]

### **Rabelais (Chapter Three)**

#### **Critical edition**

*Œuvres complètes*. Ed. Mireille Huchon and François Moreau. Paris: Gallimard, 1994.

#### **Original editions**

Numbers and abbreviated titles are those assigned by Rawles and Screech in the *NRB*; Plan's numbers are also given wherever applicable. Call numbers of copies consulted are given in brackets.

- 1 (Plan 18). *Pantagruel*. Lyons: Claude Nourry, n.d. (1531 or 1532). [BNF Rés. Y<sup>2</sup>2146]
- 3 (Plan 20). *Pantagruel*. N.p. (Paris or Poitiers, Jean and Enguilbert de Marnef), 1533. [BNF Rés. Y<sup>2</sup>2147]
- 4 (Plan 19). *Pantagruel*. Paris: Jean Longis, n.d. [BNF Rothschild 1508 (II.5.38)]
- 5 (Plan 21). *Pantagruel*. N.p., n.d. (Late 1533, early 1534?). [BNF Rés. Y<sup>2</sup>2143]
6. *Pantagruel*. N.p., n.d. [BL G10420]
- 8 (Plan 24). *Pantagruel*. Lyons: François Juste, 1534. [BNF Rothschild 3063 (VI.2.35)]
- 12 (Plan 39). *Pantagruel*. Lyons: François Juste, 1542. [BNF Rés. Y<sup>2</sup>2135]
- 13 (Plan 41 and 48). *Pantagruel, Pantagrueline prognostication, Navigation*. Lyons: Étienne Dolet, 1542. [BNF Rés. Y<sup>2</sup>2145]
- 19 (Plan 31). *Gargantua*. N.p., n.d. (Lyons: François Juste, 1534-35). [BNF Rés. Y<sup>2</sup>2126]
- 20 (Plan 32). *Gargantua*. Lyons: François Juste, 1535. [BNF Rés. Y<sup>2</sup>2130]
- 23 (Plan 38). *Gargantua*. Lyons: François Juste, 1542. [BNF Rés. Y<sup>2</sup>2134]

- 24 (Plan 40). *Gargantua*. Lyons: Étienne Dolet, 1542. [BNF Rés. Y<sup>2</sup>2144]
- 26 (Plan 42 and 43). *Gargantua, Pantagruel, Pantagrueline progostication*. N.p., 1542. [BNF Rés. Y<sup>2</sup>2137-38]
- 27 (Plan 86). *Gargantua, Pantagruel, Pantagrueline progostication*. Lyons: Pierre de Tours, n.d. [BNF Rés. Y<sup>2</sup>2140]
- 28 (Plan 67). *Tiers Livre*. Paris: Chrestien Wechel, 1546. [BNF Rés. Y<sup>2</sup>2159]
- 29 (Plan 71). *Tiers Livre*. Lyons: n.n., 1546. [BNF Rothschild 3199 (IV.9.58)]
- 31 (Plan 68 and 69). *Tiers Livre*. Paris: n.n., 1546. [BNF Rothschild 1512 (VI.2.52)]
- 32 (Plan 72). *Tiers Livre*. Lyons: n.n. (Pierre de Tours?), 1547. [BNF Rés. Y<sup>2</sup>2161]
- 33 (Plan 86). *Tiers Livre*. Lyons: Pierre de Tours, n.d. [BNF Rés. Y<sup>2</sup>2141]
- 36 (Plan 74). *Tiers Livre*. Paris: Michel Fezandat, 1552. [BNF Rés. Y<sup>2</sup>2162]
- 37 (Plan 75). *Tiers Livre*. Lyons: Jean Chabin (i.e. Paris, n.n.), 1552. [BNF Rés. Y<sup>2</sup>2163]
- 41 (Plan 77). *Quart Livre*. Lyons: n.n. (Pierre de Tours), 1548. [BNF Rés. Y<sup>2</sup>2160bis]
- 42 (Plan 76). *Quart Livre*. Lyons: n.n. (Pierre de Tours), 1548. [BNF Rothschild 1513 (V.7.78)]
- 45 (Plan 78). *Quart Livre*. Paris: Michel Fezandat, 1552. [BNF Rothschild 1514 (VI.4.50)]
- 46 (Plan 78). *Quart Livre*. Paris: Michel Fezandat, 1552. [BNF Rés. Y<sup>2</sup>2164]
- 48 (Plan 81). *Quart Livre*. Lyons: Baltasar Aleman, 1552. [BNF Arsenal 8° BL 19595 Rés.]
- 52 (Plan 83). *Quart Livre*. N.p. (Paris), 1553. [BNF Rés. Y<sup>2</sup>2167]
- 53 (Plan 87). *L'isle Sonante*. N.p., 1562. [BNF Rés. pY<sup>2</sup>1349]
- 54 (Plan 88). *Cinquiesme Livre*. N.p., 1564. [BNF Rés. Y<sup>2</sup>2168]
- 55 (Plan 89). *Cinquiesme Livre*. N.p. (Paris?), 1565. [BNF Rés. Y<sup>2</sup>2171]
- 56 (Plan 90). *Cinquiesme Livre*. Lyons: Jean Martin, 1565. [BNF Rés. Y<sup>2</sup>2170]
- 58 (Plan 92). *Œuvres*. N.p., 1553. [PUL 3281.1553]
- 59 (Plan 93). *Œuvres*. Troyes (?): "Loys qui ne se meur point," 1556. [BL C.57.a.6]

- 60 (Plan 94). *Œuvres*. N.p., 1556. [BNF Rés. Y<sup>2</sup>2175]
- 61 (Plan 97). *Œuvres*. N.p., 1559. [BNF Rés. pY<sup>2</sup>2823]
- 63 (Plan 99). *Œuvres*. Lyons: n.n., 1566. [PUL 3281.1566s]
- 64 (Plan 100). *Œuvres*. Lyons: Jean Martin, 1567. [PUL 3281.337.17s]
- 66 (Plan 102). *Œuvres*. Lyons: Pierre Estiart, 1571. [BNF Rés. pY<sup>2</sup>1423]
- 76 (Plan 113). *Œuvres*. Lyons: Jean Martin, 1593. [PUL 3281.1593]

### Other original editions

- Castiglione, Baldassare. *Le Courtisan de messire Baltazar de Castillon nouvellement reveu et corrigé*. Trans. Jacques Colin. Ed. Étienne Dolet. Lyons: François Juste, 1538. [BNF Rés. R. 2049]
- Tory, Geoffroy. *Champ Fleury*. Paris: Geoffroy Tory and Giles Gourmont, 1529. [BNF Rés. V. 595]
- Le Triumphe de l'Amant Vert*. Paris: Denis Janot, 1535. [BNF Rés. Ye 1389]

### Other critical editions

- Aristotle. "Rhetoric." Trans. W. Rhys Roberts. *The Complete Works of Aristotle*. Vol. 2. Ed. Jonathan Barnes. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1984. 2152-2269.
- Aubigné, Agrippa d'. *Les Tragiques*. Ed. Jacques Bailbé. Paris: Flammarion, 1968.
- Boccaccio, Giovanni. *Opere*. Vols. 7-8. Ed. Vittore Branca. Milan: Mondadori, 1998.
- Cicero. *On Invention, Best Kind of Orator, Topics*. Trans. H. M. Hubbell. LCL 386. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1949.
- . "Orator." Trans. H. M. Hubbell. *Cicero, vol. 5*. LCL 342. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1962. 295-509.
- . *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. Trans. Harry Caplan. LCL 403. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1954.
- Cretin, Guillaume. *Œuvres poétiques*. Ed. Kathleen Chesney. Paris: Firmin-Didot et Cie, 1932.
- Du Bellay, Joachim. *Les Antiquités de Rome. Les Regrets. Œuvres poétiques*, vol. 2. Ed. Henri Chamard. Paris: STFM, 1993.

- Erasmus, Desiderius. "De pueris statim ac liberaliter instituendis." Ed. Jean-Claude Margolin. *Opera Omnia Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami*. Ser. 1, vol. 2. Amsterdam: North Holland, 1971. 1-78.
- . *Jules, privé de Paradis!* Ed. and trans. Sylvain Bluntz. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2009.
- . *Opus epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami*, vol. 1. Ed. P. S. Allen. Oxford: Clarendon, 1906.
- . "Paraclesis." *Ausgewählte Werke*. Ed. Hajo Holborn and Annemarie Holborn. Munich: C. H. Beck'sche, 1933. 139-49.
- . "Paraclesis." *Christian Humanism and The Reformation: Selected Writings*. Ed. and trans. John C. Olin. Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1973. 92-106.
- . "Sileni Alcibiadis." *Opera Omnia Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami*. Ser. 2, vol. 5. Ed. Felix Heinimann and Emanuel Kienzle. Amsterdam: North Holland, 1981. 158-90.
- Fabri, Pierre. *Le grand et vrai art de pleine rhétorique*. Ed. A. Héron. Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1969.
- Fulgentius. *Opera*. Ed. Rudolf Helm. Leipzig: Teubner, 1898.
- Gringore, Pierre. *Œuvres polémiques rédigées sous le règne de Louis XII*. Ed. Cynthia J. Brown. Geneva: Droz, 2003.
- Guicciardini, Francesco. *Storia d'Italia*. 3 vols. Ed. Ettore Mazzali. Milan: Garzanti, 1988.
- Héroët, Antoine. *La Parfaicte Amye*. Ed. Christine M. Hill. Exeter: U of Exeter, 1981.
- Horace. *Satires, Epistles, Ars Poetica*. Trans. H. R. Fairclough. *LCL* 194. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1929.
- Jannequin, Clément. "Voulez ouïr les Cris de Paris?" *La vie privée d'autrefois: L'annonce et la réclame*. Ed. Alfred Franklin. Paris: Plon, 1887. 209-15.
- Lorris, Guillaume and Jean de Meun. *Le Roman de la Rose*. Ed. Armand Strubel. Paris: LGF, 1992.
- Lucian of Samosata. "Dionysus: An Introduction." *Lucian*, vol. 1. Trans. A. M. Harmon. *LCL* 14. London: William Heinemann, 1953. 47-59.
- . "How to Write History." *Lucian*, vol. 6. Trans. K. Kilburn. *LCL* 430. London: William Heinemann, 1959. 1-73.

- . "Philosophies for Sale." *Lucian*, vol. 2. Trans. A. M. Harmon. *LCL* 54. London: William Heinemann, 1953. 449-511.
- . "To One Who Said, 'You're a Prometheus in Words.'" *Lucian*, vol. 6. Trans. K. Kilburn. *LCL* 430. London: William Heinemann, 1959. 418-27.
- . "A True Story." *Lucian*, vol. 1. Trans. A. M. Harmon. *LCL* 14. London: William Heinemann, 1953. 249-357.
- Mantuan. *Adulescentia: The Eclogues of Mantuan*. Ed. and trans. Lee Piepho. New York: Garland, 1989.
- Martial. *Epigrams*, vol. 1. Trans. D. R. Shackleton Bailey. *LCL* 94. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1993.
- Montaigne, Michel de. *Les Essais*. Ed. Pierre Villey. Rev. V.-L. Saulnier. Paris: PUF, 2004.
- Ovid. *Heroides and Amores*. Trans. Grant Showerman. Rev. G. P. Goold. *LCL* 41. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1977.
- . *Metamorphoses*. Ed. R. J. Tarrant. Oxford: Clarendon, 2004.
- . *Tristia, Ex Ponto*. Trans. A. L. Wheeler. Rev. G. P. Goold. *LCL* 151. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1996.
- Phaedrus. *Phaedri fabulae aesopiae*. Ed. John Percival Postgate. Oxford: Clarendon, 1919.
- Pico della Mirandola, Giovanni. "Oration on the Dignity of Man." Trans. Elizabeth Livermore Forbes. *The Renaissance Philosophy of Man*. Ed. Ernst Cassirer, Paul Oskar Kristeller, and John Herman Randall, Jr. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1948. 213-54.
- Plato. "Symposium." Trans. Michael Joyce. *The Collected Dialogues of Plato*. Ed. Edith Hamilton and Huntington Cairns. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1961. 526-74.
- Plautus. "Aulularia." *Plautus*, vol. 1. Trans. Paul Nixon. *LCL* 60. London: William Heinemann, 1956. 231-323.
- Pliny. *Natural History*. Vol. 3: Bks. 8-11. Trans. H. Rackham. *LCL* 353. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1940.
- Quintilian. *The Orator's Education, Books 3-5*. Ed. and trans. Donald A. Russel. *LCL* 125. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2001.
- Romains, Jules. *Knock, ou le Triomphe de la Médecine*. Ed. Annie Angremy. Paris: Gallimard, 1993.

Ronsard, Pierre de. *Œuvres complètes*. Ed. Jean Céard, Daniel Ménager and Michel Simonin. 2 vols. Paris: Gallimard, 1993-94.

Sébillet, Thomas. "Art poétique françois." *Traité de poétique et de rhétorique de la Renaissance*. Ed. Francis Goyet. Paris: Librairie Générale Française, 1990. 37-174.

Statius. *Silvae*. Trans. D. R. Shackleton Bailey. LCL 206. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2003.

Villon, François. *Œuvres*. Ed. Auguste Longnon. 4th ed. Paris: Champion, 1992.

Virgil. *Opera*. Ed. F. A. Hirtzel. Oxford: Clarendon, 1900.

### Secondary works

Ahmed, Ehsan. *Clément Marot: The Mirror of the Prince*. Charlottesville: Rookwood, 2005.

Alduy, Cécile. "L'Adolescence de Marot mise en recueil: ordre du livre, fiction d'auteur," *L'Information littéraire* 58.3 (2006): 10-18.

Antonioli, Roland. *Rabelais et la médecine*. ER 12. Geneva: Droz, 1976.

Armstrong, Adrian. "Is This an Ex-Parrot? The Printed Afterlife of Jean Lemaire de Belges' *Epîtres de l'Amant Vert*," *Journal de la Renaissance* 5 (2007): 323-36.

---. "Paratexte et autorité(s) chez les Grands Rhétoriciens." Bessire 61-89.

---. "Songe, vision, savoir: l'onirique et l'épistémique chez Molinet et Lemaire de Belges," *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 123.1 (2007): 50-68.

---. *Technique and Technology: Script, Print, and Poetics in France, 1470-1550*. Oxford: Clarendon, 2000.

---. "Yearning and Learning: Spaces of Desire in Jean Lemaire de Belges' *Concorde des deux langages* (1511)." *The Erotics of Consolation: Desire and Distance in the Late Middle Ages*. Ed. Catherine E. Légé and Stephen J. Milner. New York: Palgrave, 2008. 79-94.

--- and Sarah Kay. *Knowing Poetry: Verse in Medieval France from the Rose to the Rhétoriciens*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2011.

Armstrong, Elizabeth. *Before Copyright: The French Book-Privilege System, 1498-1526*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Rabelais and His World*. Trans. Hélène Iswolsky. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1984.

- Baudrillard, Jean. *Le système des objets*. Paris: Gallimard, 1968.
- Bauer, Franck. "Ballades clémentines: L'ordre du sens." Vignes 137-152.
- Baumgartner, Frederic J. *Louis XII*. New York: St. Martin's, 1994.
- Bauschatz, Cathleen M. "'Une description du jeu de paulme soubz obscures parolles': The Portrayal of Reading in *Pantagruel* and *Gargantua*," *ER* 22 (1988): 57-76.
- . "From 'estudier et profiter' to 'instruire et plaire': Didacticism in Rabelais's *Pantagruel* and *Gargantua*." *Modern Language Studies* 19.1 (Winter 1989): 37-49.
- Becker, Philipp August. *Jean Lemaire: Der erste humanistische Dichter Frankreichs*. Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1970.
- Béné, Charles A. "Erasmus et le Chapitre VIII du premier *Pantagruel*," *Paedagogica historica* 1.1 (1961): 39-66.
- Berger, John. *Ways of Seeing*. London: BBC and Penguin, 1977.
- Bergweiler, Ulrike. *Die Allegorie im Werk von Jean Lemaire de Belges*. Geneva: Droz, 1976.
- Berthon, Guillaume. "Clément Marot et la tentation biographique," *Cahiers parisiens* 4 (2008): 541-51.
- . "'L'intention du Poète': Du pupitre à la presse, Clément Marot *auteur*." Diss. Université Paris-Sorbonne, 2010.
- Bertin, Annie. "Les couleurs dans *L'Adolescence clémentine*." Dauphiné and Mironneau 41-55.
- Blum, Claude. "'L'ordre de mes livres': Les *Ballades* dans *L'Adolescence clémentine* de Marot." *Désirs et plaisirs du livre: Hommage à Robert Kopp*. Ed. Regina Bollhalder Mayer, Olivier Millet and André Vanoncini. Paris: Champion, 2004. 69-80.
- Booth, Wayne C. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. 2nd ed. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1983.
- Bowen, Barbara. *Enter Rabelais, Laughing*. Nashville: Vanderbilt UP, 1998.
- Bozard, Laurent. "Le poète et la princesse: Jean Molinet, Jean Lemaire de Belges, Jean Marot et leurs 'muses': Marguerite d'Autriche et Anne de Bretagne." *Le Moyen Français* 57-58 (2005-6): 27-40.
- Brault, Gerard J. "Ung abysme de science," *BHR* 28 (1966): 615-32.
- Brown, Cynthia J. "Jean Lemaire's *La concorde des deux langages*: The Merging of Politics, Language and Poetry," *Fifteenth Century Studies* 3 (1980): 29-39.

- . *Poets, Patrons and Printers: Crisis of Authority in Late Medieval France*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1995.
- . *The Shaping of History and Poetry in Late Medieval France: Propaganda and Artistic Expression in the Works of the Rhétoriciens*. Birmingham: Summa, 1985.
- Burgwinkle, William E. *Love for Sale: Materialist Readings of the Troubadour Razo Corpus*. New York: Garland, 1997.
- Burke, Kenneth. "Literature as Equipment for Living." *The Philosophy of Literary Form*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1941. 293-304.
- Campagne, Hervé. *Mythologie et rhétorique aux XVe et XVIe siècles en France*. Paris: Champion, 1996.
- Catach, Nina. *L'Orthographe française à l'époque de la Renaissance*. Geneva: Droz, 1968.
- Cathélat, Bernard. *Publicité et société*. Paris: Payot, 1987.
- Cave, Terence. "'Je pareillement...': Instances de la première personne chez Rabelais." *Rabelais: Actes de la journée d'étude du 20 octobre 1995*. *Cahiers Textuel* 34/44, no. 15. Paris: Equipe Tradition antique et modernités de l'UFR "Sciences des textes et documents," 1996. 9-18.
- Cerquiglini-Toulet, Jacqueline. "Clément Marot et la critique littéraire et textuelle: Du bien renommé au mal imprimé Villon." *Defaux and Simonin* 157-64.
- Chang, Leah L. *Into Print: The Production of Female Authorship in Early Modern France*. Newark: U of Delaware P, 2009.
- Chartier, Roger. *L'ordre des livres: Lecteurs, auteurs, bibliothèques en Europe entre XIVE et XVIIIe siècle*. Aix-en-Provence: Alinéa, 1992.
- Chiron, Pascale. "L'édition des *Œuvres* de Villon annotée par Clément Marot, ou comment l'autorité vient au texte," *Littératures classiques* 64 (Spring 2008): 33-51.
- Clément Marot: À propos de L'Adolescence clémentine*. *Actes des quatrièmes Journées du Centre Jacques de Laprade tenues au Musée national du château de Pau les 29 et 30 novembre 1996*. Ed. James Dauphiné and Paul Mironneau. Biarritz: J & D Editions, 1996.
- Clément Marot, L'Adolescence clémentine: Actes de la journée d'étude du 8 novembre 1996*. Ed. Simone Perrier. *Cahiers Textuel* 16. Paris: Université Paris-Diderot, 1997.

- Clément Marot, "Prince des poètes françois," 1496-1996: *Actes du Colloque international de Cahors en Quercy, 21-25 mai 1996*. Ed. Gérard Defaux and Michel Simonin. Paris: Champion, 1997.
- Colard, Jean-Max. "L'apparition du paratexte." *L'inscription du regard: Moyen Âge, Renaissance*. Ed. Michèle Gally and Michel Jourde. Fontenay-aux-Roses: ENS éditions, 1995. 315-36.
- . "L'écriture comme 'passe-temps.'" Perrier 81-92.
- . "Marot: Une parole de proximité." Defaux and Simonin 545-57.
- Conley, Tom. "Un tombeau de mélanges: Les 'Epistres de l'amant vert' dans le livre imprimé des *Illustrations de Gaule et singularitez de Troie* (1512-1513)." *Ouvrages miscellanées et théories de la connaissance à la Renaissance*. Ed. Dominique de Courcelles. Paris: Ecole nationale des chartes, 2003. 79-101.
- Cooper, Richard. *Litterae in tempore belli: études sur les relations littéraires italo-françaises pendant les guerres d'Italie*. Geneva: Droz, 1997.
- Cornilliat, François. "'Comme ung aultre Ilion': Échec poétique et Renaissance lyonnaise dans *La concorde des deux langages*." Defaux, *Lyon et l'illustration* 363-90.
- . *Or ne mens: Couleurs de l'Éloge et du Blâme chez les "Grands Rhétoriciens"*. Paris: Champion, 1994.
- . *Sujet caduc, noble sujet: La poésie de la Renaissance et le choix de ses arguments*. Geneva: Droz, 2009.
- Cottrell, Robert D. "Allegories of Desire in Lemaire's *Concorde des deux langages*," *FF* 23.3 (Sept. 1998): 261-300.
- Cowell, Andrew. "Advertising, Rhetoric, and Literature: A Medieval Response to Contemporary Theory." *Poetics Today* 22.4 (Winter 2001): 795-827.
- Cowling, David. *Building the Text: Architecture as Metaphor in Late Medieval and Early Modern France*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.
- Crescenzo, Richard. "L'antique, l'ancien et le nouveau dans le *Temple de Cupido*." Dauphiné and Mironneau 73-87.
- Dagron, Tristan. "Silènes et statues platoniciennes, à propos du prologue du *Gargantua*." Simonin, *Rabelais* 79-90.
- Dauvois, Nathalie. "Portrait du jeune poète en berger: Adolescence et bucolique." Vignes 11-22.

- Davis, Natalie Zemon. *Society and Culture in Early Modern France*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1975.
- Defaux, Gérard. “‘Effacer Jean, & écrire Clément’: Une douloureuse (et double) affaire de succession.” Defaux, *La génération Marot* 81-112.
- . *Marot, Rabelais, Montaigne: L’écriture comme présence*. Paris: Champion, 1987.
- . *Pantagruel et les Sophistes: Contribution à l’histoire de l’humanisme chrétien au XVIe siècle*. La Haye: M. Nijhoff, 1973.
- . *Le Poète en son jardin: Étude sur Clément Marot et L’Adolescence clémentine*. Paris: Champion, 1996.
- . *Rabelais agonistes: du rieur au prophète*. Geneva: Droz, 1997.
- . “Rhétorique, silence et liberté dans l’œuvre de Marot: Essai d’explication d’un style,” *BHR* 46.2 (1984): 299-322.
- . “Trois cas d’écrivains éditeurs dans la première moitié du XVIe siècle: Marot, Rabelais, Dolet.” Bessire 91-118.
- . “‘Vivre je veux pour l’honneur de la France’: Marot, Tory, Rabelais et le cas Étienne Dolet.” Defaux, *Lyon et l’illustration* 417-49.
- Delègue, Yves. *Le Royaume d’exil: Le sujet de la littérature en quête d’auteur*. Paris: Obsidiane, 1991.
- Demerson, Guy. *Humanisme et facétie: Quinze études sur Rabelais*. Caen: Paradigme, 1994.
- Desan, Philippe. *L’imaginaire économique de la Renaissance*. Mont-de-Marsan: Editions Interuniversitaires, 1993.
- . “‘Profit du libraire’ et ‘honneur de l’auteur’: Marot face à ses lecteurs.” Defaux and Simonin 683-97.
- The Disciplines of Criticism: Essays in Literary Theory, Interpretation, and History*. Ed. Peter Demetz, Thomas Greene and Lowry Nelson, Jr. New Haven: Yale UP, 1968.
- Dupèbe, Jean. “Un ami de Clément Marot, le médecin Michel Amy.” *Cité des hommes, Cité de Dieu: Travaux sur la littérature de la Renaissance en l’honneur de Daniel Ménager*. Ed. Jean Céard et al. Geneva: Droz, 2003. 189-96.
- Duru, Audrey. “Les *Essais poétiques*: Emplois et sens du mot *essai(s)* dans les titres de recueils poétiques à la fin du XVIe siècle et au début du XVIIe siècle.” *Le lexique métalittéraire*

- français (XVIe-XVIIe siècles)*. Ed. Michel Jourde and Jean-Charles Monferran. Geneva: Droz, 2006. 123-45.
- Duval, Edwin. "L'Adolescence clémentine et l'œuvre de Clément Marot," *Etudes françaises* 38.3 (2002): 11-24.
- . *The Design of Rabelais's Pantagruel*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1991.
- . *The Design of Rabelais's Tiers livre de Pantagruel*. ER 34. Geneva: Droz, 1997.
- . "Interpretation and the 'doctrine absconce' of Rabelais's prologue to *Gargantua*," ER 18 (1985): 1-17.
- . "Marot, Marguerite, et le chant du cœur: Formes lyriques et formes de l'intériorité." Defaux and Simonin 559-71.
- . "The Medieval Curriculum, The Scholastic University, and Gargantua's Program of Studies (*Pantagruel*, 8)." La Charité, *Incomparable* 30-44.
- L'Écrivain éditeur*. Vol. 1. Ed. François Bessire. Geneva: Droz, 2001.
- Ehrhart, Margaret J. *The Judgment of the Trojan Prince Paris in Medieval Literature*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1987.
- Eisenstein, Elizabeth. *Divine Art, Infernal Machine: The Reception of Printing in the West from First Impressions to the Sense of an Ending*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2011.
- . *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change: Communications and Cultural Transformations in Early-Modern Europe*. Vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1979.
- En relisant L'Adolescence Clémentine: Actes de la journée d'étude du 24 novembre 2006 organisée par Marie-Madeleine Fragonard, Pascal Debailly et Jean Vignes*. Ed. Jean Vignes. Cahiers Textuel 30. Paris: Université Paris-Diderot, 2007.
- Febvre, Lucien. *Le problème de l'incroyance au XVIe siècle: La religion de Rabelais*. Paris: Albin Michel, 1968.
- , and Henri-Jean Martin. *L'apparition du livre*. Paris: Albin Michel, 1971.
- Fenoaltea, Doranne. "Doing It with Mirrors: Architecture and Textual Construction in Jean Lemaire's *La concorde des deux langages*." *Lapidary Inscriptions: Renaissance Essays for Donald A. Stone*. Lexington: French Forum, 1991. 21-32.
- François Rabelais: Critical Assessments*. Ed. Jean-Claude Carron. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1995.

- Françon, Marcel. *Autour de la lettre de Gargantua à Pantagruel*. Rochecorbon: Gay, 1957.
- Frappier, Jean. "Nouvelles réflexions sur *La concorde des deux langages*." *Bulletin de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg* 27.1 (Nov. 1948): 1-12.
- Galland-Hallyn, Perrine. "Marot, Macrin, Bourbon: 'Muse naïve' et 'tendre style.'" Defaux, *La génération Marot* 211-40.
- Gatinot, Gérard. "Knock (ou le triomphe... de la publicité)," *L'Humanité*, Feb. 8 1960: 2.
- La génération Marot: Poètes français et néo-latins (1515-1550). Actes du Colloque international de Baltimore, 5-7 décembre 1996*. Ed. Gérard Defaux. Paris: Champion, 1997.
- Genette, Gérard. *Palimpsestes: La littérature au second degré*. Paris: Seuil, 1982.
- . *Seuils*. Paris: Seuil, 1987.
- Glauser, Alfred. *Le faux Rabelais, ou De l'inauthenticité du Cinquième Livre*. Paris: Nizet, 1975.
- Goyet, Francis. "Sur l'ordre de *L'Adolescence clémentine*." Defaux and Simonin 593-613.
- Gray, Floyd. *Rabelais et l'écriture*. Paris: Nizet, 1974.
- . "Rabelais's First Readers." La Charité, *Incomparable* 15-29.
- . *La Renaissance des mots*. Paris: Champion, 2008.
- . "Structure and Meaning in the Prologue to the *Tiers Livre*," *L'Esprit Créateur* 3.2 (Summer 1963): 57-62.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*. 2nd ed. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2005.
- Greene, Thomas. "The Flexibility of the Self in Renaissance Literature." Demetz, Greene, and Nelson 241-64.
- Greimas, A.-J. *Sémantique structurale: Recherche de méthode*. Paris: Larousse, 1966.
- Grève, Marcel de. *L'interprétation de Rabelais au XVIe siècle*. ER 3. Geneva: Droz, 1961.
- Griffin, Robert. "*La concorde des deux langages*: Discordia concors." Smith and McFarlane 54-81.

- . "Cosmic Metaphor in *La concorde des deux langages*." *Pre-Pléiade Poetry*. Ed. Jerry C. Nash. Lexington: French Forum, 1985. 15-30.
- . *Clément Marot and the Inflections of Poetic Voice*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1974.
- Guy, Henry. *Histoire de la poésie française au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle. Tome I: L'école des Rhétoriciens*. Paris: Champion, 1968.
- Hardison, O. B. *The Enduring Monument: A Study of the Idea of Praise in Renaissance Literary Theory and Practice*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1962.
- Hirsch, Rudolf. *Printing, Selling and Reading, 1450-1550*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1967.
- Hoffmann, George. "About Being about the Renaissance: Bestsellers and Booksellers," *JMRS* 22.1 (Winter 1992): 75-88.
- Huchon, Mireille. *Louise Labé: Une créature de papier*. Geneva: Droz, 2006.
- . "Pantagruelistes et mercuriens lyonnais." Defaux, *Lyon et l'illustration* 405-15.
- . *Rabelais*. Paris: Gallimard, 2011.
- . *Rabelais grammairien: De l'histoire du texte aux problèmes d'authenticité*. Geneva: Droz, 1981.
- . "Rhétorique et poétique des genres: *L'Adolescence clémentine* et les métamorphoses de ses œuvres de prison." *Le Génie de la langue française autour de Marot et La Fontaine*. Ed. Jean-Charles Monferran. Paris: Editions de l'ENS, 1997. 53-71.
- Humanism and Letters in the Age of François Ier: Proceedings of the Fourth Cambridge French Renaissance Colloquium, 19-21 September 1994*. Ed. Philip Ford and Gillian Jondorf. Cambridge: Cambridge French Colloquia, 1996.
- Imbs, Paul. "Jean Lemaire de Belges: *La Concorde des deux langages*," *Bulletin de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg* 26.6 (Apr. 1948): 182-87.
- Iser, Wolfgang. *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1978.
- . *The Implied Reader: Patterns of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1974.
- Jauss, Hans Robert. *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*. Trans. Timothy Bahti. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1982.

- Jeanneret, Michel. "Banquets poétiques et métaphores alimentaires." *Ronsard en son IVe centenaire*. Vol. 2. Ed. Yvonne Bellenger et al. Geneva: Droz, 1989. 73-80.
- . *Des mets et des mots*. Paris: José Corti, 1987.
- . "La Lecture en question: Sur quelques prologues comiques du seizième siècle," *FF* 14.3 (Sept. 1989): 279-89.
- . *Perpetuum mobile: Métamorphoses des corps et des œuvres de Vinci à Montaigne*. Paris: Macula, 1997.
- . "Signs Gone Wild: The Dismantling of Allegory." Caron 57-70.
- Jodogne, Pierre. *Jean Lemaire de Belges: Ecrivain franco-bourguignon*. Brussels: Académie Royale de Belgique, 1972.
- . "Les 'rhétoriciens' et l'humanisme: problème d'histoire littéraire." *Humanism in France at the end of the Middle Ages and in the early Renaissance*. Ed. A. H. T. Levi. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1970. 150-75.
- Joseph, George. *Clément Marot*. Boston: Twayne, 1985.
- Joukovsky, Françoise. *La gloire dans la poésie française et néolatine du 16e siècle*. Geneva: Droz, 1969.
- Kennedy, William J. "Petrarchan Audiences and Print Technology," *JMRS* 14.1 (Spring 1984): 1-20.
- Kline, Michael B. *Rabelais and the Age of Printing*. *ER* 4. Geneva: Droz, 1963.
- Kritzman, Lawrence. "The Rhetoric of Dissimulation in *La première epistre de l'Amant Vert*," *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 10.1 (Spring 1980): 23-39.
- La Charité, Raymond C. "Du *Pantagruel* au *Quart Livre*: Projet narratif et lecteurs." Simonin, *Rabelais* 361-74.
- . "The Framing of Rabelais's *Gargantua*." Caron 3-18.
- . "Lecteurs et lectures dans le prologue du *Gargantua*," *FF* 10.3 (Sept. 1985): 261-70.
- . "Rabelais and the Silenic Text: The Prologue to *Gargantua*." La Charité, *Incomparable* 72-86.
- Lebègue, Raymond. "Rabelais, the Last of French Erasmians," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 12 (1949): 91-100.

- LeBlanc, Yvonne. "Death and Remembrance: The Immortality of the Word and the *Epîtres de l'Amant Vert*," *Medieval Perspectives* 8 (1993): 112-20.
- . "*Va Lettre Va*": *The French Verse Epistle (1400-1550)*. Birmingham: Summa, 1995.
- Lecointe, Jean. *L'Idéal et la différence: La perception de la personnalité littéraire à la Renaissance*. Geneva: Droz, 1993.
- Lestringant, Frank. *Clément Marot: De L'Adolescence à L'Enfer*. Padua: Unipress, 1998.
- Leushuis, Reinier. "Fertilizing the French Vernacular: Procreation, Warfare and Authorship in Jean de Meun, Jean Lemaire de Belges, and Rabelais." *Sexuality in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Times*. Ed. Albrecht Classen. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008. 783-810.
- Link, Hannelore. *Rezeptionsforschung: Eine Einführung in Methoden und Probleme*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1976.
- Literature and the Arts in the Reign of Francis I: Essays Presented to C. A. Mayer*. Ed. Pauline M. Smith and I. D. McFarlane. Lexington: French Forum, 1985.
- Losse, Deborah N. *Rhetoric at Play: Rabelais and Satirical Eulogy*. Bern: Peter Lang, 1980.
- . *Sampling the Book: Renaissance Prologues and the French Conteurs*. Lewisburg: Bucknell UP, 1994.
- Lydgate, Barry. "Printing, Narrative and the Genesis of the Rabelaisian Novel," *Romanic Review* 71.4 (Nov. 1980): 345-73.
- Lyon et l'illustration de la langue française à la Renaissance*. Ed. Gérard Defaux. Lyons: Ens Éditions, 2003.
- Martin, Daniel. "Clément Marot: nouveaux horizons de la poésie et du poète à la Renaissance," *RHR* 59 (Dec. 2004): 23-37.
- Mayer, C. A. *Clément Marot*. Paris: Nizet, 1972.
- McFarlane, I. D. "Clément Marot and the World of Neo-Latin Poetry." Smith and McFarlane 103-30.
- McGrady, Deborah. "Printing the Patron's Pleasure for Profit: The Case of the *Epîtres de l'Amant Vert*," *JEBS* 2 (1999): 89-112.
- McKinley, Mary. "Parrots and Poets: Writing Alterities in Scève and Lemaire de Belges." *Self and Other in Sixteenth-century France: Proceedings of the Seventh Cambridge French Renaissance Colloquium, 7-9 July 2001*. Ed. Kathryn Banks and Philip Ford. Cambridge: Cambridge French Colloquia, 2004. 1-14.

- Melançon, Robert. "La personne de Marot." Defaux and Simonin 515-29.
- Ménager, Daniel. "Rabelais et le 'propre de l'homme.'" Simonin, *Rabelais* 31-39.
- . *La Renaissance et le rire*. Paris: PUF, 1995.
- . "La stratégie des titres dans *Gargantua et Pantagruel*." *François Rabelais, Aurélien d'Aragon: actes des journées d'étude de l'Université Paris VII, samedi 19 novembre et vendredi 16 décembre 1988, U.F.R. "Sciences des textes et documents."* Ed. Françoise Charpentier and Marie-Claire Dumas. *Cahiers Textuel* 34/44 nos. 4-5. Paris, 1989. 13-19.
- Miernowski, Jan. "Le pas chancelant de la fiction marotique." Defaux and Simonin 531-43.
- Moss, Ann. "Fabulous Narrations in the *Concorde des deux langages* of Jean Lemaire de Belges." *Philosophical Fictions and the French Renaissance*. Ed. Neil Kenny. London: The Warburg Institute, 1991. 17-28.
- . *Poetry and Fable: Studies in Mythological Narrative in Sixteenth-Century France*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1984.
- Nelson, Lowry, Jr. "The Fictive Reader and Literary Self-Reflexiveness." Demetz, Greene, and Nelson 173-91.
- Norrell, Renée. "L'Énigme de la *Concorde des deux langages*," *Revue des langues romanes* 83.1 (1978), 151-55.
- Ouy, Gilbert. *Les manuscrits de l'abbaye de Saint-Victor: Catalogue établi sur la base du répertoire de Claude de Grandrue (1514)*. 2 vols. Bibliotheca Victorina 10. Turnhout: Brepols, 1999.
- . "Saint-Victor de Paris." *Histoire des bibliothèques françaises. Vol. I: Les bibliothèques médiévales du VI<sup>e</sup> siècle à 1530*. Ed. André Vernet. Paris: Promodis, 1989. 86-89.
- Pettegree, Andrew. *The Book in the Renaissance*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2010.
- Preisig, Florian. *Clément Marot et les métamorphoses de l'auteur à l'aube de la Renaissance*. Geneva: Droz, 2004.
- Presbrey, Frank. *The History and Development of Advertising*. New York: Doubleday, 1929.
- La publicité: Théories, acteurs et méthodes*. Ed. Éric Vernet. Paris: La documentation française, 2000.
- Quilliet, Bernard. *Louis XII, Père du Peuple*. Paris: Fayard, 1986.

- Rabelais's Incomparable Book*. Ed. Raymond C. La Charité. Lexington, KY: French Forum, 1986.
- Rabelais pour le XXI<sup>e</sup> siècle: Actes du colloque du Centre d'études supérieures de la Renaissance (Chinon-Tours, 1994)*. Ed. Michel Simonin. *ER* 33. Geneva: Droz, 1998.
- Randall, Michael. *Building Resemblance: Analogical Imagery in the Early French Renaissance*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1996.
- . "The Flamboyant Design of Jean Lemaire de Belges' *La Concorde des deux langages*," *L'Esprit Créateur* 28.2 (Summer 1988): 13-24.
- Réach-Ngô, Anne. "De l'espace du livre à l'espace de l'œuvre: la consécration du fait littéraire à la Renaissance." *Le livre et ses espaces*. Ed. Alain Milon and Marc Perelman. Paris: Presses Universitaires de Paris 10, 2007. 63-84.
- The Reader in the Text: Essays on Audience and Interpretation*. Ed. Susan R. Suleiman and Inge Crosman. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1980.
- Regosin, Richard. "The Ins(ides) and Out(sides) of Reading: Plural Discourse and the Question of Interpretation in Rabelais." La Charité, *Incomparable* 59-71.
- . "Opening Discourse." Caron 133-47.
- Renner, Bernd. "Changes in Renaissance Epistemology: The Dialogism of Rabelais's Prologues." *Charting Change in France around 1540*. Ed. Marian Rothstein. Selinsgrove: Susquehanna UP, 2006. 186-212.
- . *Difficile est saturam non scribere: L'herméneutique de la satire rabelaisienne*. *ER* 45. Geneva: Droz, 2007.
- Rigolot, François. "Authorial Authority in the Early Age of Printing: Clément Marot (1496-1544)," *Princeton University Library Chronicle* 70.1 (Autumn 2008): 35-48.
- . "Clément Marot et l'émergence de la conscience littéraire à la Renaissance." Defaux, *La génération Marot* 21-34.
- . "'De peu assez': Clément Marot et Jean Lemaire de Belges." Defaux and Simonin 185-99.
- . "Hybridity, Exemplarity, and Dialogism in a Historical Perspective: Rabelais's Dialogue on Dialogue with Lucian." *Der Dialog im Diskursfeld seiner Zeit: Von der Antike bis zur Aufklärung*. Ed. Klaus W. Hempfer and Anita Traninger. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2010. 205-17.
- . "Intentionnalité du texte et théorie de la *persona*: Le cas des *Epîtres de l'Amant Vert*."

- Poétiques: théorie et critique littéraires*. Ed. Floyd Gray. Vol. 1 of *Michigan Romance Studies*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan, 1980. 186-207.
- . "Jean Lemaire de Belges: Concorde ou discorde des deux langages?" *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 3 (1973): 165-75.
- . *Les langages de Rabelais*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Geneva: Droz, 1996.
- . *Poésie et Renaissance*. Paris: Seuil, 2002.
- . "Prolégomènes à une étude du statut de l'appareil liminaire des textes littéraires," *L'Esprit Créateur* 27.3 (Fall 1987): 7-18.
- . "Rhétoriciens." *Dictionnaire des lettres françaises: Le XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle*. Ed. Michel Simonin. Paris: LGF, 2001.
- . *Le Texte de la Renaissance: Des Rhétoriciens à Montaigne*. Geneva: Droz, 1982.
- . "Vraisemblance et Narrativité dans le *Pantagruel*," *L'Esprit Créateur* 21.1 (Spring 1981): 53-68.
- Rommel, Bettina. *Rabelais zwischen Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit: Gargantua, Literatur als Lebensführung*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1997.
- Rosenthal, Olivia. "L'auteur devant son œuvre: l'exemple de Jean Lemaire de Belges," *Nouvelle Revue du Seizième Siècle* 17.2 (1999): 181-93.
- . "Clément Marot: Une poétique de la requête." Defaux and Simonin 283-99.
- . "Les jeunesses de Clément Marot." Perrier 7-21.
- . "L'œuvre et ses éditeurs au début du XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle." *L'Autre de l'œuvre*. Ed. Yoshikazu Nakaji. Paris: Presses Universitaires de Vincennes, 2007. 23-37.
- Rothstein, Marian. "Jean Lemaire de Belges' *Illustrations de Gaule et Singularitez de Troye*: Politics and Unity," *BHR* 52.3 (1990): 593-609.
- Sainéan, Lazar. *La langue de Rabelais*. Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1976.
- Scheller, Robert W. "Gallia Cisalpina: Louis XII and Italy, 1499-1508," *Simiolus* 15.1 (1985): 5-60.
- Schneider, Lars. *Medienvielfalt und Medienwechsel in Rabelais' Lyon*. Münster: LIT, 2008.
- Schwartz, Jerome. "Rhetorical Tensions in the Liminary Texts of Rabelais's *Quart Livre*," *ER* 17 (1983): 21-36.

- Scollen-Jimack, Christine. "Clément Marot: Protestant Humanist, or Court Jester?" *RS* 1.2 (June 1989): 134-46.
- , "Marot and Deschamps: The Rhetoric of Misfortune," *FS* 42 (Jan. 1988): 21-32.
- Screech, Michael. *Clément Marot: A Renaissance Poet Discovers the Gospel*. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- . *Rabelais*. London: Duckworth, 1979.
- . *Rabelais and the Challenge of the Gospel*. Bibliotheca Dissidentium scripta et studia 5. Baden-Baden: Valentin Koerner, 1992.
- Segers, Rien T. "Readers, Text and Author: Some Implications of *Rezeptionsästhetik*." *Yearbook of Comparative and General Literature* 24 (1975): 15-23.
- Shaw, Christine. *Julius II: The Warrior Pope*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1993.
- Sherman, Michael. "Political Propaganda and Renaissance Culture: French Reactions to the League of Cambrai, 1509-10," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 8.2 (1977): 97-128.
- Skenazi, Cynthia. "Eutopie et utopie dans 'Le Temple de Cupido' de Marot," *FS* 49 (1995): 17-28.
- . *Le poète architecte en France: Constructions d'un imaginaire monarchique*. Paris: Champion, 2003.
- Smith, Paul J. "Le prologue du *Pantagruel*: Une lecture," *Neophilologus* 68.2 (Apr. 1984): 161-69.
- Smith, Pauline M. "Clément Marot and the French Language." Smith and McFarlane 163-93.
- . "Clément Marot and Humanism." Ford and Jondorf 133-50.
- Soubeyille, Georges. "Amitiés de Salmon Macrin parmi les poètes de langue vernaculaire." *Neo-Latin and the Vernacular in Renaissance France*. Ed. Grahame Castor and Terence Cave. Oxford: Clarendon, 1984. 98-112.
- Stephens, Walter. "*Livres de haulte gresse*: Bibliographic Myth from Rabelais to Du Bartas," *MLN* 120 Supplement (2005): S60-S83.
- Stone, Donald. "Some Observations on the Text and Possible Meanings of Lemaire de Belges' *La Concorde des deux langages*," *BHR* 55.1 (1993): 65-76.
- Szabari, Antónia. "Rabelais *Parrhesiastes*: The Rhetoric of Insult and Rabelais's Cynical Mask," *MLN* 120 Supplement (2005): S84-S123.

- Tinguely, Frédéric. "D'un prologue l'autre: Vers l'inconscience consciente d'Alcofrybas Rabelais," *ER* 29 (1993): 83-91.
- Tournon, André. "*Ce sont coups d'essai: L'ironie poétique.*" Perrier 117-29.
- . "Le pantagruélisme, mode de lecture du *Tiers Livre*," *Littératures* 33 (Autumn 1995): 5-16.
- "*Va, mon livre: Quelques jalons pour une histoire de la destination*," *Nouvelle Revue du Seizième Siècle* 21.1 (2003): 121-51.
- Vestergaard, Torben and Schrøder, Kim. *The Language of Advertising*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1985.
- Veyrin-Forrer, Jeanne. "Les *Œuvres* de Clément Marot: Questions bibliographiques." Ford and Jondorf 151-70.
- . "Les premières éditions collectives de Clément Marot publiées à Lyon." Defaux and Simonin 699-711.
- Vigliano, Tristan. "Pour en finir avec le prologue de *Gargantua*," *@nalyse*s (Articles courants): n. pag. Web. Jan. 24 2012. <http://www.revue-analyses.org/index.php?id=1168>.
- Weber, Henri. *La création poétique au XVIe siècle en France de Maurice Scève à Agrippa d'Aubigné*. Paris: Nizet, 1955-56. 2 vols.
- Weinberg, Florence M. *The Wine and the Will: Rabelais's Bacchic Christianity*. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1972.
- Williams, Raymond. "Advertising: The Magic System." *The Cultural Studies Reader*. Ed. Simon During. New York: Routledge, 1993. 320-36.
- Williamson, Judith. *Decoding Advertisements: Ideology and Meaning in Advertising*. London: Marion Boyars, 1978.
- Zumthor, Paul. *Le masque et la lumière*. Paris: Seuil, 1978.