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 copyrightlaw. We do not charge any permission or usage fees for the publication of images of material inour 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 onthe 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

2013

Roman Censorship and the Shaping of Montaigne's Essays

Caponegro, Mihaela Carla

Princeton, NJ : Princeton University

---

http://arks.princeton.edu/ark:/88435/dsp01kd17cs97k

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

ROMAN CENSORSHIP

AND THE SHAPING OF MONTAIGNE'S *ESSAIS*

Mihaela Carla Caponegro

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

Advisor: Professor François Rigolot

September 2013

© Copyright by Mihaela Carla Caponegro, 2013. All rights reserved

ABSTRACT

In 1581 Michel de Montaigne (1533-1592) returned to his home after a long and sinuous journey to Rome, which led him across Europe for more than eighteen months. While in Rome, the essayist had met with Pope Gregory XIII and visited the Vatican Library. The Roman Censors representing the Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith (La Congregazione per la Dottrina della Fede), otherwise known as the Roman Inquisition, reviewed the first edition of his newly published *Essays* under the direct supervision of Sisto Fabri, the Master of the Sacred Palace (Maestro del Sacro Palazzo). About one year later, in 1582, Montaigne published a second edition of his book, revised and augmented.

In this dissertation I discuss the textual changes and additions which appeared in this new edition as a direct result of Montaigne's trip to Rome, and particularly as a result of his interaction with the Roman censors. My analysis focuses on the material evidence pertaining to the process of censorship: both in the author's own account registered in his *Journal de voyage* (*Travel Journal*), published posthumously in 1774, and in the original list of objections complied by the Roman censors, a document made public only in 2000.

The complex reshaping of the *Essays* Montaigne undertook, from his return to his château (November 30, 1581) until his death (September 13, 1592), reveals the ongoing dialog he pursued with the Roman officials, a dialog that can be precisely reconstructed through an analysis of textual transformations in the 1582 edition, the 1588 Paris edition, the hand-written "allongeails" on the Bordeaux Copy, and the 1595 posthumous edition prepared by Marie de Gournay. For a dozen years Montaigne carried on a discussion with his absent censors by gradually building new textual arguments in response to them.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The following study would not have been possible without the help of my advisors, colleagues, friends and family. It is with great pleasure that I acknowledge some of them here. First of all I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Professor François Rigolot. Without his remarkable mentorship and patience, this project would not have been possible. He provided me with the perfect combination of academic guidance and research freedom, and encouraged me to have confidence in my own work. Warm thanks to professor François Cornilliat from Rutgers University, who introduced me to Montaigne and his *Essays* during one of my first undergraduate courses, and whose keen insights inspired my course of study.

I would like to extend special thanks to professors Goran Blix, Volker Schroder, and Simone Marchesi for their participation and feedback in this study, and to professors Gaetana Marrone-Puglia, Christine Sagnier, Sarah Kay and Effie Rentzou, for their support and guidance during my graduate years. I would also like to mention the valuable assistance in all non-academic matters provided by the staff in the department of French and Italian. I am grateful for the wonderful people I met in Princeton, a supportive community of exceptionally bright individuals: Meghan Gottschall, Ainsley Brown, Valerie Aguilar, Karen Quandt, Rebecca Harmon, Yann Robert and Scott Francis.

Lastly, I would like to acknowledge the support provided by my entire family, which was indispensable in completing this project: my sister, my grandmother, my cousins, my aunts and uncles, and my parents-in-law. I dedicate this study to my

wonderful husband, Max, my amazing children, Sebastian and Antonia, and to my parents Dana and Razvan. Thank you for your unconditional affection and support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract iii

Acknowledgements v

Introduction 1

Part I - Montaigne and the Roman Censors 16

Chapter 1 - The Six Objections of the Roman Censors recalled in Montaigne's *Journal* 29

1. The Use of the Word "Fortune" 29

2. Naming Heretical Authors 52

3. The Praise of Emperor Julian 64

4. The Act of Praying 70

5. Montaigne's Disapproval of Torture 76

6. The Freedom in the Education of Children 80

Chapter 2 - The Thirty Objections on the Vatican Document 86

1. On Matters of Wealth, Modesty of Women and Suicide 90

2. On Matters Addressed in II. 12 "Apologie de Raimond Sebond" 105

3. On Religious Matters, Heretics and Drinking 127

4. On Customs and Freedom of Conscience 142

Part II - The 1582 Edition of the *Essays* 169

Chapter 3 - Literary Sources Added in the 1582 Edition of the *Essays* 169

1. The Latin Quotations in the 1582 Edition 169

2. The Italian Ciatations in the 1582 Edition 187

Chapter 4 - Montaigne's European Experience in the 1582 Text of the *Essays* 220

1. Montaigne's Personal Encounters in the Trip to Italy 224

2. Textual Additions Reinforcing Montaigne's Faith in the Catholic Church.....239

Conclusion 255

Appendix A: Vatican Documentum 32.....260

Appendix B: Various Stages of Chapter I.21 "De la Force de l'Imagination" 264

Appendix C: Petrarch's *Canzone* CV 268

Appendix D: *Journal de Voyage* - Passages. Montaigne's Daily Schedule at the Waterspas of La Villa in Italy 270

Bibliography 274

INTRODUCTION

After retiring from his position as a Counselor to the Parliament in 1570, Michel de Montaigne (1533-1592) withdrew from public life in order to devote his time to private study and leisurely activities. A year later, in 1571, he consolidated the conviction of his decision by engraving it above his cabinet, adjacent to his library[1]. This period of idleness and private study will be interrupted almost ten years later, immediately after publishing the first edition of his *Essays*, by a long journey to Rome across Central Europe. Critics and historians are still debating over the reasons that might have dissuaded Montaigne form his original plan to devote his life to a tranquil, carefree retirement. The first and most evident explanation is the prospect of visiting Rome, the Eternal City. This unique metropolis was one of the most fashionable destinations for travelers in the early modern period. It was the cradle of the famous philosophers of antiquity, as well as the quintessential representation of Christianity as the papal residence, and many French humanists undertook the same project of visiting Rome. Among other important figures that embarked in this similar journey were a number of

[1] "An. Christi 1571 aet. 38, pridie cal. mart., die suo natali, Mich. Montanus, servitii aulici et munerum publicorum jamdudum pertaesus, dum se integer in doctarum virginum recessit sinus, ubi quietus et omnium securus (quan)tillum in tandem superabit decursi multa jam plus parte spatii: si modo fata sinunt exigat istas sedes et dulces latebras, avitasque, libertati suae, tranquillitatique, et otio consecravit." – Helmut Pfeiffer, 'Das Ich als Haushalt:Montaignes ökonomische Politik', in Rudolf Behrens,Roland Galle (eds.) *Historische Anthropologie und Literatur:Romanistische Beträge zu einem neuen Paradigma der Literaturwissenschaft*, Königshausen und Neumann, Würzburg, 1995 pp.69-90 p.75 - "In the year of Christ 1571, at the age of thirty-eight, on the last day of February, his birthday, Michael de Montaigne, long weary of the servitude of the court and of public employments, while still entire, retired to the bosom of the learned virgins, where in calm and freedom from all cares he will spend what little remains of his life, now more than half run out. If the fates permit, he will complete this abode, this sweet ancestral retreat; and he has consecrated it to his freedom, tranquility, and leisure." - as translates Richard L. Regosin, 'Montaigne and His Readers', in Denis Hollier (ed.) *A New History of French Literature*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, London 1995, pp.248-252, p.249.

poets, such as Joachim du Bellay, Pierre de Ronsard, Jacques Grévin, Olivier de Magny, Etienne Jodelle, writers and scholars like François Rabelais, and Marc-Antoine de Muret, and countless other political and religious dignitaries who played instrumental roles in diplomatic missions, attempting to resolve or appease conflicts between France and the Pontifical State. The trip to Rome enabled poets to find their own poetic voice. For instance, Joachim du Bellay used the theme of exile, suggested by his long sojourn in Italy, to create a marginal poetic *persona*, and to secure for himself a unique place in French literary circles, differentiating himself from other prominent figures that dominated the royal court. Du Bellay created "monumental poetry", in wich the terms of "écriture" and "architecture" evoke the symbolic image of ruins, and operate as central factors in the process of creation[2]. Other figures such as Etienne Jodelle or Jacques Grévin engaged through their poetry in an "anti-Roman" campaign, sometimes fostered by their religious and political beliefs[3]. In these cases, they used a satirical tone, and the experience of visiting Rome fell under the signs of disillusion and disappointment, as the ancient ruins represented the fall of the city, and its lost glory. In addition to literary accounts, the Reformation movement that spread through Europe at the time cast a new shadow of doubt over the reputation of the Eternal City questioning the Holy See's perceived abuse of power[4].

Of course, we cannot consider Montaigne's long and sinuous journey across Central Europe exclusively in the light of reaching a single destination, even in the case of Rome, the city with the highest popularity level at the time. We must also take into

[2] See Eric Macphail, *The Voyage to Rome in French Renaissance Literature* p. 48 - 49
[3] This is the case of Grévin who was a Protestant, and had to flee France because of his religious beliefs.
[4] Starting from 1562 France was ravaged by the wars of religion between Catholics and Protestants culminating with the Saint Bartholomew's Day Massacre on August 24th 1572.

account another central aspect, the "therapeutic" itinerary for a medical condition that troubled Montaigne throughout the adult part of his life, his kidney stone disease. A second reason for embarking in such a lengthy endeavor was finding a cure, or at least temporary treatments for his malady, which caused him countless crises of unbearable pain (as he constantly registers in his *Travel Journal* and in the *Essays*.) Montaigne and his entourage followed a rather tortuous, easily changeable itinerary with many unexpected detours and digressions, where the numerous thermal sites visited represent one of the few constant aspects of his journey. Montaigne found these aquatic treatments so useful that sometimes, like in the case of the "Bagni de la Villa" he chose to go back for a second sojourn[5]. There is yet another possible reason for his journey advanced by scholars who maintained that Montaigne might have been charged by a secret diplomatic mission. However, if we turn to the text of the *Essays*, it is Montaigne himself, who provides his readers with an explanation:

> Je respons ordinairement à ceux qui me demandent raison de mes voyages : que je sçay bien ce que je fuis, mais non pas ce que je cerche. Si on me dict que parmy les estrangers il y peut avoir aussi peu de santé, et que leurs meurs ne valent pas mieux que les nostres, je respons : premierement, qu'il est mal-aysé, *Tam multae scelerum facies !* [Virgil, Géorg., I, 506] secondement, que c'est tousjours gain de changer un mauvais estat à un estat incertain, et que les maux d'autruy ne nous doivent pas poindre comme les nostres[6]. (III.9.972b)
>
> I ordinarily replay to those who ask me the reason for my travels, that I know well what I am fleeting from, but not what I am looking for. If they tell me that among foreigners there may be just as little health, and that their ways are no better than ours, I reply, first that that is not easy,
>
> "So many are the shapes of crime"
>
> Virgil

[5] Located in the vicinity of Lucca in Tuscany, Italy.

[6] *Essais*, III. 9, p. 972 Unless otherwise noted, all references and citations are from Pierre Villey et V.-L Saulnier's edition of *Les Essais* (PUF/Quadrige, nouvelle édition 2004). The page number will be placed in the text in between round brackets, accompanied by the initials V-S.

> Second, that it is always a gain to change a bad state for an uncertain one, and that the troubles of others hould not sting us like our own[7]. (903b)

In Montaigne's terms, his main reason for traveling is to grant himself a "diversion" to avoid further exposure and participation in the precarious political scene dominated by the Religious Wars. For the most part, critics have considered his journey to Italy as a multifacious escape: from his private, domestic affairs, which were never understood as a pleasant task, and from the gradually deteriorating state of French political and religious affaires[8]. His natural curiosity enables Montaigne to find enjoyment in every new territory he visits, and the more variety he encounters the further away he chases the idea of his rapidly approaching death. By traveling, he finds himself in a state of continuous movement or "branle", which he sees as the perfect remedy against his anguish, and melancholy. As he confesses in his *Travel Journal*: "Je n'ai rien si ennemy à ma santé que l'ennuy et oisifveté; là j'avois tousjours quelque occupation, sinon si plaisante que j'eusse pu désirer, au moins suffisante à me desennuyer."[9] "There is nothing so hostile to my health as boredom and idleness; here I had always some occupation, if not pleasant as I could have desired, at least sufficient to overcome my boredom." (96)[10]

---

[7] The English version of all quotatins is from Donald Frame's edition of Montaigne's *Complete Works*, published by Alfred A. Knopf in *Everyman's Library* Collection, 2003 (text reprinted and published by arrangement with Stanford University Press).

[8] "Je me destourne volontiers du gouvernement de ma maison […] Je voudrois qu'au lieu de quelque autre piece de sa succession, mon pere m'eust resigné cette passionée amour qu'en ses vieux ans il portoit à son mesnage" *Essais*, III. 9, p. 948b, 952b, " I gladly turn aside from governing my house […]I wish that instead of some part of his estate, my father had handed down to me that passionate love that he had in his old age for his household." (878b, 883b) For more on this perspective, see Fausta Garavini's *Itinéraires à Montaigne*, p.99 Elisabeth Schneikert's *Montaigne dans le labyrinth*, p.20-23

[9] *Journal de Voyage*, p. 125. All references and citations from the *Journal de Voyage* are from François Rigolot's edition, *Journal de voyage de Michel de Montaigne*, Paris, PUF, 1992.

[10] All translations for text of the *Journal de Voyage* are from *Travel Journal* translated by Donald M. Frame, San Francisco, North Point Press, 1983

In her book, *Montaigne dans le labyrinthe,* Elisabeth Schneikert advances another hypothesis related to Montaigne's journey, looking at his trip from an initiatory point of view. She explores his possible motives to leave "la maison paternelle" from a psychological perspective, in which the son has a deep reaction of culpability vis-à-vis the memory of his father. The relationship between the father and the son is essentially contaminated by the connection with his inherited property. As the main successor of his father, Michel de Montaigne has to break away from the paternal tutelage and find a type of autonomy disconnected from his inheritance[11]. The project of a long trip at a moment in his life when he left behind the attachments of his public duties seems like an ideal opportunity. The voyage has no precise direction, as he admits it in the *Essays*. "Je ne l'entreprens ny pour en revenir, ny pour le parfaire; j'entreprens seulement de me branler, pendant que le branle me plaist.»[12] "I undertake it neither to return from it, nor to complete it; I undertake only to move about while I like moving" (908b). As for his final destination, which is Rome, the text of the *Travel Journal* presents two separate attitudes, both registered by his secretary. First, he remarks the minimal interest that Montaigne has in visiting the Eternal city. « Et quant à Rome où les autres visoient, il la desiroit d'autant moins voir que les autres lieux, qu'elle estoit connue d'un chacun » "And as for Rome, which was the goal of the others, he desired less to see it than the other places, since it was known to every man" (51); and some 30 pages later, when the traveling group arrives in the close vicinity of the city, he notes quite the opposite: « Nous en partismes lendemain trois heures avant le jour, tant il avoit envy de voir le pavé de Rome »[13]. "We

[11] Fausta Garavini and Giselle Mathieu-Castellani have also approached this perspective in their works. See *Monstri e chimere. Montaigne, il testo e il fantasma* and *Montaigne L'écriture de l'essai,* respectively.
[12] *Essais*, III. 9, p. 977b
[13] *Journal* p.61 and p. 90

left here the next day three hours before daylight, so eager was he to see the pavement of Rome" (71).

In one of her articles, "L'Ecriture de l'errance", Françoise Charpentier advances yet another hypothesis to Montaigne's voyage. She mentions an aspect little discussed of the journey that has to do with Montaigne's decision to return to France. As we know from the texts of his *Travel Journal*, and of the *Essays*, (as well as from other historical sources) Montaigne was appointed mayor of Bordeaux *in absentia*, and he was obligated to return home and take on his new charge. If it wasn't for this engagement, we don't know what would have been the date or the motivation for Montaigne to come back. What Charpentier underlines is the possibility that Montaigne left his estate without much consideration for his future return. " Montaigne est parti sans pensée de retour : non qu'il ait annoncé qu'il n'y aurait pas de retour, […] Mais il néglige toute disposition pour un avenir, il laisse en ombre toute hypothèse qui l'engagerait à un calendrier. […] Montaigne laisse en partant une œuvre achevée, [*Les Essais*] considérée comme définitive (aurait-il offert au roi un ouvrage qui n'eût pas été *perfectum* ?) »[14] Supporting this assumption is Montaigne's own perception of approaching the final passage, and the possibility of dying on the road. In addition to the precarious traveling conditions at the time, he is very much aware of the gravity of his medical condition as he confesses in the first edition of his *Essais* in 1580 before he left: "Je suis aus prises avec la pire de toutes les maladies, la plus soudaine, la plus douloureuse, la plus mortelle et la plus irremediable."[15] " I am at grips with the worst of all maladies, the most sudden, the most painful, the most mortal and the most irremediable." (689a)

[14]« L'Ecriture de l'errance », p. 243
[15] *Essais,* II. 37 p. 760a

Let us return now to the subject of the *Travel Journal*, which I briefly mentioned above. This fascinating text that documents Montagne's trip to Rome (22 juin1580 - 30 novembre1581) was discovered almost 200 years after this journey, in 1770. During this trip Montaigne ceases to write his essays, but he does not give up entirely the project of writing. He continues to register the development of his journey in his *Journal*. This text does not possess the same literary and philosophical development as his *Essays,* but it presents Montaigne in the light of an avid traveler. The details regarding its composition, its purpose or its history are still not fully determined. The text as we have it today is devided in four distinct parts: I- the first part is the longest, and it is written by an anonymous secretary (approximatey 45%), II – the second part is written by Montaigne in French, III – a third part also written by Montaigne, but this time in Italian (which makes up approximately 29% and which marks his stay in Italy and his desire to assimilate the Italian ways and culture in every possible manner, including their language), IV – and a fourth part in which Montaigne returns to writing in French and registers the final part of his return to France.[16] Upon his arrival in Rome (mercredi 30 novembre 1580), Montaigne dismisses his assistant, and decides to continue the project by himself.

> Ayant donné congé à celuy de mes gens qui conduisoit cette belle besoigne, et la voyant si avancée, quelque incommodité que ce me soit, il faut que je la continue de moy mesme.[17]
>
> Having dismissed the one of my men who was doing this fine job, and seeing it so far advanced, whatever trouble it may be to me, I must continue it myself. (83)

[16] *Journal*, Introduction, p. XII
[17] *Journal*, p.109

Montaigne continues recording his journey, and, three months into the project, he decides to carry on the redaction in Italian, as a sign of his immersion in the culture of the country he visits:

> Assaggiamo di parlar un poco questa altra lingua massime essendo in queste contrade dove mi pare sentire il più perfetto favellare della Toscana, particolarmente tra li paesani che non l'hanno mescolato et alterato con li vicini.[18]
>
> Let us try to speak this other language a little, especially since I am in this region where I seem to hear the most perfect Tuscan speech, particularly among those natives who have not corrupted and altered it with that of their neighbors. (126)

Montaigne's decision to write in Italian is, as he declares it in this opening passage, an attempt at this beutiful language, another variety of "essai" as François Rigolot remarks in his introduction to the *Journal de Voyage*.

> D'entrée de jeu l'accent s'est mis sur l'aspect approximatif de la démarche. On tente un essai (assaggiamo) de peu de durée (un poco) en recourant au langage parle (parlar). Voilà un incipit qui connote les insuffisances heureuses et éphémères de la spontanéité. On pense à la page des *Essais* où Montaigne définit son langage idéal: "Le parler que j'ayme, c'est un parler simple et naïf, tel sur le papier qu'à la bouche" (I, 26, 171a).[19]

The text of the *Journal* was never published during his lifetime, and the common understanding and response from critics is that Montaigne never intended to put it in print. However, it was found accidentally almost two hundred years later in 1770 by a local historian, Joseph Prunis while he was putting together a history of Perigord,

[18] *Journal*, p. 167, with a 1774 translation by Meunier de Querlon: « Essayons de parler un peu cette autre langue, me trouvant sur-tout dans cette contrée où il me paroit qu'on parle le langage le plus pur de la Toscane, particulierement parmi ceux du païs qui ne l'ont point corrompue par le mélange des patois voisins. » (p.235)
[19] *Journal*, Introduction, p. XXIV

together with his collaborator Guillaume-Vivien Leydet.[20] The first pages of the manuscript were missing. Due to the lengthy, unconventional passages regarding the strictly physical aspects of Montaigne's ailments, and treatments, the text was not well received by the standards of the 18th century sense of decorum,[21] and its publication was delayed until 1774. Unfortunately, the manuscript was lost, and we are left with the copies made after the original, the most significant ones by Prunis and Querlon[22].

Just as it happens in the *Essays*, Montaigne is the substance of his text. He is not only the subject but also a driving force that dominates and animates both the acts of traveling and writing. The fact that the *Journal* was partially written by a secretary can provide valuable insight about Montaigne, the person in his unique quality of tourist,[23] his habits and conduct reported in the third person, in contrast with the first-person essays that became so familiar to us. However, the aspect in which I am particularly interested is the role that this text plays in the later project of continuing writing the *Essays*. It is evident that certain events and places that Montaigne witnessed and visited in his journey became part of the material that makes up the later editions of his book. In rewriting his experience, the author lingers more on some segments of his trip more than on others, and discusses his experiences in a multitude of occurrences. However, few critics have considered the impact that Montaigne's journey to Rome had on the project of continuing

[20] A very detailed history of the manuscript's discovery, and its history is available in Concetta Cavallini's analysis of the text. See *"Cette belle besogne". Etude sur le* Journal de voyage *de Montaigne,* p.19-31
[21] The text contained too many intimate details regarding bodily functions, which were considered inappropriate for the publication.
[22] Meusnier de Querlon was the first editor of the *Journal de voyage,* which appeared in the spring of 1774.
[23] In this particular area, scholars are still debating, without being able to determine precisely the implication, and direct contribution of the secretary. The issue becomes even more unclear because Montaigne himself went back over the text written by his assistant, and made comments, or added passages in the margins. The use of the first person is thus ambiguous at times, and can refer back to the secretary, or to Montaigne.

the *Essays*. In order for me to follow and analyze the thoughts and considerations originating from the *Journal*, and transposed and reworked in the textual web of the *Essays*, I will pay close attention to the way in which Montaigne develops his chapters. I will follow the gradual transformation of the text as we can trace it from the original publication of the book in 1580 in Bordeaux, through its successive editions of 1582, 1587, 1588, and concluding with the later form of the text as it appears in the posthumous editions. This task is infinitely easier for contemporary readers and scholars due to what we call today the A B C layers of textual demarcation[24]. Almost all modern editions of the *Essays* are annotated with the letters A, B and C, which present the three main layers of the text progression in the forms of chronological editions. Layer A designates the text of the 1580 published in Bordeaux with the marked additions from its second Bordeaux publication in 1582 (and with the few corrections of the 1587 edition published in Paris, which is almost identical to the 1582 edition); B designates the text published in the1588 Paris edition[25]; and C the text subsequent to 1588 published in various posthumous editions[26].

When talking about any book, and Montaigne's *Essays* is a particularly great example, both content and form contribute to the final product which is the literary text.

---

[24]This process was initiated by Pierre Villey as a textual tool in order to better organize and structure the text of the *Essays*, and give an immediate visual understanding of the three main editions.

[25] Montaigne enriches considerably the text for this edition, adding an entire new book to the original compilation, and he publishes his book in Paris at Abel Langelier.

[26] There are several editions of the *Essays* published following the death of its author in 1592. The most well-known and commonly used today is the so called "exemplaire de Bordeaux" which is Montaigne's personal copy of the 1588 edition of his book, which he corrected by hand, and on which he added also by hand several passages, modifying considerably the existing text. However, in 2007 a new edition of the *Essays* was published in the Pléiade collection, and it follows a different version of the text, namely the 1595 edition (the first posthumous one), in care of and published by Marie de Gournay (1565 – 1645), Montaigne's "fille d'alliance". This version is considered by the editors Jean Balsamo, Michel Magnien and Catherine Magnien-Simonin as the final and most complete version of the text.

As we can see from the formal evolution[27] of the *Essays,* to the continuously changing substance and dialectic of the book corresponds a continuously changing shape of the text. « Je ne puis asseurer mon object. Il va trouble et chancelant, d'une yvresse naturelle. Je le prens en ce point, comme il est, en l'instant que je m'amuse à luy. Je ne peints pas l'estre. Je peints le passage."[28] "I cannot keep my subject still. It goes along befuddled and staggering, with a natural drunkness. I take it in this condition, just as it is at the moment I give my attention to it. I do not portray being: I portray passing." (741b) Montaigne reworks and adds to his chapters by a means of a personal method he named *allogeail* which consists in manually adding on and correcting a copy of the published text. This personalized process that became synonymous with the text of the *Essays* begins immediately after he returnes from his voyage. Montaigne corrects and augments the original text of the1580 edition, and publishes the new text in1582. This movement is of crucial importance for my argument. For it is in this 1582 edition that Montaigne makes the first textual changes to the original format of the book, and this happens immediately after his return from Italy. This intermediary form of the text that was published so close to his arrival from Rome exhibits the very beginning of a process that was to define the brilliance of Montaigne's writing. His traveling experience may have been the main factor that prompted him to make the decision to develop and reprint his work, a decision that will forever change the project of writing his essays. If this is the case, the additions and changes made in this second edition in 1582 should reflect this

[27]The process of reviewing, rewriting, and republishing the text is a transformation that I call evolution, and which is not by any means a way for Montaigne to produce more text. It is rather a process of revision that changes and reevaluates the substance of the text, constantly questioning the validity or rather the consistency of his judgment.

[28] *Essais*, III.2, p. 805b

intention. I will argue that the nature of these revisions and their placement in the text reveal more than just basic textual corrections, or insignificant developments of the existing text, thus prompting us to reconsider the importance of the 1582 edition and its main purpose.

Few critics have paid close attention to the 1582 edition, which for most purposes and most readers simply remains a variant of the 1580 edition[29]. In the modern editions, there is no letter designation corresponding to the 1582 form of the text, and most of the changes made by the author for this edition are only indicated in footnotes[30]. In 1969 Marcel Françon recognizing the importance of the 1582 edition of the *Essays* prepared and republished this intermediary text.[31] He saw this edition primarily as a reaction to Montaigne's travel experience, namely to his encounters in Rome where he met Pope Gregory XIII and where the 1580 edition he had brought with him was submitted to the Roman censors. Following this argument, Françon concluded that this republication testified to Montaigne's personal reevaluation and reaffirmation of his Catholic faith.

> …ce sont les passages que Montaigne a publiés pour la première fois à son retour d'Italie et dans lesquels il précise son attitude à l'égard du Catholicisme : il se soumet à l'enseignement de l'Eglise pour ce qui se rapporte aux questions de foi, aux dogmes ; il garde sa liberté en tant qu'homme de lettres, quand il prétend n'exprimer que des opinions qui peuvent être débattues. C'est, là, l'expression de son conformisme religieux et la confirmation de son attachement aux préceptes de la religion. Montaigne en

[29] In 1870 Reinhold Dezeimeris and H. Barckhausen recorded all the variants of 1580, 1582, and 1587 editions in their critical edition of *Essais de Michel de Montaigne. Texte original de 1580 avec les variantes des éditions de 1582 et 1587*. More recently Marcel Francon and Philippe Desan both reprinted the original version of the 1582 in photographical reproduction in 1969 and 2005 respectively, and the introductions they provide to their editions are valuable for my study. Concetta Cavallini has also published significant works in conjunction with Montaigne's travel experience revealing extensive research on the 1582 edition.

[30] I am referring to the widely circulated edition by Pierre Villey which I am also using as my main text.

[31] *Essais. Reproduction photographique de la deuxième édition (Bordeaux 1582) avec une introduction par Marcel Françon*. Harvard University, Cambridge Massachusetts, 1969.

> revenant de Rome et de Lorette, sent la nécessité de préciser sa pensée et d'éviter les malentendus. [32]

Thus in Françon's opinion the 1582 edition is a way for Montaigne to restate his allegiance to the Catholic Church.

In 2005 Philippe Desan revisited and continued Françon undertaking. He published a second photographical reproduction of the 1582 edition of the *Essays,* hoping to revive the interest in this intermediary form of the text this time from a historical and political perspective[33]. Desan sees a political connotation in Montaigne's decision to republish his book in 1582, and finds very little literary consequence in it, if any. The main reason for this conclusion on his part is the timing of this second edition. Montaigne was elected mayor of Bordeaux *in absentia* while he was in Italy, and he was given the order to return immediately and take charge of his new post[34]. Interestingly enough, after his return and even before starting out on his new mandate as mayor, he published this second edition of his *Essays*. Desan insists that this second edition is just a temporary phase of the text in which we see witness for the first time the "rewriting technique" which was to become Montaigne's literary signature.

> Nous insistons cependant sur le fait que cette pratique de la réécriture à laquelle nous sommes habitués quand nous parlons de Montaigne débute de façon assez conjoncturelle et non préméditée. Mais ne nous trompons pas, l'édition des *Essais* de 1582 nous parait essentielle précisément parce qu'elle marque une étape importante – politique plutôt que textuelle – dans ce que deviendra au fils des ans une véritable politique éditoriale des *Essais*.[35]

---

[32] *Essais. Reproduction photographique,* (1969) p. 16.
[33] *Essais (1582)* Texte présenté par Phillipe Desan; Paris, Société des Textes Français Modernes, 2005.
[34] He was elected mayor of Bordeaux on August 1st 1581, and he notes in his JV that he received confirmation of the news through a letter on September 7th when he was on his way to Rome. : "Dans la meme matinée [7 septembre], on m'apporta, par la voie de Rome, des lettres de M. Tausin, écrites de Bordeaux le 2 Août, par lesquelles il m'apprenoit que, le jour précédent j'avois été élu d'un consentement unanime Maire de Bordeaux, et m'invitoit à accepter cet emploi pour l'amour de ma Patrie." p. 275-6.
[35] *Essais (1582),* p. XXVI.

Desan also regards the title page of this second edition, where Montaigne proudly adds his new rank as mayor of Bordeaux to the other titles of nobility he inherited from his father as one more proof that reediting the book is an indication of political power, and a way to place the newly appointed mayor on the social scene of the period.

> L'avantage d'une nouvelle édition des *Essais* est également d'annuler l'édition précédente puisque Montaigne conserve le même titre pour son ouvrage. C'est bien là le même livre amendé. Cet amendement possède une fonction politique considérable car Montaigne ne pourra désormais plus être attaqué sur le texte de 1580. Les mises au point rapides de l'édition de 1582 doivent donc forcément être interprétées comme le résultat de son élection à la mairie de Bordeaux.[36]

The insights provided by Francon and Desan in their introductions represent a valuable starting point for my project. I find both views and supporting arguments valid, and indispensable in formulating a new approach. So, without contradicting either of these two critics, I would like to propose that the 1582 edition is more than the result of a convenient occurrence, as Desan sees it, or a reaffirmation of Montaigne's loyalty to the Catholic Church, as Françon puts it. To their theses, I am adding the claim that another important factor should be considered, that constitutes the main focus of this project, namely that his traveling experience enables and prompts him to take the crucial decision to develop and reprint his work, a decision that will forever change the nature and signification of his book. Therefore, the additions and changes made in this second edition are more than basic rectifications required by the Roman censors, or strategically placed elements of political propaganda. As I will elaborate in the following pages, the

[36] *Essais (1582),* p. XXXV

additions made to the 1582 edition take the form of significant textual developments triggered by personal experience, and specific reactions to the existing text, which more importantly, act as catalytic elements in the textual evolution of the subsequent editions of 1588 and 1595.

The 1582 edition is indeed an elaborate response to the Roman censors (as Françon puts it, and as we will see in Part I on this study), but this response represents the beginning of an ongoing conversation. It is as if Montaigne entered a conversation, which stimulates and enhances his own arguments. As he said several times in the *Essays*, the best converations, and most efficient are between participants with opposing, or at least different viws: "Les contradictions donc des jugemens ne m'offencent ny m'alterent; elles m'esveillent seulement et m'exercent. […] Quand on me contrarie, on esveille mon attention, non pas ma cholere; je m'avance vers celuy qui me contredit, qui m'instruit. »[37] "So contradictions of opinions neither offend nor affect me; they merely arouse and exercise me. […] When someone opposes me, he arouses my attention, not my anger. I go to meet a man who contradicts me, who instructs me." (856) This is why the first textual changes that I will consider in my analysis of the 1582 edition are the additions and transformations that were triggered by Montaigne's interaction with the Roman Inquisition officers, and I will follow their development in the following editions of the *Essays*.

Secondly, I will take a closer look at the 1582 edition as a response to the cultural environment provided by the trip to Europe, and to Montaigne's personal encounters while traveling. I will analyse the quotations that he inserted in this new edition, eight in Italian and eight in Latin (according to the previous studies by Dezeimeris and

[37] *Essais*, V-S, III. 8, p. 924b

Barckhausen, and Françon), paying particular attention to the literary relationship between Montaigne and Torquato Tasso, the Italian poet whose work provides four of the eight Italian quotations added to this 1582 edition. And I will complete my study, with an analysis of how Montaigne's personal traveling experience documented in the *Journal* resurfaces in the 1582 edition of the *Essays* via narrated anecdotes or personal observations and comments. I will conclude this study with a reevaluation of the role that the 1582 edition played in the successive transformation of the text and in the overall creative process of Montaigne's essays.

PART I

Montaigne and the Roman Censors

In this chapter I would like to explore Montaigne's experience with the Roman Censors. Until recently, scholars who researched and wrote on this topic founded their work exclusively on the information that Montaigne himself left in his *Journal de Voyage*.[38] There are two main entries in the text that pertain to the author's encounter with the Roman officials in which Montaigne mentions six main arguments that were brought to his attention and needed to be reviewed upon his return to France.[39] However,

[38] All references and citations from the *Journal de Voyage* are from François Rigolot's edition, *Journal de voyage de Michel de Montaigne*, Paris, PUF, 1992. I will pace all the page number in the text between round brackets using the abreviation *JV*.

[39] See also the studies by Malcolm Smith, *Montaigne and the Roman Censors, Montaigne and Religious Freedom*, E. Balmas *Montaigne et l'inquisition*, M. Tetel and G. Mallary (ed.) in *Le Parcours des "Essais" de Montaigne 1588-1988;* Charles Dédéyan *Essai sur le" Journal de Voyage" de Montaigne*, and most

in 1998 a new document regarding Montaigne's encounter with the Roman censors surfaced: "The Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith", a subdivision of the Vatican Archives opened the doors to its library to the public for the first time since its creation in 1542, and the original document regarding the censorship of the *Essays* in 1581was found in its archives. This branch of the Vatican Library housed the archives of three different offices: "The Congregation of the Holy Office" (CHO), "The Congregation of the Index of Prohibited Books" (CIP) and the "Inquisitorial Tribunal of Siena" (ITS), which was relocated there. The first two congregations (CHO and CIP) sprung from the original centralized office of "La Congregazione per la Dottrina della Fede" – "The Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith" which represented the Roman Inquisition. The document pertaining to Montaigne's *Essays* was recovered from the archives of the "Congregation of the Index", and in 2000 this document was published for the first time among other similar documents in Peter Godman's book, *The Saint as Censor: Robert Bellarmine between Inquisition and Index*.[40] Thus, we learn that the censorship of the *Essays* was part of the anti-heretic campaign initiated primarily by the Congregation of the Index, under the higher authority of the Roman Inquisition.[41] Since this outstanding discovery the newly found record was mentioned in only a few articles: Philippe Desan's study "Apologie de Sebond ou justification de Montaigne"; Alain Legros, "Montaigne face à ses censeurs romains de 1581 (mise à jour)"; Emily Butterworth's article "Censors and Censure: Robert Estienne and Michel de Montaigne". [42] In the following pages I will

---

recently Alain Legros « Montaigne face à ses censeurs romains de 1581 » in *Biblothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* LXXI

[40] Peter Godman, *The Saint as Censor. Robert Bellarmine between Inquisition and Index*, Leyde, Brill, 2000

[41] *The Saint as Censor*, p. 45

[42] Philippe Desan, «Apologie de Sebond ou justification de Montaigne?», «*Dieu à nostre commerce et societé»: Montaigne et la théologie*, Philippe Desan ed., Geneva, Droz, 2008, pp. 175-200 ; *Reading and*

discuss the events and ramifications of this encounter between Montaigne and the Roman *consultores*[43] in the light of both existent sources, The Vatican document and the personal entries from the *Journal de Voyage*. More importantly, I will link the new findings to (1) the 1582 edition of the *Essais*, published immediately upon Montaigne's return to France, and to (2) later developments of the text published in the successive editions of 1588 and 1595.

Let me begin with a review of the religious office of the Roman Inquisition, its beginnings and legacies. Given the unfavorable reputation of the Spanish Inquisition, the image of its Italian counterpart may be judged too hastily. However one should make a clear distinction between the two establishments. In the very opening chapter of his book, *The Italian Inquisition*, Christopher Black clarifies the difference between the two: "The new Italian institution was affected by the pre-existing Spanish Inquisition, which partly stimulated the creation of the Roman one. The adverse reputation of the Spanish Inquisition had, and has, influenced views on the Italian Inquisition, even though there were significant differences between their operations, targets and casualties."[44] The institution of the Italian Inquisition was established in 1542, (64 years after the founding of the Spanish tribunal of the Spanish Inquisition) by Pope Paul III (Alessandro Farnese) as a response to the growing Protestant movements in Italy, and the dissemination of Lutheran and Calvinist approaches among the highest Roman clerical authorities. One of

---

censorship in Early Modern Europe : Barcelona, 11-13 de diciembre de 2007 / María José Vega, Julian Weiss & Cesc Esteve, Barcelona : Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 2010, pp. 161-179 ; Alain Legros, « Montaigne face à ses censeurs romains de 1581 (mise à jour) », *BHR*, LXXI, 2009/1, p. 7-33. All three authors approached the newly found document from a theologically complex perspective, paying little or no attention to the literary aspect that these observations entailed in the development of the text.

[43] This is the term used for the censorial agents appointed to read and evaluate the texts. They were "experts in theology or civil and canon law", as Godman clarifies in his book *The Saint as Censor. Robert Bellarmine between Inquisition and Index* p.9.

[44] *The Italian Inquisition*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 2009, p. 1.

the best-known preachers of his time, Bernardino Ochino was a Capuchin General who in 1542 fled Rome and went to Switzerland where the Protestant movement flourished.[45] The activity of the Italian Inquisition was mostly related to cases of heresy in which the accused was brought in front of a tribunal of inquisitors (the word derives from the Latin *inquisitio* meaning "enquiry" referring to the legal proceedings of the magistrates requesting information from witnesses) and where he or she was investigated. As Black explains, this investigation "might or might not lead to a formal trial, which would feature an encounter between a combative accuser and the defendant before a magistrate or sometimes a jury."[46]

Montaigne's interaction with the Roman Inquisition was of a different nature. In his case we must consider the circumstances of book censorship required by the (Catholic) Church in agreement with the existing Index and the Catholic dogmas. Soon after the printing press became a great success and printing shops opened their doors in increasing numbers to texts of all kinds, the Roman authorities (just as their French, German and Spanish counterparts) realized that printed books could be very dangerous. Starting at the end of the fifteenth century, throughout Europe, local governments and religious commissions, universities and other clerical offices regulated the participation and the dissemination of the Catholic faith through books. These groups compiled different lists of texts considered forbidden, and which were distributed to the printing shops in their respective areas.[47] In Rome, before 1542, the person entrusted with the task of examining and coordinating the censorship process was *Il Maestro del Sacro Palazzo*

[45] *The Italian Inquisition*, p.13
[46] *The Italian Inquisition*, p. 2
[47] Indexes of forbidden books were produced among other places in Milan by the Senate, in Paris by the Sorbonne theological faculty, in Spain by the Inquisition, in Venice by the nuncio.

the Master of the Sacred Palace.[48] In the second part of the sixteen century, the Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith, otherwise known as the Roman Inquisition – was established as a centralized institution that was slowly to take over the responsibility of producing lists of prohibited books and monitor the publishing and distribution of future works[49]. However, the local institutions' involvement in the process of regulating printed materials survived, and the responsibility was shared among them and the new central office, the Congregation of the Holy Office (a newly established branch of the original Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith). During the papacy of Paul IV, the Congregation promulgated the first official Index of Prohibited Books in 1559. After Pope Paul IV's death, Pius IV as newly elected Pope reconvened the bishops in the Council of Trent (suspended by his predecessor Pope Paul IV) and asked them to rectify and improve the existing Index, much protested by the bishops and regarded as a too severe. As a result, in 1562 Pius IV demanded the bishops to work together with the existent inquisitors and to compile what became known as the *Tridentine Index*. Ten years later, in 1572, Pope Gregory XIII changed the Index protocol one more time. He appointed a newly formed

[48] This position had gained in authority since the thirteen century when it acted as a regent-master at the Studium Romanae Curia, to mid fifteenth century when it became actively involved in fighting the heresy. In 1456 its official responsibilities included exercising censure in the sermons to be preached in the papal chapel. In 1487 Pope Innocent VIII appointed the Master of the Sacred Palace to observe and guide the printing process in Rome, and in 1515 Pope Leo X officially appointed the Master as the official book censor; mentioned by Montaigne in his *JV*, p. 119.

[49] Authors such as Juan Antonio Llorente, (*Histoire critique de l'Inquisition d'Espagne depuis l'époque de son établissement par Ferdinand V jusqu'au règne de Ferdinand VII*, Paris, Treuttel et Würtz, 1817), or Henry Charles Lea, (*A History of the Inquisition of Spain*, New York, American Scholar Publications [1906-1907] 1966, 4 vols.) have opened and dominated the field of research regarding the history and proceedings of European Inquisitions. Starting with the 1970 there was a revival in this field. Among the historians and authors who have shed light further on the matter are: Peter Godman, *The Saint as Censor. Robert Bellarmine between Inquisition and Index*, Leyde, Brill, 2000; John Tedeschi, *The Prosecution of Heresy. Collected Studies on the Inquisition in Early Modern Italy*, New York, Binghamton, 1991; Bartolome Bennassar, *L'Inquisition espagnole, XVe-XIXe siècle*, Paris, Hachette, 1979; Andrea del Col et Giovana Paolin (dir.), *L'Inquisizione romana: metodologia delle fonti e storia istituzionale*, Trieste, University of Trieste, 2000; Francisco Bethencourt, *L'Inquisition à l'époque moderne. Espagne, Portugal, Italie. XVe-XIXe siècle*, Paris, Fayard, 1995, Bruno Neveau *L'Erreur et son juge. Remarques sur les censures doctrinales à l'epoque moderne,* Naples: Bibliopolis, 1993

commission under the name of The Congregation of the Index of Prohibited Books (CIP), as a subsection of the Congregation of the Holy Office (CHO), which was to fully take charge of regulating the material circulated through printed books. The Master of the Sacred Palace maintained its position as an overall coordinator of the censorship process, being *ex officio* member of both Congregations and linking together the two bodies. He was mostly entrusted with the expurgation of newly published books that contained knowingly or inadvertently heretic allusions or ideas.[50]

The actual process to which books were submitted varied greatly from one commission to the other throughout the fifteenth century. Peter Godman suggested that the ecclesiastical authorities of the Index formed in 1571 under Pope Gregory XIII displayed numerous judgmental errors, a lack of understanding of the process, and a tendency not to resolve any matter, continuing to compile and recompile their lists. "Consistent only in its indecisiveness and prevarication, The Congregation for the Index, incapable of mastering the problems of the past, inclined to arbitrariness in the present. A single report, by an individual *consultore*, could lead to the irrevocable condemnation of a book, and when one examines the criteria which such censors applied to the works that they examined, haste and superficiality are evident."[51] Whether it was efficient or incompetent, this was the overall structure of the Holy Office when Montaigne traveled to Rome and visited Pope Gregory XIII with the intention of offering him a copy of his newly published *Essais*, just as in Paris, a few months earlier, he had offered a copy of his book to the King Henri III.

[50] *The Roman Inquisition*, p. 158-170
[51] *The Saint as Censor,* p.40

Before proceeding withfurther analysis I need to clarify the records and connotations of the act of censorship and define this process within its historical development. During the sixteen century, the French term "censure", derived from the Latin verb *censeo,* had different connotations resonating with the literary and historical classical heritage of the period. Perhaps the best way to understand this perspective is to turn to Robert Estienne's 1531 Latin-French dictionary.[52] As Emma Herdman has noted in her article there are "two twin" definitions that spring from the Latin term: one refers to the act of judging (in the sense of considering and evaluating, or forming an opinion, or even advising) and the other refers to the act of suppressing (by repressing and restraining).[53] In his dictionary Robert Estienne gives a multitude of literary examples, from which one easily notices that the term "censere" had not yet acquired a negative connotation:

> …Censere, Iuger ou estimer en soymesme. Plaut. In Amphit. 4.125, Neque ego hac nocte longiorem me vid se censeo, nisi item unam verberatus quam pendi perpetem, Je ne pense point avoir veu une nuyt plus longue. Ibidem, 8.60, Quid enim censes, te ut deludam contra lusorem meum, qui nunc primum te advenisse dicas modo qui hinc abieris ? Qu'est ce que tu penses ? estimes tu que je et c. Ibidem , 3.134, At illa illum censet virum suum esse quae cum moecho est, Elle estime que c'est son mari. [54]

Estienne's translation conveys the action of censuring primarily as a subjective act closely related to the views and perceptions of an individual. Furthermore, in the last instance cited above, Estienne's example of "censere" indicates an opinion that is false: "At illa illum censet virum suum esse quae cum moecho est" – She thinks it is her

[52] Robert Estienne, *Dictionarium, seu Latinae linguae thesaurus*, 2 vols. Paris, Robert Estienne 1531
[53] Emma Herdman "Censured and Censored: Reactions that Help Define Obscenity", *Obscénités renaissantes,* Hugh Roberts, Guillaume Peureux, Lise Wajeman eds., Geneva, Droz 2011
[54] Robert Estienne, *Dictionarium*, I, fol. 95 verso.

husband, but she is with an adulterer (my translation). This example best illustrates the neutrality of the term at the time, and its lack of a negative undertone related to the Catholic institution of the Inquisition. A few lines down the page, in the same 1539 edition of Estienne's dictionary, we find a succinct entry for the word *censura,* which pertains to the act of correcting:

> Censura censurae,f.g. L'office de regarder aux meurs du peuple
> Censura, correction, loy, regle de viure. Plin.in Paneg.73, Nam vita principis censura est, eaque perpetua.ad hanc dirigimur, ad hanc conuertimur.[55]

In conclusion, during the first decades of the sixteenth century, at least in France, the terms "censure" and "censurer" derived from the original Latin stem "censeo" related to the act of reviewing and correcting the text.[56] This observation is particularly revealing in Montaigne's exchange with the Roman officials since, as I am about to develop in this chapter and the next, the censorship commission acted more as an insightful reader than a rigid authoritarian establishment looking to "censor" the text in the modern sense of the term.

There are two paragraphs in Montaigne's *Journal* that describe the episode regarding the Roman censorship of the *Essays*. The first one shortly presents a preliminary meeting with the censors on Monday March 20th 1581 (*Journal* p. 119), and the second pertains to a subsequent meeting with the officials which was more of a farewell nature to reinforce the cordial relations between the two parties – Saturday, April 15th 1581 (JV p. 131). Both episodes are narrated in the *Journal* by Montaigne himself after having fired his secretary who was originally hired to register the progress and

[55] Estienne, p. 96 recto
[56] Herdman, p.372

experiences of the long journey. This fortuitous, apparently negligible detail reflects in actuality an important piece in our analysis. There is no third party, no intermediary to alter or misinterpret Montaigne's experience with the 'consultores', and the recounted episode is a most accurate version of Montaigne's perspective. Since the *Journal* was not intended for publication there are no indications that Montaigne would alter or adjust the story for other religious or official purposes.

The gracious relationship between Montaigne and the Roman censors, particularly between the author and the *Maestro del Sacro Palazzo*, Sisto Fabri (1541-1594) is evident from the first paragraph that introduces the episode of the censorship in the *Journal*. From the same first entry, we can also deduce the way in which the process of censorship took place.

> Ce jour [lundi 20 mars 1581] au soir me furent rendus mes *Essais* chastiés selon l'opinion des docteurs moines. Le *Maestro del Sacro Palazzo* n'en avoit peu juger que par le rapport d'aucun Frater François, n'entendant nullement nostre langue ; et se contentoit tant des excuses que je faisois sur chaque article d'animadversion que luy avoit laissé ce François, qu'il remit à ma conscience de rhabiller ce que je verrois estre de mauvais goust.(*JV*, 119)
>
> On this day in the evening my essays were returned to me, corrected according to the opinion of the learned monks. The Master of the Sacred Palace had been able to judge them only by the report of some French friar, since he did not understand our language at all; and he was so content with the excuses I offered on each objection that this Frenchman had left him that he referred to my conscience to redress what I should see was in bed taste. (91)

Since Fabri, the main censor could not read French, he used the services of a French friar who read and evaluated the text of the book, making personal observations regarding certain points that seemed inappropriate. However the reaction of the Maestro,

was rather indulgent, and he was more inclined to offer the author the freedom to revise his text as he saw fit. “Ledit *Maestro* qui est un habile homme, m’excusoit fort et me vouloit faire sentir qu’il n’estoit pas fort de l’advis de cette reformation, et plaidoit fort ingenieusement pour moy en ma presence contre un autre qui me combattoit, Italien aussi. » (*JV*, 91) “The said Master, who is an able man, was full of excuses for me, and wanted me to realize that he was not very sympathetic to these revisions; and he pleaded very ingeniously for me, in my presence, against another man, also Italian, who was opposing me.” (92) This last sentence alludes to a third person involved in the process, the official accuser. The customs governing the process of censorship of foreign books in Rome included this third party (in some cases the translator was not needed and thus what we are referring now to the "third party" was actually the only accuser) the so called “devil’s advocate” who had the role to defend the accusations made by the French friar. This third person is mentioned in the *Journal* as the “compaignon” of the Maestro (131) and Montaigne mentions that he was Italian also, and that eventually he dropped the charges. In his work *Montaigne and the Roman Censors*, Malcolm Smith identifies this third character as Giovanni Battista Lanci (or Lancius): “This office of the socius to the Master of the sacred palace was held at the time by one Joannes Baptista Lancius, a Dominican theologian who, in November 1580 had also been made secretary of the Congregation of the Index, the committee which compiled the papal list of forbidden books.”[57]

In the same paragraph that introduces the meeting with the Roman censors, Montaigne mentions a few of the criticized passages of his text:

[57] *Montaigne and the Roman Censors*, Librairie Droz, Geneve, 1981

> Je le suppliay, au rebours, qu'il suivist l'opinion de celuy qui l'avoit jugé, avouant en aucunes choses, comme d'avoir usé du mot *Fortune*, d'avoir nommé des poëtes heretiques, d'avoir excusé Julien, et l'animadiversion sur ce que celuy qui prioit devoit estre extempt de vicieuse inclination pour ce temps ; *item*, d'estimer cruauté ce qui est au-delà de mort simple ; *item*, qu'il falloit nourrir un enfant à tout faire, et autres telles choses ; que c'estoit mon opinion, et que c'estoient choses que j'avoy mises, n'estimant que ce fussent erreurs ; (*JV*, 119)
>
> I begged him on the contrary to follow the opinion of the man who had made the judgment, admitting in certain things – such as ahaving used the word "fortune", having named heretic poets, having excused Julian, and the objection to the idea that anyone who was praying should be free from evil impulses at the time; *item*, esteeming as cruelty whatever goes beyond plain death; *item*, that a child should be brought up to do anything; and other things of that sort – that was my opinion, and that they were things I had put in, not thinking they were errors. (91)

It is not entirely clear for us how and why Montaigne chose these six observations, and until 2000, when Godman published for the first time the original document preserved in the Archives of the Vatican, we did not even suspect there were more than six censorial remarks.[58] However we know now that the Roman *consultores* compiled a much longer list of objectionable items (38 in total, between the two officials, the French friar and Lancius), which Montaigne had the chance of defending during his first visit. Perhaps he only remembered six main points by the time he entered them in his *Journal*, points that he perceived as most pertinent and/or memorable.[59] Whichever the

[58] See Apendix A *infra*

[59] On Montaigne's poor memory see his own accounts in II.17 "Il m'est advenu plus d'une fois d'oublier le mot du guet que j'avois trois heures auparavant donné ou receu d'un autre, et d'oublier où j'avoi caché ma bourse, quoy qu'en die Cicero. Je m'aide à perdre ce que je serre particulierement. C'est le receptacle et l'estuy de la science que la memoire: l'ayant si deffaillante, je n'ay pas fort à me plaindre, si je ne sçay guiere. " (651)

reasons might be, Montaigne's journal indicates thus six main observations pertaining to the text of the *Essays,* reported in the following order:

Objection 1: The use of the word "Fortune", which was not acceptable due to its pagan connotation. The correct and accepted Christian term was "Providence".

Objection 2: Naming heretic authors – more precisely the French poets Théodore de Bèze (1519 – 1605) and Clemet Marot (1496 – 1544) and the Scottish writer and historian (and former teacher of Montaigne) George Buchanan (1506 – 1582)

Objection 3: Praise of the Roman Emperor Julian (331- 363), also known as Julian the Apostate (the transgressor) name given to him by the church due to his denunciation of Christian religion in favor of Neoplatonic paganism. A member of the Constantinian dynasty, he attempted to save the Roman Empire from its dissolution, by bringing it back to its original values, and by the reviving traditional religious practices at the cost of Christianity.

Objection 4: Criticism of the act of praying, as Montaigne discussed it in the explicitly entitled essay II.56 – Des Prières – Of Prayers. In Montaigne's view a certain purity of spirit is required during the act of praying, therefore one should abstain from saying prayers while in sinful circumstances.

Objection 5: Criticism of torture, particularly the acts of extreme cruelty applied to prisoners before being executed, such as dismemberment, and other types of mutilation to which the accused was submitted prior to the actual execution of the capital punishment.

Objection 6: The place of freedom of judgment in the education of children, its advantages and its consequences.

Let us now now take a look at the document that was recently discovered in the archives of the Congregation and do the work of "filling in the blanks" left by Montaigne's succinct account in his *Journal*.[60] The document is comprised of two distinct parts representing the two separate voices that read and commented the text: the first part, annotated with the letter A, represents the notes and observations made by a first reader, and the second part, annotated with the letter B, must represent the findings and observations drawn by the second *consultor*, who re-evaluated the objections originally made in part A, and added more of his own. There is an obvious distinction between the styles and personal interpretation of the text of the two censorial figures, of the anonymous French monk and Lancius, the secretary of the Congregation of the Index. This chapter will focus on a comprehensive analysis of the six objections mentioned by Montaigne in his *Journal* as they relate to the original entries made by the French friar and Lancius in the Vatican document, and to subsequent textual developments in the body of the *Essays*. In the document published by Godman, the censors marked down next to each observation made the exact pages of the 1580 edition where they considered the text problematic. Therefore I used the photographical reproduction of the 1580 edition by Daniel Martin as my main reference in order to correctly locate each point.

[60] See *infra* Apendix A

Chapter 1

The Six Objections of the Roman Censors recalled in Montaigne's *Journal*

1. The Use of the Word "Fortune"

Let us proceed in the same order and elaborate on each of these points. Although listed first by Montaigne among the objections made by the censors, the comment regarding the repeated use of the word "fortune" is not part of the original list of observations made by the French monk on the Vatican document[61]. It is however the first original remark made by the second reader in his list. This position on the official document indicates that the input given by this second reader weighs more in the overall analysis due to a higher position of the latter, and demands more attention on the part of the author. This theory is also corroborated by the fact that this particular objection regarding the use of the term "fortune" is the only one that Montaigne brings into focus twice in his *Journal*: The first time in the passage that itemizes the six main points recalled by Montaigne "Je le suppliay, au rebours, qu'il suivist l'opinion de celuy qui l'avoit jugé, avouant en aucunes choses, comme d'avoir usé du mot *Fortune*" (119) – "I begged him on the contrary to follow the opinion of the man who had made the judgment, admitting in certain things – such as ahaving used the word "fortune" (91), and a second time the objection of the use of word "fortune" appears in the *Journal* is in the

[61] The document pertaining to Montaigne's *Essays* was recovered from the archives of the "Congregation of the Index", and in 2000 this document was published for the first time among other similar documents in Peter Godman's book, *The Saint as Censor: Robert Bellarmine between Inquisition and Index*. Thus, we find out that the censorship of the *Essais* was part of the anti-heretic campaign initiated primarily by the Congregation of the Index, under the higher authority of the Roman Inquisition. Let us recall that the Vatican document contains two separate lists, the first annotated with the letter A and the second with the letter B. In the introduction we suggested that the first compilation of objections belongs to the French monk, and the second, more detailed list to a certain Lancius, the secretary of the Congregation of the Index.

passage in which Montaigne recalls his farewell visit with the master of the Sacred Palace, Sisto Fabri.

> …qu'ils honoroient et mon intention et mon affection envers l'Eglise et ma suffisance, et esstioient tant de ma franchise et conscience qu'ils remetoient a moy-mesme de retrancher en mon livre, quand je le voudroys reimprimer, ce que j'y trouverois trop licencieux et, entre autres choses, les mots de *Fortune*". (*JV*, 131)

> …that they honored both my intention and affection to the Church and my ability, and thought so well of my frankness and conscience that they left it to myself to cut out of my book, when I wanted to republish it, whatever I found too licentious in it, and among other things the uses of the word "fortune. (101)

This passage is particularly illuminating as it accurately determines the type of relationship between the censors and the author. According to Montaigne, the amiable remarks that were exchanged during the visit attest to a cordial and constructive meeting. The written objection from the original document that the second censor made regarding the use of word "fortune" is the following:

> Di qui parla come i profani et ethnici della fortuna *maxima parte paginis* 50 et 54, 142, 158 *et alibi passim* et anco del fato come nella pagina 420 prima parte et 2a, 505, 517 et 605 parla come Epicureo 103.

The problematic passages related to the word "fortune" indicated by the second reader belong to different essays and have different nuances, referring to a variety of connotations that the term might suggest. Montaigne's response to this censorial remark was not favorable, if we judge by the reappearance of the term in the text after their meeting. In the new edition published in 1582 after his return to France, Montaigne neither changed nor removed the word "fortune" present in the 1580 version of the text

(where he used it 173 times[62]), and more importantly he continued to use it in the subsequent editions of his *Essays* up to the final complete version of the text published that counts the word “fortune” 350 times, more than the word “Dieu” (331 times)[63]. We must however go beyond mere counting of occurrences, and analyze the meaning behind this term, identifying which instances apply to what Lancius calls the "profane" use of the word, what Montaigne understands as “licentious” and why he chooses not to follow the advice given by the censors[64].

The objections made to the use of word “fortune” may refer to several irreverent connotations that the term implies. As indicated in the *Dictionnaire de Montaigne*[65], semantic allusions vary according to the contexts: chance (56 times), misfortune (39 times), accident (60 times) or the wish of the gods (120 times). Why was this word charged of immoral connotation? Inherited from Latin, Fortuna refers of course to the Roman goddess of fortune, the personification of luck in the pagan religion. It was one of the favorite characters in the classical literature so dear to Montaigne. The meaning of the word “fortune” broadened throughout the centuries to refer to the course of life, the risks encountered throughout, to all sorts of accidents and adventures as well as to one's personal fate and one's financial situation. However, at the time of Montaigne's first edition of the *Essays* (1580), the existing dictionaries present the term "fortune" as still very closely connected to its etymological source of pagan origin, and thus not independent of its impious connotations.[66] We must wait until Antoine Furètiere's

---

[62] D. Martin, *Montaigne et la Fortune*, Geneva – Paris, Slatkine-Champion, 1977 p.145
[63] R. Leake, *Concordance des* Essais *de Montaigne*, Geneva 1981
[64] “ce que j’y trouverois trop licencieux et, entre autres choses les mots de *Fortune*.” (131)
[65] *Dictionnaire de Michel de Montaigne publié sous la direction de Philippe Desan. Nouvelle édition, revue, corrigée, augmentée*. Paris, 2007, p. 415
[66] In the dictionaries compiled by Robert Estienne (1549) and Jean Nicot (1606) the term "fortune" is equated with the latin terms "sors-sortis" and "fortuna " – with the sense of one's destiny and luck. All the examples used in these

dictionary in 1690 for the term "fortune" to be officially differentiated from the Christian preferred variant "Providence" and to acquire the more independent sense of one's financial gains or situation[67]:

> FORTUNE. s.f.
> C'estoit autrefois une Divinité Payenne qu'on croyoit estre la cause de tous les évenements extraordinaires: au lieu que c'est en effet la Providence divine qui agit par des voyes inconnuës et au dessus de la prudence des hommes.
> En ce sens on a dit, Adorer la *Fortune*, sacrifier à la *Fortune*. On feignoit que la *Fortune* avoit le pied sur une rouë, pour marquer son inconstance: d'où vient qu'on a dit, la rouë de *Fortune*; Mettre un clou à sa *fortune*, pour dire, la fixer.
> Maintenant on appelle *Fortune*, Ce qui arrive par hasard, qui est fortuit et impreveu. Il faut estre égal dans la bonne et dans la mauvaise *fortune*. il n'y a que les imprudents qui donnent tout à la *fortune*. plusieurs *Favoris* ont esté le jouët de la *fortune*. […]
> FORTUNE, signifie aussi, l'establissement, le credit, les biens qu'on a acquis par son merite, ou par hasard. Cet homme fera *fortune*, poussera bien loin sa *fortune*, sçaura bien mesnager sa *fortune*, n'abusera pas de sa *fortune*. il faut qu'un homme sage se contente d'une *fortune* mediocre. heureux celuy qui ne change point de *fortune*. sa richesse est une *fortune* du jeu. il n'a jamais manqué de *fortune*.
> On dit aussi, Brusquer *fortune*, pour dire, Chercher à faire quelque gain ou establissement, du mot *buscar*, Espagnol, qui signifie, Chercher.

In his article "Curiosity, Contingency, and Cultural Diversity: Montaigne's Readings at the Vatican Library", François Rigolot approaches the use of the term "fortune" in the the context of Montaigne's visit to Rome and his access to the Vatican library, events narrated in his *Journal*. He cleverly remarks that Montaigne's account describes his success in entering this exclusive institution, and admiring some of the Vatican's most priced posessions, as a pure act of fortune.

---

two dictionaries are dierectly borrowed from classic sources. In Randle Cotgrave's 1611 French-English dictionary the term is also exclusively defined as luck and destiny: "*Fortune; also, hap, chaunce, luck, lot, hazard, aduenture; also, destinie, fatall necessitie"*.

[67] *Dictionnaire universel, contenant généralement tous les mots françois tant vieux que modernes, & les termes des sciences et des arts,* Tome 2, Rotterdam, 1702, p. 892 – Source: Gallica.bnf.fr

> The central paragraph in Montaigne's narrative is quite revealing. He attibutes his succes in gaining access to Seneca and Plutarch manuscripts to chance: Fortune brought me to it, since on the ambassador's testimony I consider the thing hopeless." [86] […] Contingency, he explained, governed his vision of the world and made life bearable. Unlike Machiavelli, who sought to outmaneuver *Fortuna*, the essaysist placed his trust in chance, with a passivity that Christians would normally adopt toward a benevolent Providence.[68]

Montaigne's attitude regarding the two terms "fortune" and "providence" is studied at length by Alain Legros in his article "Montaigne between Fortune and Providence". In his analysis Legros touches upon the same points recognized by François Rigolot in his study:

> The *Essays* do not oppose "providence" to "fortune." Far from having a force all its own for Montaigne, "fortune" exists only in the world of appearances, the world to which the human spirit is limited, no matter what we do. Only faith can admit, but without being able to pierce the mystery, that divine Providence exercises itself through this contingency, acting even through that which appears fortuitous to us, and coming to terms with secondary causes as with our free will.[69]

This differenciation between the two terms is adressed by Montaigne himself in chapter I.56 Des prières, in which the word "fortune" appears in a list of "unsanctioned terms". In the author's view, such terms are appropriate, and even recommended in non-religious matters, since only the sanctity of the Church, and holy texts should use such elevated speech. "Que le dire humain a ses formes plus basses et ne se doibt servir de la dignité, majesté, regence, du parler divin. Je luy laisse, pour moy, dire, [C] *verbis indisciplinatis*, [B] fortune, d'estinée, accident, heur et malheur, et les Dieux et autres

[68] F. Rigolot, "Curiosity, Contingency, and Cultural Diversity: Montaigne's Readings at the Vatican Library", *Renaissance Quarterly* (64), 2011

[69] A. Legros, "Montaigne between Fortune and Providence", *Chance Literature and Culture in Early Modern France*, Farnhan 2009, p. 28

frases, selon sa mode. » (V-S, 322-323b) "[B] that human speech has lower forms, and should not make use of the dignity, majesty, and authority of divine speech. I for my part allow it to say in [C] unsanctioned terms [Saint Augustin], [B] "fortune", "destiny", "accident", "good luck", "the gods" and other phrases, in its own way." (284)

Aside from the irreverent use of the term "fortune" derived from an ambiguous relationship with its religious counterpart "Providence", this controversial noun is also used by Montaigne to refer to one's financial situation. These separate usages of the word are not questioned by the censors. Although this secondary connotation is clearly derived from the original meaning of the word and inspired by the function of the pagan goddess Fortuna, this supplementary usage of the term is probably sufficiently established in the vernacular not to be directly condemned by the Roman censors. In chapter I.23 ("De la coustume et de ne changer aisément une loy receüe") the following sentence contains the word "fortune", but was not listed by Lancius.

> La societé publique n'a que faire de nos pensées; mais le demeurant, comme nos actions, nostre travail, nos fortunes et nostre vie propre, il la faut préter et abandonner à son service et aux opinions communes, [1582] comme ce bon et grand Socrates refusa de sauver sa vie par la desobeissance du magistrat, voire d'un magistrat tres-injuste et tres-inique.(V-S, 118a)[70]
>
> Society in general can do without our thoughts; but the rest – our actions, our work, our fortunes, and our very life – we must lend and abandon to its service and to the common opinions, just as the great and good Socrates refused to save his life by disobedience to the magistrate, even to a very unjustand very inquitous magistrate. (104)

In this paragraph the term "fortune" refers to one's financial situation, and the second reader seemed to have accepted this use because none of the pages mentioned in the document contain the word fortune in this context.

[70] The final sentence from "comme ce bon" to the end of the quote was added in the 1582 edition.

The two main unacceptable usages mentioned by the censor concern the meaning of fortune as chance and fate. One case can be found in a small sentence from the same essay, only a page before the passage cited above. In this instance the term "fortune" clearly denotes the notion of chance: "je scay bon gré à la fortune, dequoy, comme disent nos historiens, ce fut un gentil'homme Gascon et de mon pays, qui le premier s'opposa à Charlemaigne, nous voulant donner les loix Latines et Imperiales." (V-S, 117a) "I am grateful to fortune that, so our historians say, it was a Gascon gentleman, and from my part of the country, who first opposed Charlemagne when he wanted to give us Latin and Imperial laws." (103) The second official reader picks up on this minor reference, but he does not mention another occurrence of the word only two pages later toward the end of the chapter, in a context that indicates an inappropriate use of the term: "Si est-ce que la fortune, reservant tousjours son authorité au-dessus de nos discours, nous presente aucunefois la necessité si urgente, qu'il est besoing que les loix luy facent quelque place." (V-S, 122a)[71] "Yet it is true that Fortune, always reservig her authority above our reasonings, sometimes presents us with such an urgent necessity that the laws must needs give some place to it." (107) as Legros observes in his article, Montaigne cannot renounce the use of this term, considering its relevant connotations.

> As always when the author of the *Essays* addresses, directly or indirectly, the subject of religion, it is in order to speak of man, who is, among other things, *homo religiosus*. To refer to "fortune" in accounting for this phenomenon, avoids all rational explanation and acknowledges the incapacity of the human mind to recognize everything, to predict and to explain everything that happens to him or to his century. One understands why Montaigne should have been reticent to suppress or replace a word that allowed him to say, not without jubilation, just how poorly man commands the course of his life.[72]

[71] *Essais* ed. Martin, p. 147
[72] Alain Legros "Montaigne between Fortune and Providence", p. 21

Due to the frequent use of the term, the censor ended up referring in a more general way using "et alibi passim" to all the unmentioned occurrences of the word throughout the text.

In chapter I.12 “De la constance” of the *Essays* Montaigne defines “fortune” as a symbol for happily ending incidents. " Et est bien plus aisé à croire, que la fortune favorisa leur frayeur, et que ce seroit moyen un'autre fois aussi bien pour se jetter dans le coup, que pour l'éviter." (V-S, 46a) “It is much easier to believe that fortune favored their fright, and that another time this would be just as good a way to jump into the shot as to avoid it.” (37) The good fortune that some famous characters enjoyed constitutes memorable events. During the Invasion of Provence by Emperor Charles V (1536), the Marquis de Guast made an unlikely escape when the captain of the French artillery aimed a culverin at him so accurately that he only escaped because he had quickly jumped aside that very instant. Another example was the case of Lorenzo de Medici, duke of Urbino, who according to Montaigne's anecdote did well to duck at the last moment when he noticed a lit culverin pointing at him. In the 1582 edition, although Montaigne carefully reviewed this passage, he did not change his choice of the word "fortune". He did however change the verb that relates to the subject "fortune". So the passage slightly changed from "que la fortune ait favorisé ia leur fraieur" in the 1580 edition to "que la fortune brisa leur fraieur"[73]. This verbal modification also affects the connotations implied by the term “fortune”, changing from an intentional act “to favor” to a neutral action “briser”. The element of “fortune” must not have any similarity with God’s will, which is intentional and consequential. This change also demonstrates that Montaigne went back to that passage after his visit to the Vatican officials, and considered their suggestions. However, in the 1588 edition we notice another change in the verb, this time reverting to the original choice of "favoriser" but in the indicative rather than the

[73] The verb used in the 1582 edition is "brisa" not "favorisa" as it was incorrectly marked in the footnote of Martin's photographical reproduction of the 1580 edition.

subjunctive mode. Therefore the final version adopted by the editions following 1588 is "Et est bien plus aisé à croire, que la fortune favorisa leur frayeur, et que ce seroit moyen un'autre fois aussi bien pour se jetter dans le coup, que pour l'éviter." (V-S 46a) This is the only occurence of the word in this essay.

The second passage marked by the second Vatican reader and found in essay I.14 “Que le goust des biens et des maux depend en bonne partie de l'opinion que nous en avons”, uses the term "fortune" to explain the concept of existence with its ups and downs. This essay has a philosophical undertone that corresponds to Montaigne's earlier beliefs, such as his attitude regarding death. Whereas in the 1580 edition of this essay, Montaigne believes that we can defy death by getting accustomed to it, and regarding it as a natural part of the human existence, in later textual additions (in this particular chapter as well as in other chapters) and essays, Montaigne transforms his approach opting for a more elusive attitude when confronted with the concept of death and other physical pains, adopting what he calls "diversion" in order to deflect and turn his mind away from unpleasant affairs.[74] The second reader's remark regarding the use of "fortune" pertains to a passage in the beginning of this essay, in which Montaigne questions human perception of reality and its limited ability to control its destiny.

> Et en ayant le choix, si nul ne nous force, nous sommes estrangement fols de nous bander pour le party qui nous est le plus ennuyeux, et de donner aux maladies, à l'indigence et au mespris un aigre et mauvais goust, si nous le leur pouvons donner bon, et si la fortune fournissant simplement de matiere c'est à nous de luy donner la forme. (V-S 51a)
>
> And having the choice, if no one forces us, we are strangely insane to tense ourselves for the course that is more painful to us, and to give sickness, poverty, and slights a bitter and

[74] *Essays* V-S, III.4 “De la diversion”, III.12 “De la Phisionomie”

> unpleasent taste if we can give them a good one and if, fortune furnishing merely the material, it is for us to give it form. (39)

In the introduction to the 1580 edition of the *Essays,* Daniel Martin is drawn to this same passage in order to explain the paratextual function of the word "fortune". He attributes an even greater role to this term, and he understands the role played by the element of fortune as key factor in the "architecture" of the text. By association with all things, actions and concepts reserved for humans, the term "fortune" becomes the very matter of the text that has to be structured by the textual presence of the author.

> Dans la création du livre, Montaigne est conscient d'une collaboration étroite entre le Moi et la Fortune. La Fortune lui fournissant simplement de matière, c'est à lui de lui donner la Forme. Au total il s'agit de deux systèmes en relation d'interdépendance : un système biotique (le Moi- auteur) coopérant avec son écosystème (la Fortune) dans la production d'un livre ; un hasard et une nécessité du dehors sur un hasard et une nécessité du dedans. [75]

Following the occurrence of the word "fortune" in this essay, we notice that Montaigne not only kept the two original instances of the word, but continued to use this undesirable term in the additions he made throughout the successive re-editions of the *Essais*. In its final version (from the Bordeaux copy) we count the word "fortune" seven more times, for a total of nine times, including the two forms from the original 1580 edition.

The next passage containing the word "fortune" marked by the second reader is part of a longer and more developed section of chapter 24 "Divers evenemens de mesme conseil", which contains the term "fortune" six times. "Tant c'est chose vaine et frivole que l'humaine prudence; et au travers de tous nos projects, de nos conseils et precautions,

[75] D. Martin, *Essais: reproduction photographique de l'édition originale de 1580,* Harvard University Press, 1969, p. 7

la fortune maintient tousjours la possession des evenemens". (V-S, 127)[76] "So vain and frivolous a thing is human prudence; and athwart all our plans, counsels, and precautions, Fortune still maintains her grasp on the results." (112) This segment more than any other passages in the original text of 1580 presents a general explanation of Montaigne's view on "fortune". He associates this term exclusively with human actions and enterprises such as medicine, poetry, rhetoric, painting or choices of war. He equates the successful outcomes in these fields of action with something beyond the insufficient "human prudence". Some of its manifestations can appear as "poetic furor": "Or je dy que, non en la medecine seulement, mais en plusieurs arts plus certaines, la fortune y a bonne part. Les saillies poetiques, qui emportent leur autheur et le ravissent hors de soy, pourquoy ne les attribuerons nous à son bon heur" (V-S, 128a) – "Now, I say that not only in medicine but in many more certain arts Fortune has a large part. Poetic sallies, which transport their author and ravish him out of himself, why shall we not attribute them to this luck" (112) ; or oratorical inspiration "non plus que les orateurs ne disent avoir en la leur ces mouvemens et agitations extraordinaires, qui les poussent au delà de leur dessein." (V-S, 128a) - "…any more than orators say they have in theirs [good fortunes] those extraordinary impulses and agitations that push them beyond their plan." (112) The idea of "fortune" is the result of the imperfect understanding of the world, and thus has little to do with the divine perfection implied by the parallel term "providence". It is an unintended and unexpected outcome derived from an independent human endeavor; " Mais la fortune montre bien encores plus evidemment la part qu'elle a en tous ces ouvrages, par les graces et beautez qui s'y treuvent, non seulement sans l'intention, mais

[76] This is the original passage that attracted the attention of the censor based on the pagination offered in the document. *Essais*; *Essais* Martin ed. (1580), p. 158

sans la cognoissance mesme de l'ouvrier." (V-S, 128) – "But Fortune shows still more evidently the part the part she has in all these works by the graces and beauties that are found in them, not only without the workman's intention, but even without his knowledge." (112) Among these exclusively human endeavors, Montaigne undoubtedly counts his own book, and in this segment he invites his reader to understand the text as a universally accessible piece: " Un suffisant lecteur descouvre souvant és escrits d'autruy des perfections autres que celles que l'autheur y a mises et apperceues, et y preste des sens et des visages plus riches." (V-S, 128) - "An able reader often discovers in other men's writings perfections beyond those that the author put in or perceived, and lends them richer meanings and aspects." (112)

The secondary use derived from the term "fortune" that raised the censor's attention, was the more general treatment of fate or destiny "et anco del fato". He indicates four different locations (one in the first book and there in the second book) where this term appeared. The first location specified is on page 420 of the first book of the 1580 edition, chapter I. 46 "Des noms". "Chaque nation a quelques noms qui se prennent, je ne sçay comment, en mauvaise part: et à nous Jehan, Guillaume, Benoit. Item, il semble y avoir en la genealogie des Princes certains noms fatalement affectez: comme des Ptolomées à ceux d'Aegypte, de Henris en Angleterre, Charles en France, Baudoins en Flandres." (V-S, 276a) – "Each nation has certain names which, I know not why, are taken in a bad sense: with us, Jean, Guillaume, Benoît. Item in the genealogy of princes there seem to be certain names earmarked by fate, as that of Ptolemies in Egypt, the Henrys in England, the Charles in France, the Baldwins in Flanders." (243) Clearly, the problematic term here is "fatalement", which could be associated with the more

dangerous protestant term of "predestination". This connection presented a greater risk for Montaigne's readers due to its supposed parallel to protestantism. The next page indicated by the second reader is page 505 of the 1580 edition, essay II.27 “Couardise mere de la cruaute”. This chapter is primarily a reflection on cruelty and on the contemporary use of violence, touching again on the sensitive issue of the religious wars and all the cruelty and massacres related to this matter. On the page noted by the censor there aren’t any direct mentions of the term fortune or fate. The only sentence that pertains to the terms in question is a sentence that condemns the existing set of ethics, which devolved from the codes of past generations. Montaigne denounces his contemporaries for depreciating the basic principle of honor formerly associated with courage and strength: " Nous voulons vaincre mais lachement sans combat et sans hazard."[77] In the 1582 edition the sentence did not change, but in the 1588 edition of the *Essays* when Montaigne added several passages to this chapter, he also slightly modified this sentence, taking out the word “hazard” but without changing the main idea: "Nous voulons vaincre, mais plus surement que honorablement." On the Bordeaux copy Montaigne goes back to this passage and adds an example of such course of action, adding the word “hasard” back in to the text:

> [A] nous voulons vaincre, mais [[B]] plus surement que honorablement; [C] et cherchons plus la fin que la gloire en nostre querelle. Asinius Pollio, pour un honneste homme, representa une erreur pareille; qui, ayant escrit des invectives contre Plancus, attendoit qu'il fust mort pour les publier. C'estoit faire la figue à un aveugle et dire des pouïlles à un sourd et offenser un homme sans sentiment, plus tost que d'encourir le hazard de son ressentiment.[78] (695)

[77] *Essais*, ed. Martin 1580, p. 505

[78] The V-S edition does not specify that the words “plus surement que honorablement” were added in the 1588 edition instead of the original text from1580 and 1582 “mais lachement sans combat et sans hazard”, and they are not marked with the letter B.

> [a]We want to conquer, but more safely than honorably; [c] and in our quarel we seek an ending more than glory. For an honorable man, Asinius Pollio represented a like error; having written some invectives against Plancus, he waited until he was dead to publish them. That was like thumbing one's nose at a blind man, or uttering filthy abuse at a deaf man, or wounding an insensible man, rather than run the risk of his ressentment. (637)

The word "hasard" reappears in this passage, but this time in the exemplum of a Roman figure, context better suited for its non-christian etymology. As we can see in translation Frame chose "risk" for his English rendition. The term "hasard"/ "hazard"/"hasart" is of arabic descent, and its original uses were to designate the a dice game, and its outcome. It appears in French texts since the first half of the 12th century: the translation of Caton's *Disticha Moralia* (n.23) *Les distiques de Caton* by Everard de Kirkham, a French monk, Jean Bodel's play *Le jeu de Saint Nicolas*. (vv.1059, 1063, 1110)[79]

Two chapters later, the second reader marks another passage that contains the word "fatale"in II. 29 "De la vertu": " Or j'ay veu assez de gens encourager leurs troupes de cette necessité fatale: car, si nostre heure est attachée à certain point, ny les harquebousades ennemies, ny nostre hardiesse, ny nostre fuite et couardise ne la peuvent avancer ou reculer." (V-S, 709a) – " Now I have known a good many men to encourage their troops with this fatal necessity. For if our final hour is fixed at a certain point, neither enemy harquebus shots, nor our boldness, nor our flight and cowardice, can advance or retard it." (651) This paragraph is part of a longer reflection on the concept of

[79] CNRTL – Centre National des Ressources Textuelles et Lexicales – **www.cnrtl.fr/etymologie/hasard**; (Everard de Kirkham, *Distiques de Caton,* éd. E. Stengel, p. 115, n°23); (J. Bodel, *Jeu de Saint Nicolas,* éd. A. Henry, 1110 et v. note pp. 241-243)

"fatum" - "Parmy nos autres disputes, celle du Fatum s'y est meslée;" (V-S, 708a)[80] "Among our other disputes that of fatum has come in" (650), and the understanding of death. Montaigne combines a series of religious and non-religious observations using different cultural examples as background for the exploration of this universal issue. He places God above all matters and denounces those who believe in absolute predestination without any consideration for the human free will. This paragraph separates the divine perfection far superior to all human actions, and confers mortals a certain autonomy within the realm of the free will.

> et, pour attacher les choses advenir et nostre volonté mesmes à certaine et inevitable necessité, on est encore sur cet argument du temps passé: Puis que Dieu prevoit toutes choses devoir ainsin advenir, comme il fait sans doubte, il faut donc qu'elles adviennent ainsi. A quoy nos maistres respondent que le voir que quelque chose advienne, comme nous faisons, et Dieu de mesmes (car, tout luy estant present, il voit plustost qu'il ne prevoit), ce n'est pas la forcer d'advenir: voire, nous voyons à cause que les choses adviennent, et les choses n'adviennent pas à cause que nous voyons. L'advenement faict la science, non la science l'advenement. Ce que nous voyons advenir, advient; mais il pouvoit autrement advenir; et Dieu, au registre des causes des advenements qu'il a en sa prescience, y a aussi celles qu'on appelle fortuites, et les volontaires, qui despendent de la liberté qu'il a donné à nostre arbitrage, et sçait que nous faudrons, par ce que nous aurons voulu faillir. (V-S, 708-709a)
>
> And to attach things to come and even our will to a certain and inevitable necessity, people still use the argument of bygone days: "Since God forsees that all things are to happen thus, as undoubtedly he does, it is therefore necessary that they happen thus." To which our masters reply that to see something happen, as we do, and God likewise (for all things being present to him, he sees rather than forsees), is not to force it to happen; indeed we see because things happen, and things do not happen because we see. The event causes the knowledge, not the knowledge the event. What we see happen, happens; but it could have happened otherwise. And God, in the roll book of the causes of events which

[80] From Latin – "Fatum-i – referring to the divine utterance regarding the fate, destiny, misfortune of mortals.

> he has in his foreknowledge, has also those which are called fortuitous, and the volontary ones which depend on the freedom he has given to our will; and he knows that we shall err, because we shall have willed to err. (650)

This paragraph is a key segment in the debate over Montaigne's position on the elements of fortune, and the theory he formulates is immediately flagged by the second reader who considered it as a platform for dangerous speculation, perhaps too easy to misinterpret. The ideas featured in this passage are resonating with the famous debate over the issues of "free will" and "predestination", which animated the European scene during the early stages of the Reformation. Advocating on the side of the free will was the humanist Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam (1466-1536) who wrote the treatise *On Free Will (De libero arbitrio diatribe sive collatio,* 1524), and defending the idea of "predestination" was the German theologian Martin Luther (1483-1546), a pivotal figure of the Protestant Reformation who wrote a response treatise to Erasmus, entitled *Bondage of the Will* (*De servo arbitrio,* 1525). Montaigne's position is clearly related with Erasmus' arguments, disproofing the idea of predestination.

The last passage marked by the censor in his objective note belongs to the last essay of the 1580 edition of the text, II. 37 "De la resemblance des enfans aux peres". On the page indicated by the second reader there are several entries related to the term "fortune", used in the context of Montaigne's own reflection on the subject of doctors and medicine. This is not the first time the author connects those two subjects, with the intention to denounce and reject the imperfect science of medicine. [81] " Que les medecins excusent un peu ma liberté, car, par cette mesme infusion et insinuation fatale, j'ay receu la haine et le mespris de leur doctrine: […]Il faut qu'ils m'advouent en cela que, si ce n'est

[81] See *infra* p. 40

la raison, au-moins que la fortune est de mon party; or, chez les medecins, fortune vaut bien mieux que la raison." (V-S, 764a) – "Let doctors excuse my liberty a bit, for by this same fatal infusion and insinuation I have received my hatred and contempt for their teachings. […] They must grant me this: that if not reason, at least fortune is on my side; now with doctors, fortune is much more valuable than reason." (702) The concept of fortune is once more connected with the limited human science, having no association to any divine powers or inspiration. This observation consolidates Montaigne's previous reflection on the total separation between the all encompassing divine knowledge, and flawed human perception, as Legros remarks in his article.

> Montaigne's fortune never has the weight of a fatum or a necessity. If he enjoys playing with it, as he enjoyed dice and cards in his youth, it is precisely because he finds in it an element of gaming, in the playful, but also mechanical, sense of the word.[82]

Malcom Smith also discusses the concept of the word "fortune" in this context. He sees the frequent use of the "pagan" term as a reminder of the human limitations, emphasizing that fortune is responsible for most of human achievements: "Fortune is a concept that Montaigne often refers to with awe in order to contrast her power with the limitation of human knowledge, human reasoning, human prudence, human art."[83] He also recognizes that the absence of the term "providence" equates with "sensitivity to the power of the divine"[84]. Since people cannot elevate themselves to the understanding of theological concepts as "providence", they should not use such vocabulary. As Legros remarks in his article

[82] Alain Legros "Montaigne between Fortune and Providence", p. 21
[83] *Montaigne and the Roman Censors*, p.26
[84] *Montaigne and the Roman Censors*, p.26

The very last note the second reader made in his observation regarding the use of the word fortune, was the comment on Montaigne's epicurean perspective: "et parla come Epicureo 103". Since there is no other indication of this passage except for the page number, it is not sure which of the two books the censor had in mind when he made his comment. After a careful analysis, I agree with Legros' opinion that the second reader alludes primarily to essay I. 20 “Que philosopher c'est apprendre a mourir”. [85] Although there is no direct mention of Epicurus there, Montaigne debates on the topic of death and its implications during the course human life. It seems that the entire reflection on the terms of fortune and fate led by the passages cited by the censor revolves around human condition and its dealings with the final passage. In this essay Montaigne elaborates on a topic inspired by the epicurean philosophy that an enjoyable life surrounded by ease and comfort is worth more than an exemplary existence led in distress and misery:

> Qu'import'il, me direz vous, comment que ce soit, pourveu qu'on ne s'en donne point de peine? Je suis de cet advis, et en quelque maniere qu'on se puisse mettre à l'abri des coups, fut ce soubs la peau d'un veau, je ne suis pas homme qui y reculasse. Car il me suffit de passer à mon aise; et le meilleur jeu que je me puisse donner, je le prens, si peu glorieux au reste et exemplaire que vous voudrez. (V-S, 85-6a)
>
> What does it matter, you will tell me, how it happens, provided we do not worry about it? I am of that opinion; and in whatever way we can put ourselves to in shelter from blows, even under a calf’s skin, I am not the man to shrink from it. For it is enough for me to spend my life comfortably, and the best game I can give myself I’ll take, though it be as little glorious and exemplary as you like. (71)

[85] *Montaigne face à ses censeurs romains de 1581*, p. 21

Although Montaigne does not precisely mention in his *Journal* this secondary objection to his too epicurean approach, we can deduce that this comment is included in what he calls in a "trop licencieux" subject matter.[86]

As mentioned before, this first objection made by the second reader has been documented twice by the author in his *Journal*. No other objection regarding his text during his visit is mentioned twice, and many other remarks discussed during this encounter are not mentioned at all by the author. So we must ask ourselves why Montaigne did keep returning to this one item on the list. The most likely response would be that this was the most pertinent objection made by the censors, and should therefore be honored by the author. Yet, the first-hand evidence provided by the following editions of the *Essays* disproves, at least statistically, this alternative. As noted above, in the 1582 version of the *Essays* as well as in all the subsequent editions of the text, there are no substitutions or alterations of the word "fortune" or its derivatives, and Montaigne continues to use these terms in additional textual developments and in new essays. I see this first issue of using the term “fortune” as a metaphor for the message of the text, and as a capital point in the project of the *Essays*. Through this use, Montaigne best communicates that his text is as far away from any religious or theological matter as possible, leaving these reverent subjects to those who are better suited for such discussion.

> Should the overwhelmingly greater frequency of the appearance of the first term [fortune] lead us to neglect the second [providence]? Must we even consider that, for Montaigne, “fortune” and “providence” are necessarily mutually exclusive? I think, on the contrary, that they have a sort of compatibility, even connivance in the *Essays*, a book written “d’une façon laïque, non clericale: mais

[86] “ce que j’y trouverois trop licencieux et, entre autres choses les mots de *Fortune*.” *Journal de voyage* (131)

> tousjours tres-religieuse" (I, 56, 341) [In a lay manner, not clerical, but always very religious] (234).[87]

It is through a textual addition in the 1582 edition that Montaigne explicitly acknowledges the meeting with censors and their overall concern with the profane treatment of the subject matter, at times "trop licencieux" as Montaigne describes it. The following passage was originally introduced in the 1582 edition and it was subsequently augmented (by the addition of one short sentence) on the Bordeaux copy.

> Je propose des fantasies informes et irresolues, comme font ceux qui publient des questions doubteuses, à debattre aux escoles: non pour establir la verité, mais pour la chercher. Et les soubmets au jugement de ceux à qui il touche de regler, non seulement mes actions et mes escris, mais encore mes pensées. Esgalement m'en sera acceptable et utile la condemnation comme l'approbation, [C] tenant pour execrable, s'il se trouve chose ditte par moy ignorament ou inadvertament contre les sainctes prescriptions de l'Eglise catholique, apostolique et Romaine, en laquelle je meurs et en laquelle je suis nay. [A] Et pourtant, me remettant tousjours à l'authorité de leur censure, qui peut tout sur moy, je me mesle ainsin temerairement à toute sorte de propos, comme icy. (V-S, 317-8ac)
>
> I put forward formless and unresolved notions, as do those who publish doubtful questions to debate in the schools, not to establish the truth but to seek it. And I submit them to the judgment of those whose concern it is to regulate not only my actions and my writings, but even my thoughts. Equally acceptable and useful to me will be condemnation or approval, [c] since I hold it as execrable if anything is found which was said by me, ignorantly or inadevertently against the holy prescriptions of the Catholic Apostolic, and Roman Church, in which I die and in which I was born. [a] And therefore, always submitting to the authority of their censure, which has absolute power over me, I meddle rashly with every sort of subject, as I do here. (278)

The paragraph was strategically attached as an introduction to the chapter I. 56 "Des prières", which from its title invites religious scrutiny. It is the only one that overtly

[87] Alain Legros, "Montaigne between Fortune and Providence", p. 19

implies the treatment of religious matters, and thus the perfect vehicle for a response to the censorial Catholic offices. In the final sentence Montaigne seems to place himself under the auspices of the authority of the Church. This new incipit restores and solidifies the author's allegiance to his faith, while at the same time allowing him to pursue his strictly humanistic exploration. He reinforces his loyalty to the Catholic faith, but also recognizes his own limitations on the matter, based on his non-theological career, which invariably results in his imperfect handling of specialized vocabulary. Montaigne excuses himself in advance for his errors and limitations, a fact that paradoxically confers him the freedom to explore otherwise controversial avenues. As an additional proof that profane language is an adequate tool for nonreligious texts, Montaigne added a quotation from Dante to his 1582 edition, which precisely contains the word “fortuna”.

> *Cosi per entro loro schiera bruna*
>
> *S'ammusa l'una con l'altra formica*
>
> *Forse à spiar lor via, e lor fortuna*. (V-S, 458)

The meaning of the word « fortuna » here refers to the fate that awaits the ants outside their dirt fortress, one of the improper usages remarked in Rome, but the context and the placement of the quote are in perfect agreement with the disclosure paragraph discussed above.[88] Other than the statement added in the beginning of the essay I.LVI, Montaigne's reactions to the censorial objection against his pagan choice of words are not textually evident in the 1582 edition of the *Essays*.

It is rather in the 1588 edition, seven years after his meeting with the censors in Rome that Montaigne makes a precise reference to the second reader's observation

[88] For a more detailed study of this quote, see the second part of this study that discusses the textual changes operated on the text of the *Essais* for the 1582 edition. See *infra* p. 206

regarding the use of the word "fortune". He added some explicatory paragraphs in which he strengthens his original defense of using a more “human” language as opposed to a theological vocabulary. These long additions are also placed in the same chapter I.56 “Des prières”, a chapter on the act of praying that was also under censorial scrutiny.[89]

> J'ay veu aussi, de mon temps, faire plainte d'aucuns escris, de ce qu'ils sont purement humains et philosophiques, sans meslange de Theologie. Qui diroit au contraire, ce ne seroit pourtant sans quelque raison: Que la doctrine divine tient mieux son rang à part, comme Royne et dominatrice; Qu'elle doibt estre principale par tout, poinct suffragante et subsidiaire; Et qu'à l'aventure se tireroient les exemples à la Grammaire, Rhetorique, Logique, plus sortablement d'ailleurs que d'une si sainte matiere, comme aussi les arguments des Theatres, jeuz et spectacles publiques; Que les raisons divines se considerent plus venerablement et reveramment seules et en leur stile, qu'appariées aux discours humains; Qu'il se voit plus souvent cette faute que les Theologiens escrivent trop humainement, que cett'autre que les humanistes escrivent trop peu theologalement: la Philosophie, dict Sainct Chrysostome, est pieça banie de l'escole sainte, comme servante inutile, et estimée indigne de voir, seulement en passant, de l'entrée, le sacraire des saints Thresors de la doctrine celeste; Que le dire humain a ses formes plus basses et ne se doibt servir de la dignité, majesté, regence, du parler divin. Je luy laisse, pour moy, dire, [C] *verbis indisciplinatis*, [B] fortune, d'estinée, accident, heur et malheur, et les Dieux et autres frases, selon sa mode. (V-S, 322-3)

> In my time I have also heard certain writings reproached as being purely human and philosophical, with no admixture of theology. Nevertheless, it would not be wholly unreasonable to say the contrary: that the divine doctrine keeps her rank better apart, as queen and mistress; that she must be sovereign everywhere, not deputy and subsidiary, and that examples for grammar rhetoric and logic might perhaps be drawn more suitably elsewhere than from so sacred a matter, as also subjects for theatres, games and public spectacles; that divine reasons are regarded with greater veneration and reverence by themselves and their own style than when coupled with human reasoning; that is a more common fault for theologians to write to humanly, than for humanists to write too untheologically: philosophy says Saint Chrysostom, has long been banished from the holy schools as a useless handmaid and considered unworthy to peer, ever in passing and from the doorway,

[89] For a detailed analysis of this chapter, see *infra* p.72

> into the sanctuary of the holy treasures of the celestial doctrine; that human speech has lower forms, and should not make use of the dignity, majesty, and authority of divine speech. I for my part allow it to say, [c] in unsanctioned terms (saint Augustin), [b] "fortune", 'destiny", "accident", "good luck", and "bad luck", "the gods" and other phrases in its own way. (284)

This paragraph starts out with the mention of some texts that were judged too human, and philosophical, and not religious enough. Could Montaigne be talking about the earlier version of his own text of the *Essays* reviewed in Rome in 1581? That is a real possibility. Montaigne might react belatedly to the Roman censors, and defend the use of such "verba indisciplinata". In this paragraph, he makes clear his choices and the reasoning behind them, situating his text outside the theological sphere, and thus creating a space suitable for contemplating and wondering, where his judgment and his imagination can be set free. This paragraph acts as a textual disclosure, performing the same function as the new incipit to the same chapter in 1582. In addition to this justification, there may be an additional hint at the protestant position on this matter. Calvin clearly condemned the frequent use of the word "fortune" because the mere existence of the term implies a weakening of the divine providence that has absolute power over the human destiny, and no true Christian should use the term with this meaning in mind.[90] So, by the frequent use of the term, Montaigne also excludes himself from any possible allegiance to the protestant cause. Another aspect of the use of the term "fortune' is connecterd to the literay European context of the period. The type of language that Montaigne designates in the above-cited passage as "verbis indisciplinatis" resonates with the poetic language of the late sixteenth century. Alain Legros remarks

[90] *Institution de la religion chrétienne par Jean Calvin Nouvelle edition soigneusement revue et corrigée sur l'édition francaise de 1560, par Frank Baumgartner,* Geneva E. Beroud & C Editeur Paris 1888 – texte online archives.org - I. XVI. p.95

that this objection from the Vatican readers has to do with a general trend of the censorial institutions, which were attempting to "purge" the language of this increasingly popular trend of adopting pagan terminology in secular texts of various natures.

> However, from 1572 to 1592, when Montaigne uses this noun that simultaneously evokes games of chance (sortes), the whims of a goddess (Fortuna), and the popular image of the reversal of circumstance (wheel of Fortune), he opens himself up to the relatively recent criticism by theologians from all sides who object to the "pagan" expressions they wish to purge from the language, tracking down in texts all that is in poor taste. This last criterion, set forth by Montaigne's Roman censors upon his first interview, demonstrates nicely that their concern was primarily to proceed toward a lexical cleansing, correcting the forms of speech and writing commonly used by poets and intellectuals, prelates and courtiers without arousing suspicion that one or the other might have heterodox intentions.[91]

Legros continues this paragraph with a series of examples of such cases, among wich Etiènne de la Boetie and Pierre de Ronsard, both guilty of using the word "fortune" or similar terms in theirs works.

2. Naming Heretical Authors

The second among the six objections marked down by Montaigne in his *Journal* refers to the act of naming heretical poets in his *Essays* ("… d'avoir nommé des poëtes heretiques.")[92] Turning now to the official Roman document in which the two censors marked their objections, we note two different observations that pertain to Montaigne's account. Both these observations, number 14 and 15, appear on the list compiled by the French monk (the first reader):

> 14 Et pag. 470: loda Beza et Buccanano per boni poeti.

[91] Legros, "Montaigne between Fortune and Providence". p. 19
[92] *JV*, p. 119

> 15 Et pag. 32: approva un detto del buon Marot, et lo chiama buono, essendo egli heretici – questi autori o sono heretici o sono poco boni

The second reader, Lancius, aknowledges on his list only one of the two remarks noted by the French monk, namely objection number 15:

> 15 Già dissi che quel luogo si puo piglare per ironia, ma non tutti il pigleranno cosi forse

In the comment number 14, the writers in question are the poet Théodore de Bèze (1519 – 1605) and George Buchanan (1506 – 1582), a Scottish writer and a former teacher of Montaigne. The passage brought into question belongs to chapter II.17 "De la praesumption" in which Montaigne praises Beza and Buchanan, among the best poets of his time.

> [A] Les plus notables hommes que j'aye jugé par les apparences externes (car, pour les juger à ma mode, il les faudroit esclerer de plus pres), ce ont esté, pour le faict de la guerre et suffisance militaire, le Duc de Guyse, qui mourut à Orleans, et le feu Mareschal Strozzi. Pour gens suffisans, et de vertu non commune, Olivier et l'Hospital, Chanceliers de France. Il me semble aussi de la Poesie qu'elle a eu sa vogue en nostre siecle. Nous avons foison de bons artisans de ce mestier-là: Aurat, Beze, Buchanan, l'Hospital, Mont-doré, Turnebus. (V-S, 661a)[93]
>
> [a] the most notable men that I have judged by outward appearances – for to judge them in my own way, I would need more light on them- were in point of war and military abilitiy, the Duke of Guise who died at Orleans, and the late Marshal Strozzi. As for able men of uncommon virtue, Olivier and L'Hopital, chancellors of France. It seems to me that poetry too has flourished in our century. We have a wealth of good craftsmen in that trade: Dorat, Beza, Buchanan, L'Hopital Mont-dore, Turnebus. (609)

[93] In the original edition of 1580, Montaigne used the adjective "rares" in place of "notables" in the beginning of this passage. The current term appeared on the Bordeaux copy.

Let's take a separate look at the treatment of both these figures throughout the text of the *Essays* following the 1581 meeting with the censors, starting with the case of Theodore de Bèze. He enjoyed a distinguished reputation among the French high society until his complete change of allegiance to the protestant cause. Before he became one of the most important voices of the Reformation in Europe, he was known for his intellectual and artistic activity in France. His most famous body of work was a collection of Latin poems *Juvenilia* (1548) that turned him into one of the leading Neo-Latin poets of his time. It is also around the same period that he exchanged his humanistic career for an ecclesiastical one, moved to Geneva and, as Calvin's successor, dedicated the rest of his life to the protestant movement. In the passage noted by the first censor, Montaigne praises Beza's strictly on his poetic ability.

In the 1582 edition of the *Essays* there was no response to the criticism regarding the heretical poets and this passage is re-printed without any change. However, as in the case of the previous objection, using the word "fortune," Montaigne comes back to this subject in later editions. In 1588, in the famous chapter III.9 "De la vanité" largely dedicated to the author's travel experience, Villey identified a paragraph that is indirectly refering to Beza's work:

> J'ay veu en ma jeunesse un galant homme presenter d'une main au peuple des vers excellens et en beauté et en desbordement, et de l'autre main en mesme instant la plus quereleuse reformation theologienne de quoy le monde se soit desjeuné il y a long temps. (V-S, 989b)
>
> In my youth I have seen a gentleman offer the public with one hand verses excelling both in beauty and in licentiousness, and with the other at the same moment the most contentious work on theological reform that the world has feasted on for a long time. (920)

This passage alludes to the fact that Beza wrote erotic poetry before becoming the ardent reformer, and his previous lyrics became a disgrace for his new religious party. In the 1595 Gournay edition on the *Essays*, in chapter III. 5, "Sur des Vers de Virgile", Montaigne comes back to Beza's erotic poetry by adding a rather impious line from his *Juvenilia*, and observing the nature of the writing that mirrors the author's nature:

> [C] Qui n'en [de la vie] escrit que reverемment et regulierement, il en laisse en arriere plus de la moitié. Je ne m'excuse pas envers moy; […]. Je m'excuse à certaines humeurs, que je tiens plus fortes en nombre que celles qui sont de mon costé. En leur consideration, je diray encores cecy […], qu'ils n'ont à se prendre proprement à moy de ce que je fay dire aux auctoritez receues et approuvées de plusieurs siecles, et que ce n'est pas raison qu'à faute de rime ils me refusent la dispense que mesme des hommes ecclesiastiques des nostres et plus crestez jouissent en ce siecle. En voici deux:
> *Rimula, dispeream, ni monogramma tua est.*
> *Un vit d'amy la contente et bien traicte*. (V-S, 888-9)

> Whoever writes about it [life] only reverently and according to the rules leaves out more than half of it. I am not making excuses to myself, […] I am making excuses to certain humors which I believe to be stronger in number than those that are on my side. In consideration of them I will further say this […] that they should not properly blame me for what I quote from authorities accepted and approved for many centuries; and that it is not right that they should refuse me, because I lack rhyme, the dispensation that even churchmen and some of the most proudly crested at that, enjoy in our time. Here are two of them:
>
> May I die if your crack is more than a faint line.
> (Beza)
>
> A friendly tool contents and treats her well
> (Saint Gelais)
> (822-3)

The Latin line belongs to Beza's epigram LXXIV intitled "Ad quandam" (To a Woman), from the volume of erotic poetry *Juvenilia*, intitled "Ad quandam" (To a Woman)[94]. This is a descriptively written tribute to the sex of a woman, in which the poet's gaze is

[94] *Les juvenilia de Theodore de Bèze*, ed. Alexandre Machard, Paris, 1879, p.212

focused on the "faint line" of the woman's body. The French line belongs to the French poet Mellin de Saint –Gelais (1487-1558), from his "Rondeau sur la dispute des vits de quatre dames". Montaigne used these examples of erotic poetry, very popular in the 16th century, in an effort to reflect the totality of the human nature as a combination of virtue and carnal pleasures. He discusses the imperfection of human nature in terms easy to follow, and remarks the duality that governs a person's character. No ethical law could ever change the human nature that defines each and every one of us because the "original sin" is the defining human trait.

This same idea is reaffirmed in another passage from chapter III.10, "De mesnager sa volonte", in which Montaigne discusses the same limitation of the human nature, but this time in the context of the religious dispute between the Catholic Church and the Reformation. He disapproves of those who, out of overzealousness to a certain cause, become blind and incapable to see the positive aspects of a person just because they disagree regarding the said cause. While considering this issue, Montaigne brings into discussion an example that refers without any doubt to his meeting with the censors (cf. "magistrat") and their objection to praising Beza.

> Je me prens fermemant au plus sain des partis, mais je n'affecte pas qu'on me remarque specialement ennemy des autres, et outre la raison generalle. J'accuse merveilleusement cette vitieuse forme d'opiner: Il est de la Ligue, car il admire la grace de Monsieur de Guise. L'activeté du Roy de Navarre l'estonne: il est Huguenot. Il treuve cecy à dire aux moeurs du Roy: il est seditieux en son coeur. Et ne conceday pas au magistrat mesme qu'il eust raison de condamner un livre pour avoir logé entre les meilleurs poetes de ce siecle un heretique. N'oserions nous dire d'un voleur qu'il a belle greve? Et faut-il, si elle est putain, qu'elle soit aussi punaise? (V-S, 1013c)
>
> [c] I adhere firmly to the healthiest of the parties, but I do not seek to be noted as especially hostile to the others and beyond the bonds

> of the general reason. I condemn extraordinarily this bad form of arguing: "He is of the Ligue, for he admires the graces of Monsieur du Guise." " The activity of the king of Navarre amazes him: he is a Huguenot." "He finds this to criticize in the king's morals: He is seditious in his heart." And I did not concede even to the magistrate that he was right to condemn a book for having placed a heretic among the best poets of this century. Should we not dare say of a thief that he has a fine leg? And if she is a whore must se also necessarily have bad breath?" (942)

This is a bold move on Montaigne's part to publicly disagree with the Vatican "magistrate". However, this attitude corroborates the cordial relationship that was formed between the French essayst and the Roman officials: "Le 15 Avril, je fus prendre congé du maistre del sacro Palazzo et de son compagnon, qui me prierent de ne me server point de la censure de mon livre, en laquelle autre François les avoient avertis qu'il y avoit plusieurs sottises." (*JV*, 131) - " On April 15th I went to say good-bye to the master of the Sacred Palace and his colleague, who urged me not to make use of the censorship in my book, in which censorship some other Frenchmen had informed them that there were many stupid things." (101) Since, as we have seen in the new incipit of chapter I.56 quoted *supra*, Montaigne went to great leangths to establish the *Essays* as an intrinsically humanist book, he can thus afford judgements outside of the theological discipline, in more appropriate human endeavors such as literature and philosophy.

In the case of George Buchanan, the second protestant figure mentioned by the "magistrate" in his remark, Montaigne displays a similar treatment. Buchanan was a highly regarded educator in his time, but not an established poet like Beza. He held professorships in the universities of Bordeaux and Paris, was appointed principal at St. Andrew's, and counted among his famous pupils the young Mary Queen of Scots, the future King James VI, and Montaigne himself. It was this personal connection with his

former teacher that made Montaigne include his name along with other "rare" or "notable" characters of his time. In the 1580 edition of the *Essays* reviewed in Rome, Buchanan's name appears in two different locations: once in the II.17 passage cited above, and twice in the essay I.26 “De l'institution des enfans”:

> Nicolas Groucchi, qui a escrit *de comitiis Romanorum*, Guillaume Guerente, qui a commenté Aristote, George Bucanan, ce grand poete Escossois, Marc Antoine Muret, [C] que la France et l'Italie recognoist pour le meilleur orateur du temps, mes precepteurs domestiques, m'ont dict souvent que j'avois ce langage [la latin], en mon enfance, si prest et si à main, qu'ils craingnoient à m'accoster. Bucanan, que je vis depuis à la suite de feu monsieur le Mareschal de Brissac, me dit qu'il estoit apres à escrire de l'institution des enfans, et qu'il prenoit l'exemplaire de la mienne: car il avoit lors en charge ce Comte de Brissac que nous avons veu depuis si valeureux et si brave. (V-S, 174)

> Nicholas Grouchy, who wrote De Comitis Romanorum, Guillaume Guernte, who wrote a commentary on Aristotle Gurge Buchanan, that great Scottish Poet, [b] Marc Antoine Muret, [c] whom France and Italy recognize as the best orator of his time, [a] my private tutors, have often told me that in my childhood I had athat language so ready and handy that they were afraid to accost me. Buchanan, whom I afterwards saw in the suite of the late Marshall de Brissac told me that he was writing on the education of children and that he was taking my education as a model; for he was then in charge of that count de Brissac who later showed himself so valorous and brave. (156)

As in the case of Beza, Buchanan is brought in the discussion for his other merits, not for his religious faith. He is first described as a good poet, and then in his preceptor capacity. His humanistic reputation and his valor as a private tutor precede his religious choices. In 1582 Montaigne reconsidered this paragraph, but made no change regarding Buchanan. The only addition was the name of Antoine de Muret to the list of illustrious preceptors, as a counter-balancing name in the list of protestant figures. Muret was at the time living

in Italy, and he was much appreciated there as well. In the 1588 edition, Montaigne will add another passage to in this essay that contains the name of Buchanan:

> [B] Mettray-je en compte cette faculté de mon enfance: une asseurance de visage, et soupplesse de voix et de geste, à m'appliquer aux rolles que j'entreprenois? Car, avant l'aage, *Alter ab undecimo tum me vix ceperat annus,* j'ai soustenu les premiers personnages és tragedies latines de Bucanan, de Guerente et de Muret, qui se representerent en nostre college de Guienne avec dignité. (V-S, 176)
>
> [b] Shall I include in my account this faculty of my boyhood, assurance in expression and flexibility in voice and gesture, in adapting myself to the parts I undertook to act? For before the usual age,
>
> "Scarce had my twelfth year snatched me from the year before,
> (Virigil)
>
> I played the leading part in the Latin Tragedies of Buchanan, Guerente, and Muret, which were performed with dignity in our College de Guyenne. (159)

It is clear that the censor's remark in 1581 did not in any way alter Montaigne's appreciation for his former teacher's pedagogical worth. He continues to refer to Buchanan as one of the most influential people who shaped his education and his character. In the same 1588 edition, we came across another reference to Buchanan, a direct quote from one of his most famous poem, *Franciscanus,* a pungent satire directed against the order of Franciscan monks, in which he denounced the debaucheries and corruption among its members. This particular work could have easily been the sole reason why the "frater François," who was part of the censorial team, denounced Montaigne's use of Buchanan's name in the *Essays*.

> Qui desirera du bien à son païs comme moy, sans s'en ulcerer ou maigrir, il sera desplaisant, mais non pas transi, de le voir menassant ou sa ruyne ou une durée non moins ruyneuse. Pauvre vaisseau, que les flots, les vents et le pilotte tirassent à si contraires desseins:

> *in tam diversa magister,*
> *Ventus et unda trahunt.*
> Qui ne bée poinct apres la faveur des princes comme apres chose dequoy il ne se sçauroit passer, ne se pique pas beaucoup de la froideur de leur recueil et de leur visage, ny de l'inconstance de leur volonté. (V-S, 1016b)
>
> [b] He who desires the good of his country as I do without getting ulcers and growing thin over it, will be unhappy, but not stunned, to see it threatened either with ruin or with conditions of survival no less ruinous. Poor vessel, which the waves, the winds, and the pilot pull about with such contrary purposes :
>
> In such diverse ways
> do pilot, winds, and waves impel.
>
> (Buchanan)
>
> he who does not gape after the favor of princes as a thing he cannot do without is not much stung by the coolness of their reception and countenance or by the inconstancy of their will. (946)

Montaigne does not bring up the name of the author of the quote in this passage, aware as he is perhaps of the negative connotation it might carry. However, the quote is a viable illustration of the idea developed in the passage, and it is not removed from its original context, where the image of the vessel pulled apart by different forces is also a symbol of the difficult socio-political climate of the period. The last chronological addition related to Buchanan is a line from a different text of the Scottish humanist, added manually on the Bordeaux copy in essay III.5 “Sur des vers de Virgile”: "Tristemque vultus tetrici arrogantiam." (V-S, 845) - “The sullen arrogance of a gloomy face.” (778) This line is form the Prolog to the drama *Baptistes (Sive Calumnia)* (1578), and as in the previous case when Montaigne used a direct quote from his works, there is no reference to Buchanan's name. The prolog of the drama acts as an anticipatory disclosure of the actual text of the play in which Buchanan presumes and retaliates against the alleged critics who would condemn his book for one reason or another. The above-cited line distinguishes

and warns against this particularly deceitful type of reader who is quick to disprove a text regardless of its nature, a type of reader who is completely unsuited for his text.

> Themselves a prey to slumber and to sloth,
> Idle, they look askance on others' toil,
> And all their pains upon the task bestow
> Of laying hold of something they can blame.
> On any fault they swoop with Lynx's eye,
> And plenteously condemn with critic care;
> The while from what is irreproachable,
> With fingers on their ears, they fly away.
> Enough : on their ungenial arrogance,
> Their faces gloomy with surly pride,
> I will not waste one further word of mine.[95]

In the following lines of the prolog, he defines the frank and open-minded reader who is suitable for his text:

> But if my words have access to the ear
> Of some sincere discerner who (as nought
> By mind of man produced from fault is free),
> Making allowance for slight blemishes,
> My contenance bestow and friendly aid
> On one who furthers literary art,
> To him we offer this our drama new – [96]

This reader described by Buchanan seems closely related to Montaigne's own account of a "lecteur suffisant": " Un suffisant lecteur descouvre souvant és escrits d'autruy des perfections autres que celles que l'autheur y a mises et apperceues, et y preste des sens et des visages plus riches."(V-S, 128) - "An able reader often discovers in other men's writings perfections beyond those that the author put in or perceived, and lends them richer meanings and aspects." (112) Montaigne maintains the Buchanan's context in his

[95] *John the Baptist – a drama – translated from the latin of George Buchanan by A. Gordon Mitchell*, ed. A. Gardner, Paisley, Scotland, 1904, p.18. Mitchell's English translation of the line used by Montiagne is slightly different than the translation used by Frame in his edition of the *Essays*, "The sullen arrogance of a gloomy face" (778), but captures the same image.

[96] Ibid. p.19

own chapter when he inserts this line, accompanying it with a reference to his own book and his readers.

> [B] J'ayme une sagesse gaye et civile, et fuis l'aspreté des meurs et l'austerité, ayant pour suspecte toute mine rebarbative:
> [C] *Tristemque vultus tetrici arrogantiam*.
> [B] Et *habet tristis quoque turba cynaedos*.
> [C] Je croy Platon de bon ceur, qui dict les humeurs faciles ou difficiles estre un grand prejudice à la bonté ou mauvaistié de l'ame. Socrates eut un visage constant, mais serein et riant, non constant comme le vieil Crassus qu'on ne veit jamais rire.
> [B] La vertu est qualité plaisante et gaye.
> [C] Je sçay bien que fort peu de gens rechigneront à la licence de mes escrits, qui n'ayent plus à rechigner à la licence de leur pensée. Je me conforme bien à leur courage, mais j'offence leurs yeux. (V-S, 844-5)

> [b] I love a gay and sociable wisdom, and shun harshness and austerity in behavior, holding every surly countenance suspect:
> [c] The sullen arrogance of a gloomy face.
> Buchanan
> [b] That sad group also has its sodomites.
> Martial
> [c] I hartly agree with Plato when he says that an easy or a difficult humour is of great importance to the goodness or badness of the soul. Socrate has a settled expression, but serene and smiling, not settled like that of old Crassus, who was never seen to laugh. [b] Virtue is a pleasant and gay quality.
> [c]I know well that very few people will frown at the license of my writings who do not have more to frown at in the liscense of their thoughts. I conform well to their hearts, but I offend their eyes. (778)

We shall now continue the analysis of the Vatican criticism regarding the mention of heretical poets in the *Essays* with the 15th objection on the censors'compiled list cited above.[97] The French monk directs our attention to essay II. 3, "Coustume de l'isle de Cea", in which the name of Marot is used ironically as a referential authority.

> Il nous sera à l'adventure honnorable aux siecles advenir qu'un sçavant autheur de ce temps, et notamment Parisien, se met en peine

[97] See *supra* p. 54.

> de persuader aux Dames de nostre siecle de prendre plustost tout autre party que d'entrer en l'horrible conseil d'un tel des-espoir. Je suis marry qu'il n'a sceu, pour mesler à ses comptes, le bon mot que j'apprins à Toulouse, d'une femme passée par les mains de quelques soldats: Dieu soit loué, disoit-elle, qu'au moins une fois en ma vie je m'en suis soulée sans peché'A la verité, ces cruautez ne sont pas dignes de la douceur Françoise; aussi, Dieu mercy, nostre air s'en voit infiniment purgé depuis ce bon advertissement: suffit qu'elles dient nenny en le faisant, suyvant la reigle du bon Marot. (V-S, 357a)
>
> It will perhaps be to our honor in the centuries to come that a learned author of this day, and a Parisian at that, takes pains to persuade the ladies of our time to make up their minds to anything rather than adopt the horrible counsel of such despair. I am sorry that he did not know and insert among his stories the good one I heard at Toulouse of a woman who had passed through the hand of some soldiers: " God be praised" ahe said, " that at least once in my life I have had my fill without sin!" In truth these cruelties are not worthy of the gentle ways of France; and so, thank God, our atmosphere has been thoroughly purged of them by the man's good advice. Enough for them to say No while doing it, following the rule of our good Marot. (312)

This passage was also the subject of an earlier objection marked with number 4 on the list compiled by the first "consultore", and to which the second, more versed reader, presumed to be Lancius, responded by pointing out the irony implied by Montaigne. "Forse rispondera l'autore che quelle dice per ironia burlandosi di Parigini, ma ancor che fosse cosi, quel luogho e molto periculoso, per esser la cosa si brutta e la ironia si nascosta."[98] Lancius also identifies the irony of this passage that offends the first reader on two different fronts (the epithet "bon" attached to the name of a heretic poet, and the unethical comment regarding the moral conduct of women), but he is still showing concern regarding the way this comments will be received by other readers. The problem

[98] See *infra* p. 103 for a more detailed analysis on the 4th objection on the list.

seems to be in this case Montaigne's use of irony and double-entendre in his text, stylistic devices also mentioned in his *Journal*. (see last phrase of the following paragraph):

> Je le suppliay, au rebours, qu'il suivist l'opinion de celuy qui l'avoit jugé, avouant en aucunes choses, comme d'avoir usé du mot *Fortune*, d'avoir nommé des poëtes heretiques, […], et autres telles choses ; que c'estoit mon opinion, et que c'estoient choses que j'avoy mises, n'estimant que ce fussent erreurs ; a d'autres niant que le correcteur eust entendu ma conception. (*JV*, 119)

> I begged him on the contrary to follow the opinion of the man who had made the judgment, admitting in certain things – such as ahaving used the word "fortune", having named heretic poets,[…]; and other things of that sort – that was my opinion, and that they were things I had put in, not thinking they were errors; in other maters denying that the corrector had understood my thought. (91)

Montaigne is also aware of his sometimes indirect, less than transparent style. On the Bordeaux copy, in the same essay III.5 in which he textually brings back both Beza and Buchanan, he also adds that his text is sometimes misinterpreted: "Tu te joues souvent; on estimera que tu dies à droit, ce que tu dis à feinte." (V-S, 875) Although having acknowledged the pertinence of the objections, Montaigne does not change his text. He was after all given by Sisto Fabri himself, the master of the Sacred Palace, the liberty to correct and amend only the items that he found inappropriate.

3. The Praise of Emperor Julian

The third point mentioned in Montaigne's *Travel Journal* is the Praise of Emperor Julian: " d'avoir excusé Julien." (*JV*, p. 119) Julian the Roman Emperor (331- 363) was a member of the Constantinian dynasty, also known as Julian the Apostate (the transgressor). He gained a bad reputation with the Catholic Church because he

denunciated Christian religion in favor of Neoplatonic paganism. During his reign, Julian attempted to save the Roman Empire from its dissolution by bringing it back to its original values, and by reviving traditional polytheist practices at the cost of Christianity. Before we analyze the text based on the official document, let us take a look at the 1580 text that the censors scrutinized. In this early version of the *Essais*, we find mentions of Julian the Apostate in four chapters: I. 16, "De la punition de la couardise"; I. 42, « De l'inequalité qui est entre nous »; II. 19, "De la liberté de conscience"; and II.21, « Contre la faineantise ». The first occurrence of Julian is in the form of a brief example taken from Ammianus Marcellinus[99]. In this first entry Julian is depicted in his capacity of general of the army who, following the ancient Roman laws, condemns some of his soldiers to death for desertion; but who also, in a different episode, chooses to humiliate, rather than kill, some other soldiers guilty of the same accusations, showing his ability to discern, and lead his people effectively.

> [A]Car Ammianus Marcellinus raconte que l'Empereur Julien condamna dix de ses soldats, qui avoyent tourné le dos en une charge contre les Parthes, à estre dégradez, et apres à souffrir mort, suyvant, dict-il, les loix anciennes. Toutes-fois ailleurs pour une pareille faute il en condemne d'autres, seulement à se tenir parmy les prisonniers sous l'enseigne du bagage.(V-S,70)

> [A] For Amianus Marcellinus relates that Emperor Julian condemned ten of his soldiers who had turned theirbacks in a charge against the Parthians, to be degraded and afterwards to suffer death, according, he says, to the ancient laws. Elsewhere, however, for a similar fault he condemns others merely to stay among the prisoners under the baggage ensign. (70)

[99] Fourth century Roman historian who was probably Montaigne's main source for his accounts on Julian: Ammianus Marcellinus, *Res gestae*. C. Rolfe, *Ammianus Marcellinus, with an English translation*, Loeb Classical Library, 3 vols, London/Cambridge Mass. 1935-1939 (repr. 1971-1972); based on Clarks edition. – see books XV – XXV (Julian's merits are summed up in Book XXV – Vol. 2, pp. 504 – 519, after recounting the episode of his death)

The figure of Julian reappears in essay I. 42, and here also Montaigne presents the emperor in a positive light. This time it has to do with his behavior as a just, and sensible ruler who critiques the excessive praise of his courtiers: « [A] Ses courtisans louoient un jour Julien l'Empereur de faire bonne justice: Je m'en orgueillirois volontiers, dict-il, de ces louanges, si elles venoient de personnes qui ozassent accuser ou meslouer mes actions contraries quand elles y seroient. » (V-S, 266-7) " [a] One day the Emperor Julian's courtiers were praising him for being so just. ' I would readily take pride in these praises' he said, 'if they came from people who dared to accuse or dispraise my unjust actions, if there should be any.'" (237) Another passage that refers to Julian is in chapter II.22, in which Montaigne commends Julian's etiquette and his distinguished behavior in society: " [A] Il avoit honte si en public on le voioit cracher ou suer […] par ce qu'il estimoit que l'exercice, le travail continuel et la sobriété devoient avoir cuit et asseché toutes ces superfluitez. » (V-S, 267) "[a] He was ashamed if he was seen to spit or sweat in public […] because he considered that exercise, continual toil, and sobriety should have cooked and dried up all superfluities." (624) Judging from these three passages, it is clear that Montaigne holds the figure of the emperor in high regards, and is eager to appreciate his talents and merits as a general, as a ruler, and as a person regardless of his bad reputation with early Christian Church. The Roman emperor acquired an injurious name. "the Apostate", because during his reign, he attempted to retract the official status of the Christian religion, and reinstated paganism as an alternative for religious tolerance. It is perhaps this very effort to maintain internal peace by promulgating an edict that guaranteed freedom of religion in February 362 that entails Montaigne's admiration and his favorable depiction of the emperor. The author was involved and very concerned with

the catastrophic effects of the Religious Wars that were crushing France at the time, and concepts as internal peace and religious tolerance were probably in his mind as well.

None of the above narrated episodes however, attracted the attention of the censor when he made the official objection. It was the longer passage from the essay « De la liberté de conscience » (II.19). The censor remarked in Latin the offensive attitude of Montaigne regarding the pagan emperor. "479 Mirifice Laudat Julianum Apostatam et 481 negat eum sagitta ictum exclamasse: 'Vicisti Nazarene!' aut miracolosum aliud quodquam in eius morte accedisse." He is offended by Montaigne's admiring attitude towards Julian on page 479, and he reproaches his reservation regarding the veracity of the final words uttered by the emperor "You prevailed, Nazarene", thus recognizing the supremacy of the Christian faith over the paganism.

The censor correctly noted this chapter as a more detailed reflection on the figure of Julian, in which several traits of his character are mentioned with admiration (and which lead to a conclusion that questions the superiority of the current religious state).[100]

> C'estoit, à la vérité, un tres-grand homme et rare, comme celuy qui avoit son ame vivement tainte des discours de la philosophie, ausquels il faisoit profession de regler toutes ses actions; et, de vray, il n'est aucune sorte de vertu dequoy il n'ait laissé de tres-notables exemples. (V-S, 669)
>
> [a] He was, in truth, a very great and rare man, being one whose soul was deeply dyed with the arguments of philosophy, by which he professed to regulate all his actions; and indeed there is no sort of virtue of wich he did not leave very notable exemples. (616)

This multifaceted portrait continues throughout the entire chapter with various praiseworthy examples of his chastity, sobriety, justice, vigilance, education, military ability, and touching on his limited views in matters of religion:

[100] See *infra* p. 165

> En matiere de religion, il estoit vicieux par tout; on l'a surnommé apostat pour avoir abandonné la nostre: toutesfois cette opinion me semble plus vraysemblable, qu'il ne l'avoit jamais eue à coeur, mais que, pour l'obeissance des loix, il s'estoit feint jusques à ce qu'il tint l'Empire en sa main. (V-S, 670)
>
> [a] In the matter of religion he was bad throughout. He was surnamed the Apostate for having abandoned ours; however, this theory seems to me more likely, that he had never had it at heart, but that out of obedience to the laws, he had dissembled until he held the empire in his hand. (618)

However, even in the religious context, Montaigne admires his tolerance and non violent approach:

> Quant à la justice, il prenoit luy-mesme la peine d'ouyr les parties; et encore que par curiosité il s'informast à ceux qui se presentoient à luy de quelle religion ils estoient, toutesfois l'inimitié qu'il portoit à la nostre ne donnoit aucun contrepoix à la balance. […] Tant y a que ce faict là ne se peut pas bien rapporter aux cruautez qu'on le dit avoir exercées contre nous. Il estoit (dit Eutropius, mon autre tesmoing), ennemy de la Chrestienté, mais sans toucher au sang. (V-S, 669-670)
>
> [a] As for justice, he took the trouble to hear the disputants himself; and although out of curiosity he informed himself of the religion of those who appeared before him, at all events the enmity he bore to ours carried no weight in the scales. […] At all events the action cannot be reconciled with the cruelties that they say he exercised against us. He was (says Eutropius, my other witness) an enemy of Christianity, but without touching blood. (616)

In the 1580 edition this paragraph regarding Julian's attitude towards Christianity continued with a short reflection on the last moments of the great emperor's life, a segment that was signaled by the second Roman censor and which was removed from the 1582 edition of the *Essays*. The excluded passage read as follows:

> Aussi ce que plusieurs dissent de luy, qu'estant blessé à mort d'un coup de traict il s'escria : Tu as vaincu, ou comme disent les

> autres, Contente toy Nazarien, n'est non plus vraysemblable. Car ceux qui estoient presens à sa mort et qui nous en recitent toutes les particulieres circonstances, les contenances mesmes et les parolles n'en disent rien : non plus que de je ne scay quelz miracles que d'autres y meslent. (V-S, 670, n) [101]

Montaigne questions the historical accuracy of this account, given the lack of any written proof. On the Vatican list of objections, the first reader, The French monk who presumably compiled the first set of observations, made no allusion to this episode; it was the second reader, identified as Lancius, who noted this passage on his objections list. As I have previously stated, the French monk displays a rather literal understanding of the text, whereas the second reader is more perceptive to the subtelties of Montaigne's writing. This is perhaps the reason why Montaigne's direct acknowledgement of Julian's corrupt religious beliefs that opened the paragraph " En matiere de religion il estoit vicieux par tout." (V-S, 670) "In the matter of religion he was bad throughout" (618) sufficed to convince the first reader, but the more erudite background of Lancius discerned a different aspect of this chapter that was irreverent and thus worthy of censure.

As already mentioned above, Montaigne's original response to the Roman criticism in the 1582 edition, was to cut off the short passage that questioned Julian's final words, however leaving other passages that praise his talents. Undoubtedly, the exclusion of this paragraph from the following editions of *Essays* is a reaction to the meeting with the Roman censors. However, if Montaigne had wanted to comply with their suggestions, why didn't he modify the other part of the chapter mentioned by the second reader? Probably because, just as in the case of the objection against the praise of Beza and Buchanan in the previous section, he is not directly concerned with one's

[101] *Essais*, ed. Martin (1580), p. 481

religious allegiance, and is willing to give credit where credit is due. Montaigne's decision only to partially adhere to a censorial remark also reinforces the cordial character of his rapport with the Roman censors, and the amicable nature of their interaction.

However, we must not underestimate Montaigne's commitment to the integrity of his *Essays*. This is why on the Bordeaux copy we rediscover this passage in the body of the text, in the same chapter III.19, only a few lines below where it stood in its original form:

> [C]Ce langage qu'on lui faict tenir, quand il se sentit frappé: Tu as vaincu, Nazareen; ou, comme d'autres: Contente toi, Nazareen, n'eust esté oublié, s'il eust esté creu par mes tesmoings, qui, estans presens en l'armée, ont remerqué jusques aux moindres mouvements et parolles de sa fin, non plus que certains autres miracles qu'on y attache. (V-S, 671)
>
> [c] These words that they have him say when he felt himself struck, "thou hast conquered, Nazarene," or as others have it, "Be content, Nazarene," would not have been forgotten if they had been believed by my witnesses, who, being present in the army, noted even the slightest movements and words at his end, anymore that certain other miracles that people attach to it. (618)

The reappearance of this paragraph denotes not only Montaigne's faithfulness to his original belief that Julian never converted, but that after all these years, he was still engaged in a literary exchange with his censors, and remained influenced by his visit to Rome, even if the changes he made represent a refusal to follow to their suggestions.

4. The Act of Praying

The fourth objection mentioned by Montaigne in his *Travel Journal* refers to the act of praying, " l'animadiversion sur ce que celuy qui prioit devoit estre exempt de

vicieuse inclination pour ce temps" (*JV*, 119) " the objection to the idea that anyone who was praying should be free from evil impulses at the time;" (91) an item discussed by Montaigne in chapter I.56, "Des prières". This essay is one of the most heavily annotated and transformed throughout all the editions. Its text grows considerably in size, from 1150 words in the 1580 edition to a total of 3300 words on the "Exemplaire de Bordeaux" and the posthumous edition of 1595. Its size grew by 187 %; [102] and all these modifications started in 1582, after Montaigne's meeting with the censors. Reading through the official document compiled by the censors now available, we can identify this objection as point 9 on in the list of censorial remarks. The first reader, which we identified as the French monk, notes:

> 9 Primo libro, pagina 482: dice che sempre bisognarebbe dire il pater noster, quod male sapit et che chi sta in peccato fa male a far oracione.

The official thus disapproved of two of Montaigne's views: that it is always necessary ("bisognarebbe") to say the *Pater noster*, judged as a suggestion of "bad taste" (*quod male sapit*); and that those who are in a state of unconfessed sin should not engage in prayer. The second reader glossed over the original commentary made by his collaborator and validated the first item regarding the "patenostre":[103]

> 9 Quello che dice è questo che bisognava dare al Padre nostro questo privilegio ch'il volgo l'havesse sempre nella bocca, quasi vero *hoc non faceret Ecclesia*. L'altro punto pare che se puo colligere di doi luoghi notati nella pag. 483 et 484.

---

[102] Alain Legros, *Essais, I, 56* « Des prières » *Édition annotée des sept premiers états du texte avec étude de genèse et commentaire*, Genève, Droz 2003.

[103] Which explains Montaigne's partial account regarding his objection. The fact that Montaigne omits the first part of this objection from his own list mentioned in the JV, supports our original understanding that the second reader was the more important figure of the two readers, and whose comments resonated more with Montaigne. This person must have been lancius and not the French friar.

He first corrects in Italian the French Monk's inexact interpretation of what Montaigne wrote regarding the Pater noster. Here is the exact passage that the censors saw: "Mais on devoit donner à celle là [Pater noster] ce privilege, que le peuple l'eust continuellement en la bouche:" (V-S, 318a) "But we ought to have given that one this priviledge, that the people should have it continually in their mouth." (279) He knows that Montaigne's statement is in complete agreement with the dogma of the Church, and remarks incisively "quasi vero non feceret Ecclesia" – (as if the Church doesn't do it). Regarding the second point of the objection, the second reader limits his commentary to indicating two more locations, pages 483 and 484, where Montaigne advises that those who are engaged in sin should abstain from the act of praying, which entails purity of the spirit, auspicious for the communication between the human soul and the divine will.

> Il faut avoir l'ame nette, au moins en ce moment auquel nous le prions, et deschargée de passions vitieuses; autrement nous luy presentons nous mesmes les verges dequoy nous chastier. Au lieu de rabiller nostre faute, nous la redoublons, presentans à celuy à qui nous avons à demander pardon, une affection pleine d'irreverence et de haine. Voylà pourquoy je ne loue pas volontiers ceux que je voy prier Dieu plus souvent et plus ordinairement, si les actions voisines de la priere ne me tesmoignent quelque amendement et reformation. (V-S, 319a)
>
> [a] We must have our soul clean, at least in that moment in which we pray to him, and rid of vicious passions; otherwise we ourselves present to him the rods with which to chastise us. Instead of redressing our fault we redouble it when we offer feelings full of irreverence and hatred to him whom we are to ask for pardon. That is why I am not inclined to praise those whom I see praying to God most often and habitually, if the actions surrounding the prayer do not show me evidence of some amendment and reform. (279)

Before we move into further analysis of the comments made by the censors, we must note that none of the two points raised by the censors in this "religiously inspired"

essay represents a major inconsistency with the doctrine preached by the Church. Montaigne was aware that his book would be scrutinized by papal officials during his stay in Rome, and he needed to make a good impression in order to be able to have the Pope's approval? We must understand the objections and remarks of the two censors within the historical and religious context of the time. Malcolm Smith suggested that Montaigne was alluding to matters discussed in the Council of Trent,[104] and speculated that since Montaigne was a layman and not clergy, the French monk considered that he was not to pass judgment on religious matters, this approach being too close to the protestant way (the protestants opened all religious documents to public interpretation). This suggestion also corroborates the addition made in the beginning of "Des Prières", which emphasizes the author intention to write as a layman a text stripped of any religious aspirations. As Smith puts it:

> It is more likely however that the censor did indeed recognize that Montaigne's thought reflected the teaching of Trent but felt apprehensive about any reflection on that teaching, especially by a layman, which did not contextually reproduce it in the form the Council put it.[105]

Alain Legros suggested that it was just plain bad advice, and that with this statement Montaigne was discouraging Catholics from prayer altogether, because they might not always find themselves in the required state of mind, free of all other distractions: " Consequence pratique: faute de pouvoir se mettre souvent en cet état, le laïc peut se sentir invité, en dehors du culte public, à raréfier ses prières"[106] Either way, this objection found its way into the *Journal* as a main concern, and Montaigne first

[104] The French monarchy adopted a rather hostile position vis-a-vis certain points supported by the Roman Catholic Church during the sessions of the Council, and the act of praying was among these.
[105] *Montaigne and the Roman Censors*, p. 63
[106] *Montaigne. Essais, I, 56 'Des prières'*, p. 44

addressed it in the 1582 edition, and in the following editions he continued to build on this initial response, commenting and analyzing his original stand, without however changing his position. The 1582 addition takes the form of a new introduction of the chapter.[107] With this paragraph, Montaigne wants to better frame his ideas, and reinforce his argument.

> Je propose icy des fantasies informes et irresolues, comme font ceux qui publient des questions doubteuses à debattre aux escoles : non pour establir la verité, mais pour la chercher. Et les soubmets au jugement de ceux à qui il touche de regler, non seulement mes actions et mes escris, mais encore mes pensées. Esgalement m'en sera acceptable et utile la condemnation, comme l'approbation. Et pourtant, me remettant toujours à l'authorité de leur censure, qui peut tout sur moy, je me mesle ainsin temerairement à toute sorte de propos, comme icy. (V-S, 317-8a)
>
> [a] I put forward formless and resolved notions, as do those who publish doubtful questions to debate in the schools, not establish the truth, but to seek it. And I submit them to the judgment of those whse concern it is to regulate not only my actions and my writings, but even my thoughts. Equally acceptable and useful to me will be condemnation or approval, [c] since I hold it as execrable if anything is found which was said by me, ignorantly or inadvertently against the holy prescriptions f the Catholic, Apostolic and Roman Church in which I die and in which I was born. [a] and therefore always submitting to the authority of their censure, which has absolute power over me, I meddle rashly with every sort of subject, as I do here. (278)

After this pious introduction Montaigne places the same text that brought him the censure in the first place. Far from simply giving a proof of his allegiance to the Church teachings, this passage gives Montaigne even more liberties than he took before. By using this paragraph as a sort of disclosure, he is now able to freely speculate on the matter, placing all censorship on the shoulders of the Church. Malcolm Smith and Alain

[107] See the commentary in the segment dedicated to the commentary on the use of the word "fortune", *infra* p. 30

Legros both remark the double function of this paragraph inserted in 1582: "… obedience to the authority of the Roman Catholic Church in matters of faith on the one hand and freedom of speculation on the other"[108]. "Le nouvel incipit des Prieres, non sans paradoxe, pousse plus loin encore l'association entre soumission de conscience et liberté de propos…Tout se passe comme si l'existence d'une censure externe dispensait de toute autocensure créant même chez l'auteur des *Essais* une sérénité, une confidence propice à la liberté d'expression,…"[109] However, what none of the two critics did mention is that such strategies were common among authors and philosophers who published their works under the watchful eye of the Church. Reworking and modifying passages in order to veil the original meaning of the passage were successful tactics used by those wrtiters submitted to censorship. In his book, *The Italian Inquisition* Christopher Black remarks: "Except for atheism proper and outright claims for the mortality of the soul, most new thinking could find some tolerance by leading figures in the Church, especially if the person and text concerned presented the ideas as hypothesis, and not absolute truths."[110] Montaigne, as a published author and integral part of the European intellectual nobility was already aware of such practices, and he had already used it in his preface to his translation of Raymond Sebond's *Theologie naturelle*: "Or pour ce que la sacro-saincte Eglise Romaine est mere de tous les Chrestiens fideles, maistresse de grace, reigle de foy et verité, je soubmets entierement à sa correction tout ce qui est dit et contenu en ce mien ouvrage."[111] Due to the continual additions in 1582, 1588 and on the Bordeaux copy, to

---

[108] *Montaigne and the Roman Censors,* p. 64
[109] *Montaigne. Essais, I, 56 'Des prières',* p. 60
[110] *The Italian Inquisition,* p.181
[111] *La Theologie Natvrelle de Raymond Sebon, Tradvicte Novvellement en François par messire Michel, Seigneur de Montaigne, Chevalier de l'ordre du Roy & Gentil-homme ordinaire de sa chambre*, Paris, chez Gilles Grobin, à l'enseigne de l'Esperance devant le College de Cambray, 1581, p. 4 Digitized edition available online in the Google EBooks Collection

the text of “Des prières”, this chapter becomes crucial for understanding the relationship between Montaigne and the Roman censors in the the delicate religious context of his time.

5. Montaigne’s Disapproval of Torture

The fifth objection mentioned by Montaigne in his *Journal de Voyage* refers to the censorial remark regarding his disapproval of torture, “ estimer cruauté de qui est au dela de mort simple.” (*JV*, 119) In the chapters “De la Cruauté” (II 11), and “Couardise, mere de la cruauté” (II, 27), Montaigne endorses humane executions and condemns torture. It was indeed a passage from the essay “De la Cruaute” that triggered the second consultor’s remark: “141 Tutti i castigi oltre la morte istima pura crudeltà.”

> Quant à moy, en la justice mesme, tout ce qui est au delà de la mort simple, me semble pure cruauté, et notamment à nous qui devrions avoir respect d'en envoyer les ames en bon estat; ce qui ne se peut, les ayant agitées et desesperées par tourmens insupportables. (V-S, 431a)
>
> [a] As for me, even in justice, all that that goes beyond plain death seems to me pure cruelty, and especially for us who ought to have some concern about sending souls away in a good state; which cannot happen when we have agitated them and made them desperate by unbearable torture. (381)

This paragraph was not mentioned by the first reader, but in the eyes of the second censor, a more experienced voice in the matter of textual censorship, the specific reference (“notamment à nous”) could be recognized as an indirect attack to the ways in

---

http://books.google.com/books?id=kMO2Z66YK_YC&dq=editions:wZmB5gKWxqAC&source=gbs_navlinks_s

which punishment was assigned in trials presided by catholic judges.[112] Although this essay was carefully considered in the process of re-editing for the 1582 edition of the book, Montaigne did not change or remove this sentence. However, he did respond to the censorial remark by adding two new examples, which emphasize the exemplary ways in which justice was carried in Rome, as to exculpate the Eternal city.

The first addition to the essay in 1582 is a paragraph narrating, from Montaigne's personal experience, the execution of Bartolomeo Catena, a well known thief wo had committed monstrous crimes.[113] The author witnessed this event in Rome during the same trip in which his *Essays* were inspected. The second addition is a short sentence regarding unusual humane customs of other nations involving animals: "Les Turcs ont des aumosnes et des hopitaux pour les bestes." (V-S, 435) "The Turks have alms and hospitals for animals." (685) The first addition, the paragraph narrating Catena's execution is a reflection on the way people react to a more humane execution. It was common practice during that period for the prisoners to be publicly tortured before they were finally killed. In the case of the execution witnessed in Rome, the torture was performed after death: first they executed the prisoner and then they dismembered his body, without subjecting the latter to any unnecessary pain. Montaigne carefully accentuates that an execution has the same impact on its spectators, weather the physical brutality was applied before or after the death of the prisoner. For the unsuspecting reader, "un lecteur suffisant", this example is nothing more than a pertinent case to

[112] As A. Legros remarks in his article *Montaigne face à ses censeurs romains de 1581* : "R2 a bien compris que la critique de Montaigne visait en particulier les juges chrétiens, voire ecclésiastiques, dont les décisions et pratiques contredisent les principes."
[113] See Montaigne's secretary's remarks in the *JV*, p.97

illustrate Montaigne's preceding argument: any punishment involving anything other than death is just pure cruelty.

> Je me rencontray un jour à Rome sur le point qu'on défaisoit Catena, un voleur insigne. On l'estrangla sans aucune émotion de l'asistance; mais quand on vint à le mettre à quartiers, le bourreau ne donnoit coup, que le peuple ne suivit d'une vois pleintive et d'une exclamation, come si chácun eut presté son sentiment à cette charongne. (V-S, 432)

> I happened to be in Rome one day at the moment when they were doing away with Catena, a notorious robber. They strangled him without any emotion among the crowd; but when they came to quarter him, the executioner struck no blow that the people did not follow with a plaintiff cry and exclamation as if everyone has lent his own sense of feeling to that carcass. (382)

But since we are considering this episode in light of Montaigne's meeting with the Roman censors, and particularly in the new light of the official document recently discovered, we notice that Montaigne subtly but unquestionably communicates with the second censor, letting him know that his remark was not left unanswered. He places this passage immediately following the part denounced by the censor, and by praising the Roman ways of implementing justice, he reassures his readers, and the Roman censors that the Catholic Church in Rome is excluded from his critique. Once again, without modifying the text of the *Essays*, Montaigne finds a way to reinforce his arguments and, at the same time, to subscribe to the suggestion made by the censor. It is clear that he does not change his previous position on torture, but reinforces it by adding more supporting evidence in the later editions of 1588 and 1595. On the Bordeaux copy, Montaigne adds another short paragraph preceding the anecdote of the Catena's execution added in 1582 with a biblical reference from Saint Luke: "[C] come Dieu dict, 'Qui

corpus occidunt, et postea non habent quod faciant.'" (V-S, 431)[114] "[c] As God says: they kill the body and after that have no more that they can do [Saint Luke]." (382) Astutely Montaigne quotes the Gospel to seek his censors' approval and show his "good faith" as an author of "livre de bonne foy." (V-S, 3)

The second addition he made to this chapter in 1582 is the short sentence I have already quoted "Les Turcs ont des aumosnes et des hopitaux pour les bestes." (V-S, 435) Montaigne inserted it immediately before the existing sentence regarding another Roman inspired example, this time from its classical period involving the communal respect for animals, and for life in general; "Les Romains avoient un soing public de la nourriture des oyes, par la vigilance desquelles leur capitole avoit esté sauvé;" (V-S, 435) "The Romans made a public charge of the feeding of geese, by whose vigilance their Capitol had been saved" (385). The insertion of this sentence can be read from a double perspective. From the informational point of view, it does not add much to the ideas discussed in the paragraph.[115] From a strategic point of view, we can infer that Montaigne places this sentence immediately before the "Roman example" in order to diversify the spectrum of his examples, taking out of focus the symbolic value of the holy city. This paragraph was also enriched by more additions on the Bordeaux copy, Montaigne adding more examples form other cultures with different religions, who show the same respect for life, if not more, thus further diversifying the nature of his argument:

> Les Agrigentins avoyent en usage commun d'enterrer serieusement les bestes qu'ils avoient eu cheres, comme les chevaux de quelque rare merite, les chiens et les oiseaux utiles ou mesme qui avoyent servy de passe-temps à leurs enfans. Et la magnificence qui leur estoit ordinaire en toutes autres choses, paroissoit aussi

[114] Luke XII, 4

[115] The Ottoman empire is a hot topic at the time, and Montaigne shows interest in its political power as well as its culture.

> singulierement à la sumptoisité et nombre des monuments élevés à cette fin, qui ont duré en parade plusieurs siecles depuis. Les Aegyptiens enterroyent les loups, les ours, les crocodiles, les chiens et les chats en lieux sacrez, enbasmoyent leurs corps et portoyent le deuil à leur trepas. (V-S, 435c)
>
> [c] The Agrigentines commonly gave a solemn burial to animals they had held dear, such a s horse of some rare merit, dogs, and useful birds, even those which had served as a pastime for their children. And the magnificence that was ordinary with them in all other things was also singularly apparent in the sumptuousness and number of the monuments they rose to animals, monuments which have endured in their splendor for many centuries after. The Egyptians buried wolves, bears, crocodiles, dogs and cats in sacred places, embalmed their bodies and wore mourning at their death. (385)

6. The Freedom in the Education of Children

The sixth and last objection mentioned by Montaigne in his *Journal* refers to the place of freedom in the education of children. It primarily bears upon the arguments presented in chapter 26 of the first book, "De l'institution des enfans". Montaigne recalls this objection in his Journal as it follows: "avouant […] qu'il falloit nourrir un enfant a tout faire, et autres telles choses." (*JV*, 119) " that a child should be brought up to do anything." (92) On the official document, this comment is the first objection that appeared on the list compiled by the first reader, the French monk.

> 1 Questo autore in molte cose parla assai profanamente all'usanza de gentili, come pag.221 nella prima parte dice che bisogna avezzar li giovani ad acomodarsi in ogni cosa alli compagni etc. Etiam nelli disordini et cose male come imbriacarsi etc. [116]

In this chapter Montaigne proposes a type of liberal education in which a child should be brought up to be capable of doing "anything". Afford him the experience of making up

[116] Godman, p.339

his own judgement by experiencing a variety of situations, and exposing him to different ideas, and he will learn by himself to choose the right path. This particular approach also includes exposing the student to less than orthodox behavior, which would in turn facilitate a better understanding of the imperfect world we live in, and the best way to approach it by discerning between good and bad examples. The particular passage mentioned by the first censor on page 221 of the 1580 edition, reads:

> L'institution a gaigné cela sur moy, il est vray que ce n'a point esté sans quelque soing, que, sauf la biere, mon appetit est accommodable indifferemment à toutes choses dequoy on se pait. Le corps encore souple, on le doit, à cette cause, plier à toutes façons et coustumes. Et pourveu qu'on puisse tenir l'appetit et la volonté soubs boucle, qu'on rende hardiment un jeune homme commode à toutes nations et compaignies, voire au desreglement et aus exces, si besoing est. Qu'il puisse faire toutes choses, et n'ayme à faire que les bonnes. (V-S, 166-7a)
>
> [a] education has won this much from me – it is true that is not without some trouble – that, except for beer, my appetite adapts itself indiscriminately to everything people eat. While the body is still supple, it should for that reason be bent to all fashions and customs. And provided his apetite and will can be kept in check, let a yound man boldly be made fit for all nations and companies, even for dissoluteness and excess, if need be. [c] […] [a] let him be able to do all things, and love to do only the good. (150)

Perhaps the first reader was shocked by Montaigne's apparent invitation to overindulgence and debauchery because he misses the actual argument, which is to develop in the young student the capacity to choose in his/her own between good and bad things. The accent is placed on the act of conscientious choice that the student would make on his own, understanding why that is the right path. However, the hypothetical initial involvement of the student in immoral activities poses a problem from a Christian point of view, and the second *consultor* agrees with this evaluation. Also, individual

introspection or exploration of the systems already in place brings into mind the projects of the Reformation, who was questioning religious institutions, and their authority. The second reader, recognizes the case made by his collaborator, and it also changes the page of reference, offering a clearer example of the inadequate advice proposed by the author.

> Quanto a la prima: ancor che il autore non dice chiaramente nella pag. 221 che bisogna avezzar li giovani ad imbriacarsi, niente di meno si collige assai di cio che soggionge nella pagina seguente.[117]

He is undoubtedly referring to the following passage on the next page:

> [A]Je veux qu'en la desbauche mesme il surpasse en vigueur et en fermeté ses compagnons, et qu'il ne laisse à faire le mal ny à faute de force ny de science, mais à faute de volonté. (V-S, 167)
>
> [a]Even in dissipation I want him to outdo his comrades in vigor and endurance; and I want him to refrain from doing evil, not for lack of power or knowledge, but for lack of will. (150)

In the 1582 edition, we see very little textual change in this chapter, and no direct response to this objection raised by the censors. There are two minor modifications and two very short additions. The first modification omits the quantifier "un peu" from the qualifier "excusable" regarding the way French writers fail to effectively imitate the sublime energy of classical sources, without any pertinence to the censors' readings or suggestions.[118] The other textual modification is another short omission regarding the description of an instrument that Montaigne's tutors used to wake him up. The text in the 1580 edition read: "il me faisoit esveiller par le son de quelque instrument: et avoit un

---

[117] Godman, p. 340

[118] *Il m'advint l'autre jour de tomber sur un tel passage. J'avois trainé languissant apres des parolles Françoises, si exangues, si descharnées et si vuides de matiere et de sens, que ce n'estoient voirement que paroles Françoises: au bout d'un long et ennuyeux chemin, je vins à rencontrer une piece haute, riche et eslevée jusques aux nues. Si j'eusse trouvé la pente douce et la montée un peu alongée, cela eust esté excusable: c'estoit un precipice si droit et si coupé que, des six premieres paroles, je conneuz que je m'envolois en l'autre monde.* (*Essais* V-S, I.26, p. 147)

joueur d'espinette pour cet effet;"[119] and in 1582 he removed the last sentence after the colon.

These modifications do not correspond to any censorial remarks, or have anything to do with Montaigne's experience in Italy. There are however two textual appendages made in 1582 that pertain to the author's traveling experience. The first addition is a short line from Dante's *Inferno:* "Che non men che saper dubbiar m'aggrada" (For doubting pleases me no less than knowing), Montaigne was presumably struck by this famous line while in Italy and uses it to reinforce his argument about pedagogy. The accent is placed on the process of learning rather than on the results.[120] The second addition is the name of Marc-Antoine de Muret in the list of most appreciated preceptors. Montaigne saw Muret during his trip to Rome, and he was aware of his former preceptor's wide recognition abroad. On the Bordeaux copy Montaigne added a short description following his name. " Marc Antoine Muret, [C] que la France et l'Italie recognoist pour le meilleur orateur du temps." (V-S, 174) "Marc-Antoine Muret, [c] whom France and Italy recognize as the best orator of his time." (157)

In the 1588 edition, we can identify a paragraph that brings into focus the Roman Inquisition in very familiar terms. Montaigne places this episode following an earlier paragraph that discusses the role of authority and its appropriate uses in education. A few lines before the quotation from Dante, added in 1582, we read: [121]

> Je vy privéement à Pise un honneste homme, mais si Aristotélicien, que le plus general de ses dogmes est: que la touche et regle de toutes imaginations solides et de toute verité c'est la conformité à la doctrine d'Aristote; que hors de là ce ne sont que chimeres et inanité; qu'il a tout veu et tout dict. Cette proposition, pour avoir

[119] *Essais* 1580, ed. Martin, v. 1, p. 237
[120] For more on this quotation see *infra* part II, chapter 4. p. 222
[121] This paragraph is also discussed in part II, *infra* p. 196.

> esté un peu trop largement et iniquement interpretée, le mit autrefois et tint long temps en grand accessoire à l'inquisition à Rome. (V-S, 151b)
>
> [b] I had a private talk with a man at Pisa, a good man, but such an Aristotelian that the most sweeping of his dogmas is that the touchstone and measure of all solid speculations and of all truth is conformity with the teaching of Aristotle; that outside of this there is nothing but chimeras and inanity; that Aristotle saw everything and said everything. This proposition, having been interpreted a little to broadly and unfairly, put him once, and kept him long, in great danger of the inquisition at Rome. (134)

This paragraph narrates the story of a man whom Montaigne met during his trip, but also establishes a direct connection with his own experience with the Roman officials. In this passage Montaigne addresses the commission who reviewed and censured his book: the two *consultores* and Sisto Fabri, the Master of the Sacred Palace himself. The Congregation of the Index that was in charge of book censorship, a sister branch of the Inquisitional Tribunal showed more sensibility in interpreting a given text, allowing the author the liberty to defend his book. However, in the paragraph from the *Travel Journal*, Montaigne also mentions among the impressions he experienced during his visit with the *consultores*, that in some cases the censors also interpreted his *Essays* too literally, without really understanding his view. "a d'autres, niant que le correcteur eust entendu ma conception." (*JV*, 119)

Returning to the paragraph indicated by the censor, we must wait until the Bordeaux copy for an addition possibly in response to the objections made by the second censor. Following the criticized passage, Montaigne inserts a citation from Seneca: "Multum interest utrum peccare aliquis nolit aut nesciat." (V-S, 167) [122] "there is a great difference between not wishing to do evil and not knowing how." (150) The citation

[122] Seneca, *Ep*. XC

added later reinforces the finality of his educational method, and the positive long lasting effect of the less than orthodox pedagogical approach of exposing the young to all sins and depravities of society.

Chapter 2

The Thirty Objections on the Vatican Document

In this chapter we will continue our journey through the recently discovered document in the Vatican Archives, identifying the objections made by the official censors, under the direction of Sisto Fabri, the Master of the Sacred Palace, regarding the 1580 edition of the *Essays*.[123] In the previous section we commented on six preliminary points contested by the censors, which were recorded by Montaigne in his *Journal de voyage*. We will now direct our attention towards the remaining thirty or so censorial points, which were not acknowledged by the author in any of his travel documents. Let us recall that the Vatican document contains two separate lists, the first annotated with the letter A and the second with the letter B. In the previous chapter, we suggested that the first compilation of objections belongs to the French monk, and the second, more detailed list to a certain Lancius, the secretary of the Congregation of the Index.

Among the observations not mentioned by Montaigne in his *Journal*, are a great number of comments constructed as misreadings on the part of the Roman officials ("à d'autres niant que le correcteur eust entendu ma conception.") (*JV*, 119) Most of these passages misinterpreted by the Vatican censors have to do with Montaigne's sharp irony. Sometimes the actual meaning surfaces more clearly than others, depending on the commentator's mental agility. The two readers clearly display different levels of understanding the substance of a given passage: While the first reader seems more preoccupied with a literal reading, pointing out several dangerous topics that are being discussed in the book and which should be reconsidered, the second reader appears more

[123] See Appendix A *infra*

resourceful and detects the satirical notes so cleverly implied by the author in these "risky" passages, but doubts that his readers will be able to recognize it as such.

A good example of such interplay between the two readers could be found in observation 4 in the appended document. The first reader identifies a passage in which the author seems to encourage sexual acts for women who say "no" when asked, but allow and engage in carnal pleasures. "Et pag. 30 dice che basta alle donne quando sono richieste dire di no e lasciarsi violare. Onde loda una che, essendo capitata in mano de soldati, ringraciava Dio che s'era saciata de atti carnali senza peccato."[124] The second censor, detects the hidden irony of the passage, but does not approve of Montaigne's approach, inviting him to explain himself. "Forse risponderà l'autore che quelle dice per ironia burlandosi di Parigini, ma ancor che fosse cosi, quel luogo e molto periculoso, per esse cosa si brutta et la ironia si nascosta"[125]

The first censor is consistently offering a rather literal, more limited interpretation of the text, while the second censorial voice brings nuance and perspective to the passages cited by his colleague. This is the main reason why we suggest that the first list belongs to the French monk, and the second set of commentaries is put together by Lancius, a more versed character in the field. This postulation differs entirely from Alain Legros's hypothesis, which attributes the judgment marked with A to Lancius, the secretary of the congregation, and the list marked B to the French monk. After a general comparison of the two different accounts provided on the official document, Legros concludes:

> R2 [the censor behind the second set of observations], plus sensible que R [the censor responsible for the first list of

[124] See more on this objection *infra* p. 174.
[125] See Appendix A *infra* p. 340

> objections] au style de Montaigne, décèle la part d'ironie de certains propos, tout en se souciant de la façon dont un lecteur non averti pourrait comprendre un passage dont l'ironie lui échappe. Il semble par là qu'il ait une connaissance de la langue française meilleure que R, si bien qu'on peut supposer avec vraisemblance qu'il est le "Frater François" dont parle le *Journal de Voyage*.[126]

Legros' characterization of styles for the two officials makes sense. However, we must also consider the attention that Montaigne paid to the two sets of observations, and the precautions he took, if any, to respect and comply with their objections. Following this perspective, we must recognize that he is much more concerned with the second set of corrections, and the strongest evidence is once again provided by his own recounting of the censorial episode in the *Journal*. As stated above, he only mentions six of the 38 total objections: three mentioned by both censors, and three only noticed by the second reader (the use of the word fortune, the objection regarding emperor Julian, and the remark on the disapproval of torture). Also, further treatment and mention of these objections in following editions of the *Essays* led us to the conclusion that the person responsible for the second set of corrections must have held a higher rank with more power. This is why we believe that this person must have been Lancius, and not the French monk. Consequently, the person who compiled the first list of corrections must have been the French monk.

The evidence presented by the document reveals a much more organized and formal analysis of the text than Montaigne led us to believe in his *Journal,* where he did not even distinguish between the two separate readings corresponding to the A and B segments of the document. The first part (A), presents eighteen original remarks, and the notes made in the second part (B) correspond to the response to these original eighteen

[126] Legros, "Montaigne face à ses censeurs romains de 1581", p. 31

items, plus twenty more added points. While also recognizing this discrepancy between Montaigne's own records and the evidence from the newly found document, Emily Butterworth, citing Desan, points out that the two readings represented by A and B were actually discussed separately during the two meetings: "The *Journal de Voyage* does not distinguish between the two readings, suggesting that the second meeting was nothing other than a courtesy call before leaving Rome; in fact it must have been an official reading of the second censure."[127] Yet, this scenario would not have been possible, for the following reason: Montaigne mentions the objections on the use of the word "fortune", on his praise of emperor Julian, and on his view on cruelty right after his first meeting with the censors, and, since these three objections appear only on the second list, he must have seen boths lists during that same first meeting. Therefore, Montaigne's original account from the *Journal* describing the second meeting as a farewell visit could very well be accurate (disproving Desan's and Butterworth's conclusions that the two readings were done separately), since he clearly defended all objections during the first encounter.

Let us now take a closer look at each of these objections and see if and how Montaigne textually addressed them in the 1582 edition of the *Essays*. My further textual investigation is meant to demonstrate the unexpectedly utilitarian nature of the Roman censorship operated on the text of the *Essays*. I will examine the impact of the meeting with the *consultores,* in the form of the itemized list of objections made, and follow Montaigne's reactions to each point as they are reappear in the following editions of his book in 1582, 1588, in the Bordeaux copy, and in 1595, and most importantly how these unofficial answers were disguised in the elaborate form of the essays.

[127] Buterworth, p.170

As in the previous chapter, we will be using the *Réproduction photographique* of the 1580 edition by D. Martin as our orientative copy in order to locate the passages indicated by the censors, and the Villey edition as our reference edition. Also, since the objections are only assigned consecutive numbers in the A list, and just up to 18, we took he liberty of cataloguing the rest of them in consecutive order up to 38, which enabled us to reference them more easily.

1. On Matters of Wealth, Modesty of Women and Suicide
(Objections 2, 3 4)

The first objection that opens the document is referring to a passage from I.26, on the education of children, ("De l'institution des enfans"), and we have already discussed it in the previous section.[128] The second remark on the A list targets a passage from essay I.39, "De la solitude".

> 2 Et pag. 371: biasma quei che si privano delle commodità o per divocione o per philosophare, il che quanto alla divocione è pernicioso a dire.

The text that triggered this comment is the conclusion of Montaigne's reflection on the differences between human dispositions, and how this variation results in several distinctive approaches to public life, and in the distribution of civic functions. Montaigne identifies himself as an individual inclined to more compliant, private endeavors, evaluating his existence average and ordinary. He doesn't like nor engage in human pursuits of excess or extreme deprivation, considering inappropriate any extreme manifestations, even if they reflect cases of intense virtue.

> [A] D'anticiper aussi les accidens de fortune, se priver des commoditez qui nous sont en main, comme plusieurs ont faict par devotion et quelques philosophes par discours, se servir soy-

[128] See *supra* p. 81.

> mesmes, coucher sur la dure, se crever les yeux, jetter ses richesses emmy la riviere, rechercher la douleur (ceux là pour, par le tourment de cette vie, en acquerir la beatitude d'un'autre; ceux-cy pour, s'estant logez en la plus basse marche, se mettre en seurté de nouvelle cheute), c'est l'action d'une vertu excessive. (V-S, 243a)
>
> [a] Moreover, to anticipate the accidents of fortune; to deprive ourselves of the commodities that are in our hands, as many have done through piety and some philosophers through reasons; to wait on ourselves; to sleep on the hard ground; to put out our eyes; to throw our riches into the river; to seek pain, some in order to win bliss in another life by torment in this, others to make themselves safe from a new fall by settling on the lowest step – these are the acts of an excessive virtue. (217)

Certainly, Montaigne refers here to the model of "juste milieu" coined by Aristotle in his study *Nichomachean Ethics,* the desirable "mediocritas" between deficiency and surplus. In his article " Montaigne et Aristote: la conversion à l'*Ethique à Nicomaque*", François Rigolot analyses the nature of Montaigne's attitude towards Aristotle's philosophy.[129] During the first years of composing the *Essays* (1580- 1588), Montaigne had a rathther negative approach regarding the model of wisdom established by the Greek philosopher. This approach was primarily motivated by the abusive use of Aristotelian teachings in the "scholastic practice", a useless and abstract pedagogic technique employed as a dominant pedagogical method at the time. "Cependant si Montaigne nomme fréquemment le Stagirite c'est généralement pour se moquer moins de sa philosophie que de l'usage abusive qui en a été fait par une scolastique décadente."[130] A good exemple of such use of Aristotle's name we find in chapter De l'Institution des enfans (I.26) : « Qu'il luy face tout passer par l'estamine et ne loge rien en sa teste par simple authorité et à credit; les principes d'Aristote ne luy soyent principes, non plus que ceux des Stoiciens ou

[129] "Montaigne et Aristote: la conversion à l'*Ethique à Nicomaque*", *Au-delà de la Poétique: Aristote et la littérature de la Renaissance,* ed. Ulrich Langer, Geneva, Droz 2002, pp.47-63
[130] François Rigolot, " Montaigne et Aristote: la conversion à l'*Ethique à Nicomaque*", p. 48

Epicuriens. Qu'on luy propose cette diversité de jugemens: il choisira s'il peut, sinon il en demeurera en doubte." (V-S, 151) "Let the tutor make his charge pass everything through a sieve and lodge nothing in his head on mere authority and trust: let not Aristotle's principles be principles to him any more than those of Stoics or Epicureans." (135) However, in the above-cited passage objected to by the Roman censor, Montaigne does not refer to this type Aristotelian dogma. He brings into focus the principle of the "golden mean" from the treatise *Nicomachean Ethics*. François Rigolot explains in his article that given Montaigne's later interest (after 1588) in this treatise, all possible allusions to this principle must have reached him via other Latin texts inspired from the philosophy of *Nicomachean Ethics*.

> A notre avis, tous les autres échos qu'on peut trouver de l'Ethique à Nicomaque ne viennent pas de l'ouvrage grec ou de ses traductions, mais dérivent d'ouvrages latins de seconde main, inspirés par la morale du Philosophe. [Comme les œuvres morales de Cicéron: *De officiis, De amicitia, De senectute*] Tout cela changera après 1588. Aristote ne sera plus cité par Montaigne que pour servir de soutien à tel ou tel point moral qui lui tient au cœur.[131]

It is thus quite possible that this was the case for the passage, which attracted the censors' attention, in which Montaigne advocates against excess in every domanin, even when it comes to the notion of virtue. His example however is not well received by the first reader who immediately associates Montaigne's comment with an attack against Christian exemplarity, particularly the case of saints and martyrs brought into question by the Reformation. These canonical figures were models of Catholic devotion through their voluntary renunciation of all life's pleasures or riches, leading existences of extreme austerity and sometimes poverty. The second censor however, seems to show less

[131] Francois Rigolot, " Montaigne et Aristote: la conversion à l'*Ethique à Nicomaque*", p. 50

concern about this statement, recognizing that this account is a personal opinion of the author. He changes the tone of the original concern, which reads the passage as direct blame "biasma" and qualifies the comment pernicious ("pernicioso") to a more unaffected tone, derived form a personal opinion.

> 2 Quanto a la 2a, quello che dice è, che opinarsi delle comodita è attorno d'una virtu eccesiva, e poi lauda la mediocrita et cio che, quanto a lui, a assai a fare senza andare innanzi – nel che acenna non so che contra l'austerita religiosa.

He acknowledges that Montaigne rejects "religious austerity", but he regards it as a personal preference "quanto a lui" attributed to the individual limitations of his weak nature. His remark is formulated more as a clarification of the text's message " quello che dice è," in response to the first reader's harsh, accusatory remarks. Montaigne doesn't change this text in any of the follwing editions, reassured perhaps by the second censor's response.

Objection 3 concerns the act of suicide. The French Monk notes: "3 Nel 20 libro pagina 17: par che senta bene dell'ammazzar se stesso et che dice che par che Dio ci dia licencia d'ammazzarci, quando ci pone in tal stato ch'il vivere ci è peggio." The page indicated in this objection is probably a mistake because the second reader restates the page numbers, 21-22 of book II, aware of this inconsistency and pointing to the correct reference. " 3 Quanto a la terza: non solo in quell lugo (pag. 21 et 22) pare laudare quei che s'amazzano se stessi pag.21 et 22 ma anco in altri luoghi par fare il medesimo come [1] a parte, pagina166 et 2a parte, 576." This second reader, presumed by us as Lancius, agrees thus with his collaborator regarding the passages from II. 3, "Coustume de l'isle de Cea", and also directs this censorial remark to two more areas of the text, I. 24 "Divers

evenemens de mesme conseil", and II. 35 "De trois bonnes femmes". Here is the original passage from II.3 that prompted the two censors to question Montaigne's approach regarding the issue of suicide.

> [A]La plus volontaire mort, c'est la plus belle. La vie despend de la volonté d'autruy; la mort, de la nostre. En aucune chose nous ne devons tant nous accommoder à nos humeurs, qu'en celle-là. La reputation ne touche pas une telle entreprise, c'est folie d'en avoir respect. Le vivre, c'est servir, si la liberté de mourir en est à dire. Le commun train de la guerison se conduit aux despens de la vie: on nous incise, on nous cauterise, on nous detranche les membres, on nous soustrait l'aliment et le sang; un pas plus outre, nous voilà gueris tout à fait. Pourquoy n'est la vaine du gosier autant à nostre commandement que la mediane? Aux plus fortes maladies les plus forts remedes. Servius le Grammairien, ayant la goutte, n'y trouva meilleur conseil que de s'appliquer du poison et de tuer ses jambes. [C]Qu'elles fussent podagriques à leur poste, pourveu que ce fut sans sentiment' [A] Dieu nous donne assez de congé, quand il nous met en tel estat que le vivre nous est pire que le mourir. (V-S, 350)
>
> [a] The most voluntary death is the fairest. Life depends on the will of others; death, on our own. In nothing should we suit our own humor as much as in this. Reputation s not concerned in such an enterprise; it is folly to consider it. Life is slavery if the freedom to die is wanting. The ordinary curse of a cure is carried on at the expense of life: they incise us, they cauterize us, they amputate our limbs, they deprive us of food and blood. One step further and we are completely cured. Why is not the jugular vein as much at our disposal as the median vein? For the most violent diseases the most violent remedies. Servius the grammarian, having the gout found no better plan for it than to apply poison and kill his legs. [c] Let them be as gouty as they like provided they were insensitive. [a] God gives us leave enough when he puts us in such a state that it is worse to live than to die. (306)

The sentence marked with the letter C was introduced after 1588, on the Bordeaux copy. It is clear why this paragraph stood out for the first censor. From the first sentence the author proclaims suicide as the most beautiful death, while the Catholic Church established without excuse that suicide is a sin. However, as both censors seem to also

observe, Montaigne's text cannot be judged partially, and this long argument is part of a longer and more complex debate, in which his position is actually not stated. In order to appreciate the role of this paragraph in the greater organization of the debate, "un lecteur suffisant" must continue the reading on the next page until the author reaches the opposite view. Here is the text that appears in the 1580, 1582, and 1588 editions (on the Bordeaux copy the second sentence starting from "Car outre" up to "d'autre philosophes", the text in italics, was replaced with "Car plusieurs")

> Mais ceci ne s'en va pas sans contraste. *Car outre l'authorite, qui en defendant l'homicide y enveloppe l'homicide de soy mesmes: dautres philosophes* tienent, que nous ne pouvons abandoner cete garnison du monde sans le commendement expres de celuy qui nous y a mis; et que c'est à Dieu, qui nous a icy envoyez non pour nous seulement, ains pour sa gloire et service d'autruy, de nous donner congé quand il luy plaira, non à nous de le prendre. (V-S, 352)
>
> [a] This does not pass without contradiction. *For many* [hold that we cannot abandon this garrison of the world without the express command of him who has placed us in it; and that it is for God, who has sent us here not for ourselves alone, but his glory and a service of others, to give us leave when he pleases, not for us to take it. (307)

Following the articulation of this second viewpoint, he goes on enumerating the examples that support this Christian approach.

> Et l'opinion qui desdaigne nostre vie, elle est ridicule. Car en fin c'est nostre estre, c'est nostre tout. Les choses qui ont un estre plus noble et plus riche, peuvent accuser le nostre; mais c'est contre nature que nous nous mesprisons et mettons nous mesmes à nonchaloir; c'est une maladie particuliere, et qui ne se voit en aucune autre creature, de se hayr et desdeigner. C'est de pareille vanité que nous desirons estre autre chose que ce que nous sommes. Le fruict d'un tel desir ne nous touche pas, d'autant qu'il se contredict et s'empesche en soy. Celuy qui desire d'estre fait d'un homme ange, il ne fait rien pour luy, il n'en vaudroit de rien mieux. Car, n'estant plus, qui se resjouyra et ressentira de cet amendement pour luy? (V-S, 353)

> [a] As for the opinion that disdains our life, it is ridiculous. For after all, life is our being, it is our all. Things that have a nobler and richer being may accuse ours; but it is against nature that we despise ourselves and care nothing about ourselves. It is a malady peculiar to men, and not seen in any other creature, to hate and disdain himself. It is by a similar vanity that we wish to be something other than we are. The object of such a desire does not really affect us, inasmuch as the desire contradicts and hinders itself within. A man who wishes to be made into an angel does nothing for himself; [c] he would never benefit from the change. [a] For when he is no more who will feel and rejoice in this improvement for him? (308)

Furthermore, Montaigne excludes himself from the debate in one of the following paragraphs. “Entre ceux du premier avis [the adepts of suicide], il y a eu un grand doute…” (V-S, 353) After careful consideration, the reader can comprehend that Montaigne’s position is not with the partisans of suicide; rather, he examines neutrally this debate, and judging by formulation of their remarks, we are of the opinion that both censors picked up on this textual development. The first reader says the the author seems to have good feelings about the act of suicide, “par che senta bene dell’ammazzar se stesso”, and the second notes that Montaigne seems to praise “pare laudare” the act. The verb “to seem” playing an important role in assessing the censors’ perception.

In the 1582 edition there is no response from Montaigne to this objection. The text remained unchanged until the Bordeaux copy, which enriches the original concept of approving the act of suicide with a series of examples from the classics.

> [C]C'est foiblesse de ceder aux maux, mais c'est folie de les nourrir. Les Stoiciens disent que c'est vivre convenablement à nature, pour le sage, de se departir de la vie, encore qu'il soit en plein heur, s'il le faict opportuneement; et au fol de maintenir sa vie, encore qu'il soit miserable, pour veu qu'il soit, en la plus grande part des choses qu'ils disent estre selon Nature. Comme je n'offense les loix qui sont faictes contre les larrons, quand j'emporte le mien, et que je me

> coupe ma bourse; ny des boutefeuz, quand je brusle mon bois: aussi ne suis je tenu aux loix faictes contre les meurtriers pour m'avoir osté ma vie. Hegesias disoit que, comme la condition de la vie, aussi la condition de la mort devoit despendre de nostre eslection. Et Diogenes, rencontrant le philosophe Speusippus, affligé de longue hydropisie, se faisant porter en littière, qui luy escria: Le bon salut! Diogenes.--A toi, point de salut, respondit il, qui souffres le vivre, estant en tel estat.
>
> De vray, quelque temps après Speusippus se fit mourir, ennuié d'une si penible condition de vie. (V-S, 351)

> [c] It is weakness to yield to ills, but it is madness to foster them. The Stoics that it is living in conformity with nature for the sage to part with life even in full happiness, if he does so opportunely, and for the fool to cling to his life, even though he is miserable – the essential thing, for both men, is to be in general harmony with nature. Just as I do not violate the laws against thieves when I carry away my own money and cut my own purse, or those against firebugs when I burn my own wood, so I am not bound by the laws against murderers for having taken my own life. Hegesias used to say that like to condition of life, the condition of death ought to depend on our choice. And when Diogenes met the philosopher Speusippus, long afflicted with the dropsy, and being carried in a litter, who called out to him "Good health to you, Diogenes!" he replied "No health to you, who endure life, being in such a state." Indeed, sometime after Speusippus killed himself weary of such a painful condition of life. (306)

If we consider this passage in light of the other textual modification regarding this debate (see note 3 on the previous page), which removes the reference to the authority of "philosophes" related to the Christian approach to suicide, we can interpret the debate as an unambiguous comparison between the pagan and the Christian positions. However, there is a short sentence that Montaigne adds on the Bordeaux copy that, although placed a few pages later in the chapter, seems to pertain to the religious approach regarding the act of suicide. "[C]L'histoire ecclésiastique a en reverence plusieurs tels exemples de personnes devotes qui apelerent la mort à garant contre les outrages que les tirans

preparoient à leur conscience." (V-S, 357) [132] "[c]Church history holds in reverence several such examples of devout people who called on death to protect them against outrages that tyrants were preparing against conscience." (312)

Lancius' remark also points out to two other paragraphs that contain similar arguments regarding the act of suicide, in which the sentiments of the author appear to be in agreement with a non-religious approach. The first one is in chapter "Divers evenemens de mesme conseil" (I. 24).

> Il me souvient avoir leu autrefois l'histoire de quelque Romain, personnage de dignité lequel, fuyant la tyrannie du Triumvirat, avoit eschappé mille fois les mains de ceux qui le poursuivoyent, par la subtilité de ses inventions. Il advint un jour, qu'une troupe de gens de cheval, qui avoit charge de le prendre, passa tout joignant un halier où il s'estoit tapy, et faillit de le descouvrir; mais luy, sur ce point là, considerant la peine et les difficultez ausquelles il avoit desjà si long temps duré, pour se sauver des continuelles et curieuses recherches qu'on faisoit de luy par tout, le peu de plaisir qu'il pouvoit esperer d'une telle vie, et combien il luy valoit mieux passer une fois le pas que demeurer tousjours en cette transe, luy mesme les r'apella et leur trahit sa cachete, s'abandonnant volontairement à leur cruauté, pour oster eux et luy d'une plus longue peine. (V-S, 132a)
>
> [a] I remember having read once the story of some Roman, a personage of dignity, who, fleeing the tyranny of the Triumvirate, had a thousand times escaped the hands of his pursuers by the subtlety of his devices. It happened one day that a troop of horsemen who had orders to take him passed right next to a thicket where he had hidden and just missed discovering him. But at that point, considering the trouble and hardships which he had already so long endured to save himself from the continual careful searches that were made for him everywhere, the little pleasure he could hope for from such a life, and how much better it was for him to take the step once and for all than to remain always in this apprehension, he himself called them back and betrayed his hiding place to them, voluntarily abandoning himself to their cruelty in order to rid them and himself of further trouble. (117)

[132] This textual addition also connects to objection 4 on our list and I will come back to it in the analysis of the next objection on the list.

In this paragraph Montaigne approaches the topic in following the similar method of "iudicio alternante". He first seems to agree with the initial postulation:

> D'appeller les mains ennemies, c'est un conseil un peu gaillard; si croy-je qu'encore vaudroit-il mieux le prendre que de demeurer en la fievre continuelle d'un accident qui n'a point de remede. (V-S, 132)
>
> To call out for the hand of the enemy is a rather extreme measure, yet a better one, I think, than to remain in continual fever over an accident that has no remedy. (117)

Then he turns the tables to conclude in the opposite side of the argument.

> Mais, puisque les provisions qu'on y peut aporter sont pleines d'inquietude et d'incertitude, il vaut mieux d'une belle asseurance se preparer à tout ce qui en pourra advenir, et tirer quelque consolation de ce qu'on n'est pas asseuré qu'il advienne. (V-S, 132)
>
> But, since all the precautions that a man can take are full of uneasiness and uncertainty, it is better to prepare with fine assurance for the worst that can happen, and derive some consolation from that fact we are not sure that it will happen. (117)

The context of this closing paragraph is the analysis of various outcomes derived from similar situations when princes and emperors are threatened by conspiracy. Montaigne did not change this final paragraph of I.24 in the 1582 edition. In 1588, he will add a substantial number of examples, all from classical sources and authors, pertaining to his original point of successful dealing with avowed conspirators, nothing related to the closing example of self-elected death. On the Bordeaux copy, we note a new addition immediately preceding the example in question. This time, Montaigne alludes to an episode from Machiavel's *History of Florence,* (Book II, Chapter 8) in which the duke of Athens, also appointed duke of Florence, killed Matteo Morozzo, a friendly courtier who advised him of the conspiracies plotted against him.

The second objectionable paragraph indicated by Lancius is in II. 35 “De trois bonnes femmes”. In his passage Montaigne praises the honorable example of Arria, Paetus’wife who killed herself out of love and respect for her husband.

> son mary Paetus n'ayant pas le coeur assez ferme de soy-mesme pour se donner la mort, à laquelle la cruauté de l'Empereur le rengeoit, un jour entre autres, apres avoir premierement emploié les discours et enhortements propres au conseil qu'elle luy donnoit à ce faire, elle print le poignart que son mary portoit, et le tenant trait en sa main, pour la conclusion de son exhortation: Fais ainsi, Paetus, luy dit-elle. Et en mesme instant, s'en estant donné un coup mortel dans l'estomach, et puis l'arrachant de sa playe, elle le luy presenta, finissant quant et quant sa vie avec cette noble, genereuse et immortelle parole: *Paete, non dolet*. Elle n'eust loisir que de dire ces trois paroles d'une si belle substance: Tien, Paetus, il ne m'a poinct faict mal. (V-S, 746-7a)

> Since her husband Paetus had not a firm enough heart to put himself to death on his own, as the emperor’s cruelty forced him to do, one day among others, after having first employed the arguments and exhortations appropriate to the advice she was giving him to do this, she took the dagger that her husband was wearing and holding it drawn in her hand, for the conclusion of her exhortations she said to him: “do this, Paetus.” And at the same moment, having given herself a fatal blow in the stomach and then turned the dagger out of her wound, she presented it to him, at the same time ending her life with this noble, generous, and immortal saying: “Paete non dolet”. She had time only to speak those three words of such beautiful substance: “See, Paetus, it did not hurt me.” (685)

Overall Montaigne changes the form of this essay very little in the following editions of the *Essays*, and none of the additions he made to the original form of the 1580 text reviewed by the censors had anything to do with the example set by Arria, Paetus’wife, and her admirable death. However, this passage narrating the death of Arria is a particularly revealing segment in discussing the topic of suicide in the context of its appearance on the censorial list. Returning to the previous passages indicated by the censors, we note that Montaigne is fascinated with the idea of a bold, courageous death

rather than with the specific act of suicide, and even if his views on death change in time, he doesn't loose this particular interest in discussing and analyzing models of heroic deaths.[133]

I also believe that both censors were aware of this distinction in Montaigne's discourse, but they agreed that the topic of suicide was too dangerous from a religious point of view. However, they did not directly accuse the author, as they both used the verb "parere" – "to seem" in their evaluations. The first censor notes that the author "seems to have good feelings about suicide" and "[seems] to say that God gives permission to kill one's self". This is not a direct accusation against the author, but some miscommunication of the text. Lancius agrees in his list of corrections with the erroneously postulated position of the author on the matter. "non solo in quel luogo […] pare laudare" – "not only on that place seems to praise "[…] ma anco in altri luoghi par fare il medesimo" - "but also in other places seems to do the same". If the censors did understand that Montaigne's paragraph was not his personal stance on the matter, and they did not misinterpret the passage, we must assume that this particular objection was not part of those alleged points mentioned in his *Journal*, in which the censor did not grasp the meaning of the text "niant que le correcteur eust entendu ma conception."(*JV*, 119)

The first reader identifies another questionable passage in II.3 "Coustume de l'isle de Cea". This time the author seems to encourage the duplicitous engagement of women in sexual acts, by saying "no" when asked, but by allowing and practicing acts of carnal pleasures. "Et pag. 30 dice che basta alle donne quando sono richieste dire di no e

[133] See his views on the topic of death in the early essays I.14 and I.19 – in contrast with his final approaches on the same topic particularly evident in III.12

lasciarsi violare. Onde loda una che, essendo capitata in mano de soldati, ringraciava Dio che s'era saciata de atti carnali senza peccato."[134] The second censor, detects the hidden irony of the passage, but does not approve of Montaigne's approach, inviting him to explain himself. "Forse risponderà l'autore che quelle dice per ironia burlandosi di Parigini, ma ancor che fosse cosi, quel luogo e molto periculoso, per esse cosa si brutta et la ironia si nascosta." This is one of the instances mentioned by Montaigne in his *Journal*, in which he had to explain his text to Sisto Fabri, the Maestro del Sacro Palazzo who held the final judgement in the matter: "et [Fabri] se contentoit tant des excuses que je fasois sur chaque article d'animadiversion que luy avoit laissé ce Francois." (*JV*, 119)

Although this fourth objection seems to be completely unconnected contextually, with the previous point regarding the act of suicide, in the essay II.3 the two concepts are linked. Among the models of suicide expressed by the author, there is the example of suicide by Christian virtue, which he discuses in the following paragraph, noted by the censors.

> Pelagia et Sophronia toutes deux canonisées, celle-là se precipita dans la riviere avec sa mere et ses soeurs pour eviter la force de quelques soldats, et cette-cy se tua aussi pour eviter la force de Maxentius l'Empereur. [C]L'histoire ecclésiastique a en reverence plusieurs tels exemples de personnes devotes qui apelerent la mort à garant contre les outrages que les tirans preparoient à leur conscience. [A] Il nous sera à l'adventure honnorable aux siecles advenir qu'un sçavant autheur de ce temps, et notamment Parisien, se met en peine de persuader aux Dames de nostre siecle de prendre plustost tout autre party que d'entrer en l'horrible conseil d'un tel des-espoir. Je suis marry qu'il n'a sceu, pour mesler à ses comptes, le bon mot que j'apprins à Toulouse, d'une femme passée par les mains de quelques soldats: Dieu soit loué, disoit-elle, qu'au moins une fois en ma vie je m'en suis soulée sans peché'A la verité, ces cruautez ne sont pas dignes de la douceur Françoise; aussi, Dieu mercy, nostre air s'en voit infiniment purgé depuis ce bon advertissement: suffit qu'elles dient nenny en le faisant, suyvant la

[134] Appenix A, p. 339

> reigle du bon Marot. L'Histoire est toute pleine de ceux qui, en mille façons, ont changé à la mort une vie peneuse. (V-S, 356-7)
>
> [a]Pelagia and Sophronia both have been canonized; Pelagia threw herself in the river with her mother and sisters to escape being raped by some soldiers, and Sophronia killed herself to escape the violence of the Emperor Maxentius. [c] Church history holds in reverence several such examples of devout people who called o death to protect them against outrages that tyrants were preparing against their conscience. [a] It will perhaps be to our honor in the centuries to come that a learned author of this day and a Parisian at that, takes pains to persuade the ladies of out time to make up their minds to anything rather than adopt the horrible counsel of such despair. I am sorry that he did not know and insert among his stories the good one I heard at Toulouse of a woman who had passed through the hands of some soldiers: " God be praised," she said, " that at least once in my life I have had my fill without sin!" In truth these cruelties are not worthy of the gentle ways of France; and so thank God, our atmosphere has been throughly purged of them by that man's good advice. Enough for them to say No while doing it, following the rule of our good Marot. History is chalk full of those who in a thousand ways have changed a painful life for death. (312)

The subject raised is of outmost importance, and deserves respectful acknowledgement, rather than a comical tone. Montaigne first introduces the virtuous example of two women, Pelagia and Sophronia, who chose death rather than dishonor, due to malicious acts during the Diocletian Persecution in the case of the former, or in order to save herself from being disgraced by soldiers in the case of the latter. However, this passage containing the exemplarity of the two sanctified women, also displays a great dose of irony and indirectly references contemporary sources, as the second reader very well remarked. Montaigne hints at the work of two French, Protestant authors, Henri Estienne and Clement Marot. Both humanists engaged in irreverent literature, erotic or non-religious. Of course, just as in the previous instance regarding the act of suicide, Montaigne's intention is to contrast the two diametrically opposite stands represented on

one side by the virtue of the two women saints, and on the other side by the two contemporary figures of Clement Marot (1496-1544) and Henri Estienne (1528-1598).

In the case of Henri Estienne, "scavant autheur de ce temps, et notament parisien", Montaigne probably references his *Apologie pour Herodote*, which is practically a bitter satire of the period, particularly targeting the practices and representatives of the Roman Church, in the form of a collection of uncanny stories following the literary example set by Herodotus. In the case of the "bon" Marot, Montaigne alludes to one of his famous huitain, *De ouy et nenny*. In which the author advises women to adopt a coquettish, teasing attitude.

> Ung doulx Nenny, avec ung doulx soubzrire
> Est tant honneste, il le vous fault apprendre:
> Quant est d'Ouy, si veniez à le dire,
> D'avoir trop dict je vouldroys vous reprendre:
> Non que je soys ennuyé d'entreprendre
> D'avoir le fruict, dont le desir me poingt:
> Mais je vouldroys, qu'en me le laissant prendre,
> Vous me disiez, non, vous ne l'aurez point.[135]

This irreverent paragraph connects to the previous objection made by the censors regarding the act of suicide, and triggers two censorial remarks, the fourth, iterated above, and also the fifteenth from the official document: "15 Et pag. 32: approva un detto del buon Marot, et lo chiama buono, essendo egli heretici – questi autori o sono heretici o sono poco boni"[136] This is perhaps the reason why on the Bordeaux copy Montaigne finally reacts at a textual level, with a succinct remark that separates the two contrasting examples: the religious with the examples of Pelagia and Sophronia, and the contemptuous with the examples of Marot and Estienne. This sentence has a closing

[135] *Oeuvres Complètes,* ed. François Rigolot, Garnier-Flammarion, Paris, 2007, vol I, p. 449
[136] For a more detailed analysis of this point see Chapter 1 *supra* p. 54.

function for the first religious example, thus attempting to suggest that there is no connection between the two. “L'histoire ecclésiastique a en reverence plusieurs tels exemples de personnes devotes qui apelerent la mort à garant contre les outrages que les tirans preparoient à leur conscience.” (V-S, 357) Additionally, this short statement also responds to the objections of the censors regarding Montaigne’s conception of suicide, by proving that there are several examples involving this act that are not only accepted, but revered by the Roman Catholic Church.

2. On Matters Addressed in II. 12 “Apologie de Raimond Sebond”
(Objections 5, 6, 8, 12, 29, 32, 33, 34, 18)

The fifth observation on the list is the first of several comments generated by the longest essay II. 12, “Apologie de Raimond Sebond”. We will thus devote the following section to these objections, (a total of eight, although they were not marked in consecutive order). The fifth observation pertains to a passage in which Montaigne compares people to animals, evaluating that what we call natural instincts, are not just biological or environmental impulses, and that they stem from a process of reason and choice comparable to the human intelligence.

> [A] Je dy donc, pour revenir à mon propos, qu'il n'y a point d'apparence d'estimer que les bestes facent par inclination naturelle et forcée les mesmes choses que nous faisons par nostre choix et industrie. Nous devons conclurre de pareils effects pareilles facultez, et confesser par consequent que ce mesme discours, cette mesme voye, que nous tenons à ouvrer, c'est aussi celle des animaux. (V-S, 460)
>
> [a] So I say, to return to my subject, that there is no apparent reason to judge that the beasts do by natural and obligatory instinct the same things that we do by our choice and cleverness. We must infer from like results like faculties, and consequently confess that this same reason this same method that we have for working, is also that of the animals. (408)

The first censor judged this approach as "not very Christianly" – "5 Page. 182 aguagla in tutto l'huomo all'altri animali poco christianamente et parla male del libero arbitrio." The second censor doesn't add any of his own observations regarding this topic but he appears to agree with his collaborator because he adds further references on the matter on page 181 and 182 (of the second book). "I luoghi dove parla similamente sono notati nella pag. 181 et 182." The other passage that the second censor must have noted on page 181, is a reinforcement of the place that people have in relation to other creatures. While the Bible clearly states that the man plays the role of master among beasts, Montaigne's passage infers a different relationship between the two classes : "Nous ne sommes ny au dessus, ny au dessoubs du reste: tout ce qui est sous le Ciel, dit le sage, court une loy et fortune pareille, […]Le miserable n'a gardé d'enjamber par effect au delà; il est entravé et engagé, il est assubjecty de pareille obligation que les autres creatures de son ordre, et d'une condition fort moyenne, sans aucune prerogative, praeexcellence vraye et essentielle. (V-S, 459-460a) "We are neither nor below the rest: all that is under heaven, says the sage, incurs the same law and the same fortune, […] The poor wretch is in no position really to step outside them; he is fettered and bound, he is subjected to the same obligations as the other creatures of his class, and in a very ordinary condition, without any real and essential prerogative or preeminence." (408) In these sections, Montaigne also touched on the controversial topic of "free will" which was of major importance in the rupture between Catholics and Protestants. He seems to imply that the concept of "free will" is a fabrication of human vanity, and thus draws very near to the protestant concept of predestination and lack of free will. Montaigne

does not alter this text in any of the following editions, confident that his final considerations will exonerate and explain his earlier premises of the chapter.

The entire essay on the apology of Sebond is a rhetorical strategy prepared by Montaigne in order to exonerate the reputation of the Spanish Theologian, and in the end Montaigne ties together his previously individual segments in an all-catholic and pious conclusion that rehabilitates his original postulations. This is perhaps the reason why the second censor, whose influence seems to be much greater on Montaigne's textual modifications, tends to undermine or overlook the other objection, number 12, regarding this chapter and the treatment of Sebond, made by the first reader. To the original remark that the French monk advances "12 Et cap 12: defende Raymondo Sebondo", Lancius reacts with an appeasing note: "12 E vero che defende Raymodo Seboni, ma in quell autore non v'e altro prohibito che la prefacione". This interaction between the two readers is also noted by Montaigne in his *Journal* when he acknowledges the competence of the two censors and their over arching expertise: "mais c'est merveille combien ils cognoissent les hommes de nos contrées, et Sebon, ils me dirent que la preface estoit condamnée." (*JV*, 120)[137] Montaigne's text regarding objection 5, regarding the difference of status between men and beasts and the role of free will remained thus unchanged in the paragraphs cited. For the 1588 and the 1592 editions, he adds some more examples and clarifications in the close vicinity of the paragraphs mentioned by the censors and cited above, but no direct or indirect acknowledgement of the censorial comments. The sources for all his following additions are classical authors, whose observations complete the vision of the human being as a slave to his vanity.

[137] The name of Sebond appears in François Rigolot's edition of the *Journal*, but Querlon transcribed this passage as follows "et le bon ils me dirent que la preface etoit condamnee" (p.158). The Leydet copy replaces "le bon" with "Sebon" – see *Journal*, ed. Rigolot, p.120 n.59

The “Apologie de Raimond Sebond”, served as context for several others objections documented by either of the two readers. This is the also the case of objection number 6 in the document that pertains to a later paragraph in the Apology, in which the first reader mistakenly interprets an example from Montaigne’s own experience inserted as supportive material for his argument that even the most perfectly compiled texts (i.e. the gospels) can give room to erroneous interpretations. The first censor writes: “6 Pag. 363: loda una che prova l’arte della pietra philosophica con cinque autorita della Sacra Scriptura.” The denominative “una” must be a mistake because in the paragraph indicated at page 363 of the second book, Montaigne clearly states that he is talking about a man.

> Un personnage de dignité, me voulant approuver par authorité cette queste de la pierre philosophale où il est tout plongé, m'allegua dernierement cinq ou six passages de la Bible, sur lesquels il disoit s'estre premierement fondé pour la descharge de sa conscience (car il est de profession ecclesiastique); et, à la verité, l'invention n'en estoit pas seulement plaisante, mais encore bien proprement accommodée à la deffence de cette belle science. (V-S, 585-6a)
>
> A certain dignitary, trying to justify to me by authority that quest of the philosopher’s stone in which he is completely immersed lately alleged to me five or six passages from the Bible on which he said he had primarily relied for the discharge of his conscience (for he is an ecclesiastic by profession); and in truth, his discovery was not only amusing, but also very properly suited to the defense of that fine science. (537)

This paragraph is a mere illustration of what Montaigne denounces as common practice among heretical writers who mislead people by falsely interpreting holy texts, completing the idea enunciated in the previous paragraph.

> En la parole la plus nette, pure et parfaicte qui puisse estre, combien de fauceté et de mensonge a l'on fait naistre? quelle heresie n'y a trouvé des fondements assez et tesmoignages, pour entreprendre et pour se maintenir? C'est pour cela que les autheurs de telles erreurs

> ne se veulent jamais departir de cette preuve, du tesmoignage de l'interpretation des mots. (V-S, 585a)
>
> In the clearest, purest, and most perfect writing that can be, how much falsehood and lying has been brought to birth? What heresy has not found in it grounds and testimonies enough to make its start and to maintain itself? It is for that reason that the authors of such errors will never give up this form of proof, from the evidence of the interpretation of words. (537)

There is a paradoxical connection between the paragraph cited that denounces the act of misinterpreting/misreading certain texts, and the objection brought forward by the first censor, who does exactly that which the paragraph denounces: misinterprets a paragraph that denounces misinterpretation. It is once again an obvious case of misunderstanding on the part of the reader, a situation which Montaigne documented more generally in his *Journal* "niant que le correcteur eust entendu ma conception." (JV, 119) This is the reason why the text alluded to in this objection also remains unaltered in the 1582, or any later editons.

Lancius, a more careful reader, chooses to ignore this remark of the French monk, completely skipping point 6 on his list of objections. He also excludes from his commentaries objection 8 marked by his collaborator on his A list. "8 Pag.167 et 168: dice che l'accioni nostre etiam della ragione e de vertu e vicii sono sottoposte al cielo et stele." This comment follows the example of the previous censorial remark made by the French monk, in the sense that once more, the reader fails to understand the meaning implied by the author. In this segment of the essay, Montaigne is deploring the general human sense of vanity that gives man the false impression of his overall superiority and sense of domination. The part that triggers the French monk's indignation is a piece of indirect speech, in which Montaigne paraphrases the text of Manilius, a Roman

astrologer, the author of the poem *Astronomica*, in which he discusses the general understanding of the universe and the role men play in its overall structure:

> *Quantaque quam parvi faciant discrimina motus:*
> *Tantum est hoc regnum, quod regibus imperat ipsis'*
> si nostre vertu, nos vices, nostre suffisance et science, et ce mesme discours que nous faisons de la force des astres, et cette comparaison d'eux à nous, elle vient, comme juge nostre raison, par leur moyen et de leur faveur, (V-S, 450) [138]
>
> How great a change the slightest motion brings:
> So great this kingdom is that gonvens kings;
> Manilius
> [a] if our virtue our vices, our competence and knowledge, and this very dissertation that we are making about the power of the stars and this comparison of them to us, comes, as our reason judges by their medium and their favor. (400)

Montaigne uses the arguments from Manilius' text ironically, in order to caricature the authority of astrology, which through its very existence claims that men can undertake and explain the laws of the universe. "si nous tenons de la distribution du ciel cette part de raison que nous avons, comment nous pourra elle esgaler à luy? commant soub-mettre à nostre science son essence et ses conditions? Tout ce que nous voyons en ces corps là, nous estonne." (V-S, 451) "if we hold by the dispensation of heaven this portion of reason that we have, how can our reason make us equal to heaven? How subject its essence and conditions to our knowledge? All that we see in those bodies astonishes us." (400)

This paragraph also remains unmodified in further editions of *Essays*. The only later addition to this part of the argument is a quote from Cicero's *De natura deorum* (I. 8), which refers to the vastness and complexity of the universe and which doesn't change the view developed previously. "*Quae molitio, quae ferramenta, qui vectes, quae*

[138] The quote belongs to Manilius, *Astronomica*, I.55, and IV 93

machinae, qui ministri tanti operis fuerunt? (V-S, 450c) –"*What preparation, what levers, what machines, what workmen performed so great a work*? [Cicero]" (400)

Although the second censor abstained from commenting on the first reader's interpretation of some passages form regarding Sebond and his book, he does mention separately on his list that the preface to this book was rightfully condemned, in objection 29 on our list[139]: "36 Che senza il Sebondo eravamo persi. Et per questo punto fu prohibita la sua prefazione, onde di forza fu ben notato questo." This comment appears towards the end of the document, and preceedes a series of other remarks that go back to the text of the "Apologie", numbered 32, 33 and 34 by our system. The 32nd comment states: "157 Iddio debbe il suo aiuto extraordinario alla fede et alla religion, non alli huomini". 157 is the page number that indicates the location of the passage questioned, which we recognized very easily since the censor translated it in Italian almost word per word. "Dieu doibt son secours extraordinaire à la foy et à la religion, non pas à nos passions. Les hommes y sont conducteurs et s'y servent de la religion: ce devroit estre tout le contraire." (V-S, 443a) "[a]God owes his extraordinary help to faith and religion, not to our passions. Men are the leaders here, and make use of religion; it ought to be quite the contrary." (391) Montaigne brings into question here the role played by religion in contemporary civil wars, and how their ends are ultimately human, having little to do with God and the teachings He imparted to humans. The second reader detected the allusion of Montaigne to the wars of religion between the Catholics and Protestants and criticized the author's approach to accuse both parties of the similar irreligious approaches and measures. This segment of the essay discussing the power of the

[139] In order to better identify all the objections on the Vatican document I continued counting the objections beyond the original 18 numbered objections made by the first reader and commented by the second censor. See appendix A *infra*

Christian religion was heavily augmented in the following editions of 1588 and on the Bordeaux copy, and we note a short addition in the Bordeaux copy that pertains to the paragraph mentioned by the censor.

> [C] Sentez si ce n'est par noz mains que nous la menons, à tirer comme de cire tant de figures contraires d'une regle si droitte et si ferme. Quand c'est il veu mieux qu'en France en noz jours? Ceux qui l'ont prinse à gauche, ceux qui l'ont prinse à droitte, ceux qui en disent le noir, ceux qui en disent le blanc, l'employent si pareillement à leurs violentes et ambitieuses entreprinses, s'y conduisent d'un progrez si conforme en desbordement et injustice, qu'ils rendent doubteuse et malaisée à croire la diversité qu'ils pretendent de leurs opinions en chose de laquelle depend la conduitte et loy de nostre vie. Peut on veoir partir de mesme eschole et discipline des meurs plus unies, plus unes? Voyez l'horrible impudence dequoy nous pelotons les raisons divines, et combien irreligieusement nous les avons et rejettées et reprinses selon que la fortune nous a changé de place en ces orages publiques. Cette proposition si solenne: S'il est permis au subjet de se rebeller et armer contre son prince pour la defence de la religion, souvienne-vous en quelles bouches, cette année passée, l'affirmative d'icelle estoit l'arc-boutant d'un parti, la negative de quel autre parti c'estoit l'arc-boutant; et oyez à present de quel quartier vient la voix et instruction de l'une et de l'autre; et si les armes bruyent moins pour cette cause que pour cette là. Et nous bruslons les gents qui disent qu'il faut faire souffrir à la verité le joug de nostre besoing: et de combien faict la France pis que de le dire! (V-S, 443c)

> [c] See if it is not by our hands that we lead it, drawing, as if from wax, so many contrasting figures from a rule so straight and so firm. When has this been seen better than in France in our day? Those who have taken it to the left, those who have taken it to the right, those who call it black those who call it white, use it so similarly for their violent and ambitious enterprises, conduct themselves in these with a procedure so identical in excess and injustice that they render doubtful and hard to believe that there really exists, as they claim, a difference of opinion between them in a thing on which depends the conduct and law of our life. Can one see conduct more uniform, more at one, issue from the same school and teaching? See the horrible imprudence with which we bandy divine reasons about, and how irreligiously we have both rejected them and taken them again, according as fortune has changed our place in these public storms. This proposition, so solemn, weather it is lawful for a subject to rebel and take arms against his prince in

> defense of religion – remember in whose mouths, this year just past, the affirmative of this was the buttress of one party, the negative was the buttress of what other party; and here now from what quarter comes the voice and the instruction of both sides, and weather the weapons make less din for this cause than for that. And when we burn the people who say that truth must be made to endure the yoke of our need. And how much worst France does, than say it. (392)

By inserting this new example, Montaigne adds to this argument an intrinsically political character. He is still discussing the irreverent use of religion, but in light of this paragraph he drives his argument home, to France, where political matters overshadowed the direct implication of the institution of the Church (which seemed much more under attack in the previous form of the text).

Objection 33 of the second censor is in a certain measure a reiteration of what he already mentioned in his 19th objection "et parla come Epicureo"[140]. This time Lancius doesn't mention the direct reference; he just translates in Italian the phrase that presents a problem to the religious reader. "244 il non havere male e la maggior felicita che l'huomo possa havere." The number 244 indicates the page on which this statement appears in essay II. 12. "Nostre bien estre, ce n'est que la privation d'estre mal. Voylà pourquoy la secte de philosophie qui a le plus faict valoir la volupté, encore l'a elle rengée à la seule indolence. Le n'avoir point de mal, c'est le plus avoir de bien que l'homme puisse esperer." (V-S, 493a) "[a] Our well-being is but the privation of being ill. That is why the sect of philosophy that set the greatest value on voluptuousness still ranked it with mere freedom from pain. To have no ill is to have the most good that man can hope for." (442) This declaration of the author was understood as too close in formulation to the philosophy of Epicurus, approach already criticized above. No changes were made to this

[140] This particular observation is discussed supra p. 47.

paragraph in 1582 or in 1588, but on the Bordeaux copy we found a new addition that directly responds to this comment. Montaigne acknowledges the possible confusion one might encounter when discussing the topic, and clarifies that his views have nothing to do with the epicurean philosophy.

> Si ne la faut il point imaginer si plombée, qu'elle soit du tout sans goust. Car Crantor avoit bien raison de combattre l'indolence d'Epicurus, si on la bastissoit si profonde que l'abort mesme et la naissance des maux en fut à dire. Je ne loue point cette indolence qui n'est ny possible ny desirable. Je suis content de n'estre pas malade; mais, si je le suis, je veux sçavoir que je le suis; et, si on me cauterise ou incise, je le veux sentir. (V-S, 493c)
>
> [c] Yet we must not imagine so leaden as to be totally without feeling. For Crantor was quite right to combat the apathy of Epicurus, if it was built so deep that even the approach and birth of evils were lacking. I have no praise for the insensibility is neither possible nor desirable. I am glad not to be sick; but if I am, I want to know I am; and if they cauterize or incise me, I want to feel it. (443)

It is no certainty that this explanation, added more than eight years after the original discussion Montaigne had with Lancius, recalls the objection we referenced above. We can also attribute it to the avowed volatile opinions of the author that transformed as time passed, or to a more elaborate explanation on the topic. However, the immediately preceding paragraph was reworked in the 1582 edition, when he added a long passage on Tasso and his folly, and this reference to his trip to Italy could have triggered other memories from that trip such as the objection on his Epicurean approach. It is perhaps a combination of the two factors: reminiscences of his experiences during his trip, and other personal changes of view that triggered this explanatory paragraph.

The next and last individual observation, 34 on our list, concerning the chapter of the "Apologie" (II. 12) has to do with another short but incisive statement. "Le Dieu de la

science scholastique, c'est Aristote; c'est religion de debatre de ses ordonnances, comme de celles de Lycurgus à Sparte." (V-S, 539) It is quite obvious why this statement generated a censorial remark from Lancius, who notes "296 Il dio della scienza scolastica è Aristotele." Just as in the previous objection, there is no comment form the censor that states the erroneous part of the sentence. Perhaps the evident nature of this irreverent phrase did not require any additional commentary. Montaigne does not alter this passage in any future editions. However there is a passage added in the 1582 edition that relates directly to this comment.

> Je vy privéement à Pise un honneste homme, mais si Aristotélicien, que le plus general de ses dogmes est: que la touche et regle de toutes imaginations solides et de toute verité c'est la conformité à la doctrine d'Aristote; que hors de là ce ne sont que chimeres et inanité; qu'il a tout veu et tout dict. Cette proposition, pour avoir esté un peu trop largement et iniquement interpretée, le mit autrefois et tint long temps en grand accessoire à l'inquisition à Rome. (V-S, 151b) [141]
>
> [b] I had a private talk with a man at Pisa, a good man, but such an Aristotelian that the most sweeping of his dogmas is that the touchstone and measure of all solid speculations and of all truth is conformity with the teaching of Aristotle; that outside of this there is nothing but chimeras and inanity; that Aristotle saw everything and said everything. This proposition, having been interpreted a little to broadly and unfairly, put him once, and kept him long, in great danger of the inquisition at Rome. (134)

Is Montaigne referencing here this 34th objection on Lancius' list? Perhaps he is implying that, although he too holds Aristotle in high regards, his case was totally different.[142]

Objection 18, although not related to essay II.12 on the first list compiled by the French monk, takes a different turn in the hands of Lancius. In part A the objection reads:

---

[141] See *infra* p. 85.
[142] For more on Montaigne and his attitude vis-à-vis Aristotle's philosophy see *supra* p. 93

"18 Ha ancora alcune cose poco honeste nel primo libro, pag 217 et el cap.28 mette molti sonetti amorosi etc." Lancius' response is a more elaborate comment.

> 18 Quei sonetti non trovo troppo dishonesti, ma par empio che nel secondo sonetto dice l'autore de esso che vede ch'a *quel grande dio* (cio ad Amore) *bisogna ch'ancor ch'habbia torto la ragione lasciva*, et nel 70 chiama il nome dell'amica *santo*, et nel 17 dice: *per questo fatto io ti daria un altare*. Nella pagina 257 della prima parte non vi truovo niente dishonesto, ma in assai altri luoghi, si come nella parte 2 pagine 205 et 208 e 213 et 360.

The part of this comment that refers to essay II. 12, is the final sentence of this objection, which states that there is nothing dishonest on page 257 of the first book (although here we notice a slight error of the page number, because the first reader identified an immoral issue on page 217, not 257), but there are some questionable passages in the second book.[143] All of the subsequent page numbers indicated point us to several passages from the "Apologie".

The first reference from page 205 of book II in the 1580 edition, refers to an impudent citation from Lucretius regarding certain practices associated with the act of procreation.

> *more ferarum*
> *Quadrupedumque magis ritu, plerumque putantur*
> *Concipere uxores; quia sic loca sumere possunt,*
> *Pectoribus positis, sublatis semina lumbis*. (V-S, 470a)

> And they say
> That wives conceive best in the wild beasts way,
> Like quadrupeds; for thus, loins high, breasts low,
> The seeds can to their destination go.
> Lucretius (419)

[143] I will come back to the comments from the first part of this 18th objection, and to the issue of the inconsistency of the page numbers.

This passage is a citation from the *De Rerum Natura* (IV,1261), and it is a descriptive text that recommends a certain position for the act of copulation, which is more conducive to pregnancy.[144] Presumably, following the comment directed at the irreverent nature of this citation, Montaigne comes back to this section in the 1582 edition and adds more clarification on the matter, using the continuation of the same quote from Lucretius. This more complete version emphasizes the decency of his argument, which is in agreement with the Christian ethics that state that copulation must serve only the purpose of procreation.

> Et rejettent comme nuisibles ces mouvements indiscrets et insolents que les femmes y ont meslé de leur creu, les ramenant à l'exemple et usage des bestes de leur sexe, plus modeste et rassis:
> *Nam mulier prohibet se concipere atque repugnat,*
> *Clunibus ipsa viri venerem si laeta retractet,*
> *Atque exossato ciet omni pectore fluctus.*
> *Ejicit enim sulci recta regione viaque*
> *Vomerem, atque locis avertit seminis ictum.*(V-S, 470-471a)
>
> [a] And they condemn as harmful those indecent and unusual motion which the women have brought into it on their own, recalling them to the more modest and sedate exemple and practice of the animal of their sex:
> For thus a woman may oppose conception,
> If, writhing in her joy she makes improvements,
> Draws back his part from hers upsets his movements.
> For thus she turn the plowshare from its way
> And sends the vital spurt of seed astray.
> Lucretius

Only a couple of pages after, on page 208 Lancius notes another dishonest passage. Since this entire section of the essay is dedicated to the nature of desire and its impact on relationships between men and women, the censor's attention is directed at the erotic

[144] Montaigne's own annotated copy of edition of Lucretius (which is currently owned by Cambridge University), is the subject of Michael Screech's edition *Montaigne's Annotated Copy of Lucretius : a transcription and study of the manuscript notes and pen-marks,* Geneva, Droz, 1998.

passages from classical sources used as examples. This time it is a citation from Horace's *Satires*.

> *Neque illa*
> *Magno prognatum deposcit consule cunnum*. (V-S, 472a)
>
> Nor does she require
> A wench who claims a consul as her sire.
> Horace (420)

Montaigne uses this example as an illustration of the classification of desire: natural and necessary – such as eating and drinking, natural but unnecessary – such as intercourse, or unnatural and unnecessary which unfortunately makes up the great majority of our human desires. There is no textual modification in this part of the text in any editions.

The next page indicated by Lancius in his 18th objection, refers to another quotation, this time of the second degree. The following discourse is attributed to emperor Augustus, and recorded and passed on by Martial in his *Epigrames*, XI, XXI.

> *Quod futuit Glaphyran Antonius, hanc mihi poenam*
> *Fulvia constituit, se quoque uti futuam.*
> *Fulviam ego ut futuam? Quid, si me Manius oret*
> *Paedicem, faciam? Non puto, si sapiam.*
> *Aut futue, aut pugnemus, ait. Quid, si mihi vita*
> *Charior est ipsa mentula? Signa canant*. (V-S, 474-5a)
>
> Since Antony took Glaphyra to his bed
> Fulvia wills that she to mine be led.
> I must have Fulvia? Than if Manius pray
> I do the same to him? No thanks I say.
> Make love or fight, she says. Supposing so,
> Dearer than life's my member?...Bugles blow!
> Augustus, quoted by Martial (423)

The language used in this epigram is quite improper, and Montaigne is aware of this because following this citation he adds in parenthesis a note of consent. "(J'use en liberté de conscience de mon Latin, avecq le congé que vous m'en avez donné.)" (V-S, 475a) "(I

use my Latin with the free conscience and with the permission you have given me.)" (423)

The general understanding of the critics is that this note in parenthesis is directed at the same person he addresses later in the essay, presumably Margaret of Valois, future wife of Henry of Navarre. (V-S, 557n) However, Montaigne's reasons for using these passages are not derived from the impact of such language associated with the public persona of Augustus. His intentions are to humanize these highly esteemed characters and to show that they are subjects to the same desires and the same internal passions as any other human being. There is nothing different in their inherently human nature. Since the author's intentions were not transparent enough in the original form of the text in 1580, Montaigne rearticulates this idea with a new paragraph inserted in1582:

> Les ames des Empereurs et des savatiers sont jettées à mesme moule. Considerant l'importance des actions des princes et leur pois, nous nous persuadons qu'elles soyent produites par quelques causes aussi poisantes et importantes: nous nous trompons: ils sont menez et ramenez en leurs mouvemens par les mesmes ressors que nous sommes aux nostres. (V-S, 476a)
>
> [a]The souls of emperors and cobblers are cast in the same mold. Considering the importance of the actions of princes and their weightiness, we persuade ourselves that they are produced by some causes equally weighty and important. We are wrong: they are led to end fro in their movements by the same springs as we are in ours. (424)

On page 360 of the II.12 of the 1580 edition we encounter the last passage that triggered a censorial remark regarding the use of "dishonesty" in this chapter. The passage was submitted to several modifications that we unquestionably link to this remark made by Lancius in 1581. First, here is the 1580 form of the text, that the censors

saw. Montaigne discusses the genesis of social laws and practices, and suggests that they follow the progress of society and change accordingly. In ancient times, the Cynics who were following a more natural state, would have not understood the ways our marriages work, or the way our current system of modesty is applied.

> Comme, pour exemple: peu d'entre eux eussent approuvé les conditions et formes de nos mariages; Ils refusoient et dedaignoient la plus part de nos ceremonies. Chacun a ouy parler de la des-hontee facon de vivre des philosophes Cyniques. Chrisippus disoit qu'vn philosophe fera vne dousaine de culebutes en public, voire sans haut de chausses, pour vne dousaine d'oliues. Et céte honnesteté et reuerance, que nous appellons, de couurir et cacher aucunes de nos actions naturelles et legitimes, de n'oser nommer les choses par leur nom, de craindre a dire ce qu'il nous est permis de faire, n'eussent ils pas peu dire auecq raison que c'est plustost vne affeterie et mollesse inuentée aus cabinets mesmes de Venus, pour donner pris et pointe a ces ieus? N'est ce pas vn alechement, vne amorce et vn aigueillon a la volupté? car l'vsage nous fait sentir euidemment que la ceremonie, la vergoigne et la difficulté, ce sont esguisemens et alumetes a ces fleures la. [145] (V-S, 583n)

This paragraph discusses what Christianity claimed as virtuous modesty, an issue addressed by the Bible from the first chapter of Genesis, in which following the original sin, Adam and Eve became aware of their nudity and became adepts of Christinan modesty. Montaigne's approach had a rather pagan character bringing into view a different explanation for current social practices.

The text remains unmodified for the next two main re-editions of 1582 and 1588. It is after this last date, on the Bordeaux copy, that we discover he first textual changes. Montaigne reworked the entire segment regarding the classical approach the concept of reverence, vice and virtue and added several examples. The passage that was mentioned by the second censor in his list of objections is also heavily transformed. The text cited

[145] Ed. Martin, 1580, p. 360

above starting with “Et céte honnesteté” up to the end of the quotation disappears and it is replaced by

> A peine eust il donné advis à Clisthenes de refuser la belle Agariste, sa fille, à Hippoclides pour luy avoir veu faire l'arbre fourché sur une table. Metroclez lascha un peu indiscretement un pet en disputant, en presence de son eschole, et se tenoit en sa maison, caché de honte, jusques à ce que Crates le fut visiter; et, adjoutant à ses consolations et raisons l'exemple de sa liberté, se mettant à peter à l'envi avec luy, il luy osta ce scrupule, et de plus le retira à sa secte Stoïque, plus franche, de la secte Peripatetique, plus civile, laquelle jusques lors il avoit suivi.
>
> Ce que nous appellons honnesteté, de n'oser faire à descouvert ce qui nous est honneste de faire à couvert, ils l'appelloient sottise; et de faire le fin à taire et desadvouer ce que nature, coustume et nostre desir publient et proclament de nos actions, ils l'estimoient vice. Et leur sembloit que c'estoit affoler les mysteres de Venus que de les oster du retiré sacraire de son temple pour les exposer à la veue du peuple, et que tirer ses jeux hors du rideau, c'estoit les avilir (c'est une espece de poix que la honte; la recelation, reservation, circonscription, parties de l'estimation); que la volupté tres ingenieusement faisoit instance, sous le masque de la vertu, de n'estre prostituée au milieu des quarrefours, foulée des pieds et des yeux de la commune, trouvant à dire la dignité et commodité de ses cabinets accoustumez. (V-S, 584c)

> [c] he would hardly have advised Cleisthenes to refuse the beautiful Agarista, his daughter to Hippocleides, for having seen him stand on his head on a table with his legs apart. Metroclez rather indiscreetly let a fart while debating in the presence of his school, and was staying in his house, hiding for shame, until Crates went to visit him and, adding to his consolations and reasons the example of his own freedom, started a farting contest with him, by which he rid him of this scruple and furthermore drew him over to his own freer Stoical school from the more polite Peripatetic school of which he had hitherto been a follower.
>
> What we call decency – not to dare to do openly what it is decent for us to do in private – they call stupidity; and to try to be clever by hushing up and disavowing what nature, custom, and our desire publish and proclaim about our actions, they considered a vice. And it seemed to them that it was profaning the mysteries of Venus to remove them from the secluded sanctuary of her temple and expose them to the sight of the people; and that to draw her sports from behind the curtain was to cheapen them (shame is a sort of weight; concealment reservation, circumscription are factors in

> esteem); that voluptuousness very ingeniously insisted, under the mask of virtue, on not being prostituted in the middle of the crossroads, trodden beneath the feet and eyes of the crowd, lacking the dignity and comfort of its accustomed cabinets. (535)

This new development better illustrates the distinction between "ils" (the practices attributed to classical examples) and "nous"(the existing concepts approved in society). His arguments seem less ambiguous, and his personal position in this argument becomes very clear, and fully applied in the example of the Christian ethics.

Objection 18 that contains the second censor's references to these dishonest passages in II.12, also contains allusions to other similarly immoral parts of the text. The first censor mentions some improper allusion at page 217 of the first book, "18 Ha ancora alcune cose poco honeste nel primo libro, pag 217" which are in turn disproved by the second censor, who also corrects the reference to page 257: "Nella pagina 257 della prima parte non vi truovo niente dishonesto." After careful consideration, we agree with Legros' hypothesis that the second reader was right in indicating the page as 257 rather than 217. However, even this new page number is highly uncertain because Book I of the 1580 edition does not contain page 257, this particular number being skipped. The pages were numbered in the following order: 256, 259, 258, 259. The pagination of this book was already erroneous even before this omission because the printer assigned two consecutive pages the number 240. Since this objection refers to the irreverent discussion of the rapports between men and women, we associate this argument with a passage on page 259, actually 257, from chapter I.28, "De l'amitié" in which the author compares the connection between two friends to the amorous relationship between two lovers. Page 217 belongs to essay I.26, "De l'institution des enfans", and there is nothing of this nature

in this part of the chapter. It is thus more likely that the page to which the first censor referred, was indeed 257 rather than 217, to the following text:

> D'y comparer l'affection enuers les fames, quoy qu'elle naisse a la verité de, nostre choix, on ne peut, ny la loger en ce rolle. Son feu, ie le confesse,
> *(Neque enim est Dea nescia nostri*
> *Quae dulcem curis miscet amaritiem)*
> est plus actif, plus cuisant et plus aspre. Mais c'est vn feu temeraire et volage, ondoiant et diuers, feu de fiebure, subiect. [146]

On the Bordeaux copy Montaigne comes back to this particularly touching topic for him, which is the definition of the perfect friendship between two individuals, and which finds its best example in the relationship he had with his late friend La Boetie. His additions on the Bordeaux copy put in perspective the differences between homosexual love and friendship. The following passage is an emotionally charged paragraph that attempts to recreate on paper the connection that bounds two people and which is so personal that becomes impossible to express in words.

> [A] En l'amitié dequoy je parle, elles se meslent et confondent l'une en l'autre, d'un melange si universel, qu'elles effacent et ne retrouvent plus la couture qui les a jointes. Si on me presse de dire pourquoy je l'aymois, je sens que cela ne se peut exprimer, [C] qu'en respondant: Par ce que c'estoit luy; par ce que c'estoit moy. [A] Il y a, au delà de tout mon discours, et de ce que j'en puis dire particulierement, ne sçay quelle force inexplicable et fatale,

---

[146] « D'y comparer l'affection envers les femmes, quoy qu'elle naisse de nostre choix, on ne peut, ny la loger en ce rolle. Son feu, je le confesse,

neque enim est dea nescia nostri
Quae dulcem curis miscet amaritiem,

est plus actif, plus cuisant et plus aspre. Mais c'est un feu temeraire et volage, ondoyant et divers, feu de fiebvre, subject à accez et remises, et qui ne nous tient qu'à un coing."*Essais*, V-S I. 28, p. 185a - "[a] To compare this brotherly affection with affection for women, even though it is the result of our choice – it cannot be done; nor can we put the love of women in the same category. Its ardor, I confess –

Of us that goddess is not unaware
Who blends a bitter sweetness with her care (Catulus)

is more active, more scorching and more intense. But it is an impetuous and fickle flame, undulating and variable, a fever flame, subject to fits and lulls, that hold us only by one corner. (166)

> mediatrice de cette union. [C] Nous nous cherchions avant que de nous estre veus, et par des rapports que nous oyïons l'un de l'autre, qui faisoient en nostre affection plus d'effort que ne porte la raison des rapports, je croy par quelque ordonnance du ciel: nous nous embrassions par noz noms. Et à nostre premiere rencontre, qui fut par hazard en une grande feste et compagnie de ville, nous nous trouvasmes si prins, si cognus, si obligez entre nous, que rien des lors ne nous fut si proche que l'un à l'autre. Il escrivit une Satyre Latine excellente, qui est publiée, par laquelle il excuse et explique la precipitation de nostre intelligence, si promptement parvenue à sa perfection. Ayant si peu à durer, et ayant si tard commencé, car nous estions tous deux hommes faicts, et luy plus de quelque année, elle n'avoit point à perdre temps, et à se regler au patron des amitiez molles et regulieres, ausquelles il faut tant de precautions de longue et preallable conversation. Cette cy n'a point d'autre idée que d'elle mesme, et ne se peut rapporter qu'à soy. (V-S, 188ac)

> In the friendship I speak of, our souls mingle and blend with each other so completely that they efface the seam that joined them, and cannot find it again. If you press me to tell why I loved him, I feel that this cannot be expressed, [c] except by answering: because it was he because it was I. [a] Beyond all my understanding, beyond what I can say this in particular, there was I know not what inexplicable and faithful force that was the mediator of this union. [c]we sought each other before we met because of the report that we heard of ach other, which had more effect on our affection that such reports would reasonably have; I think it was by some ordinance from heaven. We embraced each other by our names. At our first meeting, which by chance came at a great feast and gathering in the city, we found ourselves so taken with each other, so well acquainted, so bound together, that from that time on nothing was so close to us as each other. He wrote an excellent Latin satire, which is published, in which he excuses and explains the precipitancy of our mutal understanding, so promptly grown to its perfection. Having so little time to last, and having begun so late, for we were both grown men, and he a few years older than I, it could not lose time and conform to the pattern of mild and regular friendships, which needs so many precautions in the form preliminary associations. Our friendship has no other model that itself, and can be compared only with itself. (169)

The last reference brought by this objection was the inclusion in the text of the 29 love poems by La Boétie. These 29 poems preceded by a short introduction, represented chapter 29, before the chapter 28 on friendship (“De l’amitié”). Altough flagged in its

entirety by the first censor, the so-called chapter 29 was almost completely cleared by the second censor, with a few exceptions, such as the power of Love over Reason Sonnet III. v.13-14.

Je voy qu Amour, sans que ie le deserue,
Sans aucun droict, se vient saisir de moy;
Et voy qu'encor il faut a ce grand Roy,
Quand il a tort, que la raison luy serue.[147]

The other inappropriate context was the use of the epithet "sainct" attached to a common name (VII, v.8).

Ardant de te cognoistre, essaie a te nommer,
Et, cerchant ton sainct nom ainsi a l'aduenture,
Esbloui, n'attaint pas a veoir chose si claire:[148]

The last reference belongs to La Boétie's sonnet XVII and alludes to the use of the word "autel" (altar) in line11:

Je te donrois vn autel pour ce fait
Qu'on vist les traictz de ceste main diuine:[149]

In fact, the story behind Montaigne's decision to place these sonnets at the center of Book One of the *Essays* is significant. As the author himself confesses, originally he wanted to develop the text of his book around a different text by La Boétie, namely treatise *La Servitude volontaire*. He imagined his own text as a series of "grotesques" placed around a beautifully achieved piece of art, La Boétie's discours.

> Considérant la conduite de la besongne d'un peintre que j'ay, il m'a pris envie de l'ensuivre. Il choisit le plus bel endroit et milieu de chaque paroy, pour y loger un tableau élabouré de toute sa suffisance; et, le vuide tout au tour, il le remplit de crotesques, qui sont peintures fantasques, n'ayant grace qu'en la varieté et

[147] Etienne de La Boétie, *Œeuvres complètes d'Estienne de La Boëtie, publiées, avec notice biographique, variantes, notes et index, par Paul Bonnefon*, Ed. Paul Bonnefon, 1892, pp. 289 - Gallica.bnf.fr
[148] Ibid. p. 291
[149] Ibid. p. 298

> estrangeté. Que sont-ce icy aussi, à la verité, que crotesques et corps monstrueux, rappiecez de divers membres, sans certaine figure, n'ayants ordre, suite ny proportion que fortuite?
> *Desinit in piscem mulier formosa superne*.
> Je vay bien jusques à ce second point avec mon peintre, mais je demeure court en l'autre et meilleure partie: car ma suffisance ne va pas si avant que d'oser entreprendre un tableau riche, poly et formé selon l'art. Je me suis advisé d'en emprunter un d'Estienne de la Boitie, qui honorera tout le reste de cette besongne. C'est un discours auquel il donna nom La Servitude Volontaire; (V-S, 183a)
>
> As I was considering the way a painter I employ went abut his work, I had a mind to imitate him. He chooses the best spot, the diddle of each wall, to put a picture labored over with all his skill, and the empty space all around it he fills with grotesques, which are fantastic paintings whose only charm lies in their variety and strangeness. And what are these things of mine, in truth, but grotesques and monstrous bodies, pierced together of divers members, whithout definite shape, having no order, sequence, or proportion other than accidental?
> A lovely woman tapers off into a fish. (Horace)
> I do indeed go along with my painter in this second point, but I fall short in the first and better part; for my ability does not go far enough for me to dare and undertake a rich polished picture, formed according to art. It has occurred to me to borrow one from Etienne de La Boetie, which will do honor to all the rest of this work. It is a discourse to which he gave the name *La Servitude Volontaire*; (164)

However, while Montaigne was still working on his text, between 1571 and 1580, when he published his first edition of the *Essays*, *La Servitude volontaire* had already been printed and circulated in a religiously revolutionary context by the Protestans.[150] Therefore in 1580 when he published his book, Montaigne made a last minute substitution, exchanging la servitude volontaire for "a gayer and more lusty" text:

> Parce que j'ay trouvé que cet ouvrage a esté depuis mis en lumiere, et à mauvaise fin, par ceux qui cherchent à troubler et changer l'estat de nostre police, sans se soucier s'ils l'amenderont, qu'ils ont meslé à d'autres escris de leur farine, je me suis dédit de le loger

[150] In 1574 it appeared partially in *Le reveille – matin des François et de leur voisins*, and in 1576 in *Mémoires de l'Estat de France sous Charles Neufiesme*. – see Donald M. Frame, *Montaigne: A Biography*, New York: Harcourt, 1965.

> icy. […]Or, en eschange de cet ouvrage serieux, j'en substitueray un autre, produit en cette mesme saison de son aage, plus gaillard et plus enjoué. (V-S, 194a)
>
> [a]Because I have found that this work has since been brought to light, and with evil intent, by those who seek to disturb and change the state of our government without worrying whether they will improve it, and because they have mixed his work up with some of their own concoctions, I have changed my mind about putting it here. […] Now in exchange for this serious work, I shall substitute another, produced in the same season of his life, gayer and more lusty. (175-6)

La Boétie's sonnets which replaced *La servitude volontaire* remained part of the text of the *Essays* until the Bordeaux copy, when Montaigne decided to exclude them, and replace them by a short reference: "Ces vers se voient ailleurs." (V-S, 196) The reasons for this excusion are not explained by the author in the text. There are several interpretations of Montaigne's decision to entirely eliminate the "rich, polished picture" represented by La Boétie's text. As François Rigolot puts it, after the publication of his text in 1588, Montaigne might have felt that his *Essays* could stand alone, without the need for a centralizing piece: "In other words Montaigne may have come gradually to the realization that his *Essays* no longer needed an outsider's legitimizing seal, and that they could adequately stand for themselves and by themselves: they had moved from periphery to the center."[151]

3. On Religious Matters, Heretics and Drinking
(Objections 7, 10, 13, 35, 26, 16, 17)

[151] " Montaigne's Anti-mannerist Mannerism" in *Le visage changeant de Montaigne*, Paris: Honoré Champion, 2003, p. 213; For more on the topic of this substitution see François Rigolot, *Les Métamorphoses de Montaigne*, Paris: PUF, 1998, Michel Butor *Essais sur les essais*, Paris: Gallimard 1968

We shall now return to our original analysis of objections in consecutive order, picking up at remark number 7 on the list. The first censor reprimands Montaigne for poking fun at the Catholic practice of saying "sursum corda" during Mass. This Latin expression, meaning "lift up your hearts" is a phrase used in the "Preface" (which precedes the transubstantiation) of the Catholic mass, and which establishes a dialog between the priest and the people, thus spiritually preparing them to receive the glory of God. "7 Pag 109: si burla di quel che si dice nel prefacio della messa *sursum corda*." The second censor agrees with the first reading, but adds more nuance to the previous comment. "7 Nella settima: se non si burla del *sursum corda*, al manco pare ch'il fa dicendo che simili parole le quali si eccita l['] attention sono fuorché per esso lui." He recognizes that Montaigne's intention is perhaps not to directly mock a liturgical item, but to place himself above the Catholic practice, saying that the use of such words should not be necessary, since the devout Christian is always prepared to receive God.

> Je ne veux pas qu'on s'employe à me rendre attantif et qu'on me crie cinquante fois: Or oyez! à la mode de nos Heraux. Les Romains disoyent en leur Religion: *Hoc age*, [C] que nous disons en la nostre: *Sursum corda*; [A]ce sont autant de parolles perdues pour moy. J'y viens tout preparé des le logis: (V-S, 414ac)
>
> [a]I do not want a man to use his strength making me attentive and to shout at me fifty times "Or oyez!" in the manner of our heralds. The Romans used to say in their religion "Hoc age", [c] as we say in ours "sursum corda":[a] these are so many words lost on me. I come fully prepared from my house. (365)

In the 1582 edition, following the suggestions received in Rome, Montaigne excluded the phrase that directly refers to the Catholic *sursum corda*, marked with the letter C in the text cited above. Moreover, in the 1588 edition when Montaigne develops some of his

essays and adds another book to the text, we notice one more reference to the opening "sursum corda" of the mass, now held in very high regards.

> Ce n'est pas en passant et tumultuairement qu'il faut manier un estude si serieuz et venerable. Ce doibt estre une action destinée et rassise, à laquelle on doibt tousjours adjouster cette preface de nostre office: *Sursum corda*, et y apporter le corps mesme disposé en contenance qui tesmoigne une particuliere attention et reverence. (V-S, 321b)
>
> [b]It is not in passing and in whirlwind fashion that we should handle so serious and venerable a study. It must a premeditated and sober action, to which we should always add this preface of our service, Sursum corda, and always bring even the body disposed in a demeanor that attests a particular attention and reverence. (281)

On the Bordeaux copy, Montaigne decides to revert to the original text of chapter II. 10, thus reintroducing in the exact former location the identical phrase he took out in 1582, not without however re-contextualising his statement. He adds a new paragraph immediately following the passage in question, explaining that the mixed feelings he has for the use of "sursum corda" are nothing but a reflection of a personal weakness, impatience, he experiences in areas that he most enjoys.

> La licence du temps m'excusera elle de cette sacrilege audace, d'estimer aussi trainans les dialogismes de Platon mesmes et estouffans par trop sa matiere, et de pleindre le temps que met à ces longues interlocutions, vaines et preparatoires, un homme qui avoit tant de meilleures choses à dire? Mon ignorance m'excusera mieux, sur ce que je ne voy rien en la beauté de son langage. Je demande en general les livres qui usent des sciences, non ceux qui les dressent. (V-S, 414c)
>
> [c] Will the license of the times excuse may sacrilegious audacity in considering that even Plato's dialogues drag and stifle his substance too much, and in lamenting the time put into these long vain preliminary interlocutions by a man who had so many better things to say? My ignorance will excuse me better in that I have no perception of the beauty of his language. In general I ask for books that make use of learning, not those that build it up. (366)

On the same Bordeaux copy, Montaigne also modifies the second passage in which he commented on the use of "sursum corda", from I.56. He adds a short paragraph to reinforce the existing argument and perhaps further convince his readers that although he reinstated the irreverent statement omitted in1582, he truly understands the meaning of this prologue to "Elevation", and considers it crucial in the most important part of the Mass. The following paragraph was attached as a continuation to the previous paragraph from I.56 cited *supra*.

> Ce n'est pas l'estude de tout le monde, c'est l'estude des personnes qui y sont vouées, que Dieu y appelle. Les meschans, les ignorans s'y empirent. Ce n'est pas une histoire à compter, c'est une histoire à reverer, craindre, et adorer. Plaisantes gens, qui pensent l'avoir rendue maniable au peuple, pour l'avoir mise en langage populaire! Ne tient-il qu'aux mots qu'ils n'entendent tout ce qu'ils trouvent par escrit? Diray-je plus? Pour l'en approcher de ce peu, ils l'en reculent. L'ignorance pure et remise toute en autruy estoit bien plus salutaire et plus sçavante que n'est cette science verbale et vaine, nourrice de presomption et de temerité. (V-S, 321c)
>
> [c] It is not everyone's study; it is a study of the persons who are dedicated to it, whom god calls to it. The wicked, the ignorant, grow worse by it. It is not a story to tell, it is a story to revere, fear, and adore. Comical folk, those who think they have made it fit for the people to handle because they have put it into the language of the people! Is it just a matter of the words that they do not understand all they find in writing? Shall I say more? By bringing it this little bit closer to the people, they remove it farther. Pure ignorance that relied entirely on others was much more salutary, and more learned, that this vain and verbal knowledge, the nurse of presumption and temerity. (282)

Thus in the 1595 text, after going through several intermediary configurations, Montaigne manages to stay loyal to his original stance, and at the same time to respond constructively to the censorial remarks. This particular case is a good example that the

event of the censorship of the *Essays* was indeed a catalytic moment, perhaps the archetypal act that mutated in the more personal endeavor of continually reshaping and augmenting the text following the changing of the self.

The next point on the official document is observation 10: the first censor denounces Montaigne's praise for "Rabolet" (Rabelais), and the second also adds the name of Boccaccio as an inappropriate mention. "10 Nel lib. 2, pag.99: loda alcuni libri male massime Rabolet, il quale nell'indice è *prime classis*." The second reader briefy adds "Et Bocaccio ancora". Indeed both authors were included in the Roman *Index* of forbidden books: Rabelais in the category "auctores primae classis" and Boccaccio in a secondary category, a less severe class, reserved for the individual condemnation of certain books. The passage that triggered their comment is far from praising ("loda") the works of the two authors in question. Montaigne mentions these authors among others, as comical, and worth reading.

> Entre les liures simplement plaisans, ie trouue, des modernes, le Decameron de Boccace, Rabelays et les Baisers de Iean Second, s'il les faut loger sous ce tiltre, [et, des siecles vn peu au dessus du nostre, l'Histoire Æthiopique], dignes qu'on s'y amuse.[152] (V-S, 410a)
>
> [a] Among the books that are simply entertaining, I find, of the moderns, the Decameron of Boccaccio, Rabelais and The Kisses of Johannes Secundus, if they may be placed under this heading worth reading for amusement. (361)

The only modification of this passage occurs on the Bordeaux copy, and it is the exclusion of the short phrase placed between square brackets in the passage cited above.

[152] The text between the brackets appeared in the editions published during Montaigne's lifetime, but he crossed it off on the Bordeaux copy.

Upon rereading his essay Montaigne considered excluding the Greek novel and leave the names of Boccaccio and Rabelais, thus dismissing the suggestion of the Roman officials.

Observation 13 has to do with Montaigne's mention of Machiavelli's *Discorsi*, and it only appears on the list of the first censor, the second reader skipping this number on his own repport. "13 Et pag.459: loda di *Discorsi* del Macchiavello." Although the second reader seems to ignore this observation in the consecutive order of his comments (at number 13), later on his list, at number 35, we notice its reappearance. "460 Loda al manco iscusa il Macchiavello. Idem fece pagina 554". As ususal in his approach of the comments made by his collaborator, the second censor brings nuance to the original claim, saying that Montaigne praises, or at least excuses Machiavelli, and he adds another page reference for more support. The first instance mentioned by both censors is on page 459-460 of the second book, in chapter II.17 "De la praesumption". In this paragraph Montaigne is discussing an early and more rudimentary version of what today we would call "political science", and state affairs endlessly disputable among different camps:

> Notamment aux affaires politiques, il y a un beau champ ouvert au bransle et à la contestation:
> *Justa pari premitur veluti cum pondere libra* □
> *Prona, nec hac plus parte sedet, nec surgit ab illa*
> Les discours de Machiavel, pour exemple, estoient assez solides pour le subject, si y a-il eu grand aisance à les combattre; et ceux qui l'ont faict, n'ont pas laissé moins de facilité à combatre les leurs. Il s'y trouveroit tousjours, à un tel argument, dequoy y fournir responses, dupliques, repliques, tripliques, quadrupliques, et cette infinie contexture de debats que nostre chicane a alongé tant qu'elle a peu en faveur des procez,
> *Caedimur, et totidem plagis consumimus hostem,*
> les raisons n'y ayant guere autre fondement que l'experience, et la diversité des evenements humains nous presentant infinis exemples à toute sorte de formes. (V-S, 655a)

> Notably in political matters, there is a fine field open for vacillation and dispute:

> As when an even scale with equal weights is pressed,
> Neither side rises neither falls; it stays at rest
> Tibullus
>
> Machiavelli's arguments, for example, were solid enough for the subject, yet it was very easy to combat them; and those who did so left it no less easy to combat theirs. In such an argument there would always be matter for answers, rejoinders, replications, triplications, quadruplications, and that infinite web of disputes that our pettifoggers have spun out as far as they could in favor of lawsuits:
>
> We are hard hit and hit out hard in turn
> Horace
>
> For the reasons have little other foundations than experience, and the diversity of human events offers us infinite examples in all sorts of forms. (603)

Considering the full context of the role of Machiavelli's name and reputation, the second censor is closer to the truth in his comment, estimating the author's approach as an excuse rather than a praise. Montaigne considers the personality of the author of the *Prince* a good match for the inherently duplicitous fields of politics, therefore indirectly accepting his work on this subject. As in the case of the heretic poets, Beza and Buchanan, discussed in the previous chapter of this study, Montaigne is not reluctant to recognize the merit of people based on the domain of their activity, disregarding their implications for Christian morality. While some authors might not be adequate Christians, it doesn't mean that their works outside the field of religion are inadequate as well. This is the reason why he doesn't change or exclude any of the authors' names that were indicated as inappropriate, including this paragraph that mentions Machiavelli. However, in the view of the censors, even the mention of the name of a condemned author, is improper practice.[153] This is the case of the second occurrence of Machiavelli's name on the page indicated by Lancius in essay II.34 "Observations sur les moyens de faire la guerre de Julius Caesar". The opening phrase of this chapter was not excluded

[153] Machiavelli was also at the Index in 1559 among "auctores primae classis"

from future editions:

> On recite de plusieurs chefs de guerre, qu'ils ont eu certains livres en particuliere recommandation: comme le grand Alexandre, Homere: [C] Scipion l'Aphricain, Xenophon; [A] Marcus Brutus, Polybius; Charles cinquiesme, Philippe de Comines; et dit-on, de ce temps, que Machiavel est encores ailleurs en credit; (V-S, 736ac)
>
> [a]It is reported of many leaders in war that they had certain books in particular esteem, as the great Alexander did Homer: [c] Scipio Africanus, Xenophon; [a] Marcus Brutus, Polybius; Charles V, Philippe de Comines. And it is said that in our day Machiavelli is still in repute in other countries. (674)

Although Machiavelli's name is not a common occurrence in the *Essays*, the Italian Politician inspired Montaigne's work in different way and throughout several parts of his book.[154] So, in addition to not removing his name form the original form of the text, for the 1588 edition, Montaigne came back to Machiavelli's political philosophy. In the very first chapter of the newly added Book III, "De l'Utile et de l'Honneste", he develops his own approach to the matter of private versus public affairs and the role of the state and of the prince in relation to the people. Although no direct mention of Machiavelli's name appears in the text (perhaps in an effort to bypass eventual religious censorship), Montaigne engages in series of arguments that respond to the Italian diplomat's philosophy. Among them, the author of the *Essays* recognizes the role of "vices" in society and similarly the existance of certain abject but necessary state offices.

> [B]Desquelles qualitez qui osteroit les semences en l'homme, destruiroit les fondamentalles conditions de nostre vie. De mesme, en toute police, il y a des offices necessaires, non seulement abjects, mais encore vitieux: les vices y trouvent leur rang et s'employent à la cousture de nostre liaison, comme les venins à la

[154] For further reading on this topic see Marcel Tétel *Présences italiennes dans les* Essais *de Montaigne*, Paris: Honoré Champion, 1992; Hugh Grady, *Shakespeare, Machiavelli & Montaigne: Power & Subjectivity from 'Richard II' to 'Hamlet*.' 2003; Eric MacPhail, "Praising the Past: Novelty and Nostalgia in Machiavelli, Castiglione and Montaigne" *Romanic Review*. Nov 2010, Vol. 101, Issue 4, p. 639-654.

> conservation de nostre santé. S'ils deviennent excusables, d'autant qu'ils nous font besoing et que la necessité commune efface leur vraye qualité, il faut laisser jouer cette partie aux citoyens plus vigoureux et moins craintifs qui sacrifient leur honneur et leur conscience, comme ces autres antiens sacrifierent leur vie pour le salut de leur pays; nous autres, plus foibles, prenons des rolles et plus aisez et moins hazardeux. Le bien public requiert qu'on trahisse et qu'on mente [C] et qu'on massacre; [B] resignons cette commission à gens plus obeissans et plus soupples. (V-S, 791bc)
>
> [b] Whoever should remove the seeds of these qualities from men would destroy the fundamental conditions of our life. Likewise in every government there are necessary offices which are not only abject but also vicious. Vices find their place in it and are employed for sewing our society together as are poisons for the preservations of our health. If they become excusable, inasmuch as we need them and the common necessity effaces their true quality, we still must let this part be played by the more vigorous and less fearful citizens, who sacrifice their honor and their conscience, as those ancients sacrificed their life for the good of their country. We who are weaker, let us take parts that both easier and less hazardous. The public welfare requires that a man betray and lie [c] and massacre; [b] let us resign this commission to more obedient and suppler people. (727)

Of course, the subject of Montaigne's interaction with Machiavelli's philosophy is a much larger topic than we can handle within the limits of this study, and we will simply confine ourselves here to Montaigne's response to specific issues brought up by the problem of censorship.

Another objection marked on the official document that has to do with Montaigne's admiration of certain contemporary characters who were labeled as heretics and marked in the newly complied Indexes of Prohibited books, is objection 26. The first censor had already scolded Montaigne for praising authors such as Rabelais, Buchanan, and Beza. Now the second censor references two more paragraphs in which the author's accolades reach religiously corrupt authors.[155] "239 *Honorifice meminit Ganesii et*

[155] See *infra* p. 53.

Buchanani hereticorum et 344 *Giraldi et Castilionis*.". In the case of Buchanan, the censor indicates one more time the following passage from the I.26: [156]

> Et Nicolas Groucchi, qui a escrit *de comitiis Romanorum*, Guillaume Guerente, qui a commenté Aristote, George Bucanan, ce grand poete Escossois. (V-S, 174a)

For the 1582 edition, Montaigne added the name Marc Antoine Muret in 1582, after the adjective "Escossois". As already mentioned, the author met with Muret in Rome during his trip to Italy, where he was highly regarded as a great scholar. Later, on the Bordeaux copy, immediately following Muret's name, he inserted a short description "que la France et l'Italie recognoist pour le meilleur orateur du temps" (V-S, 174c). " …[c] whom France and Italy recognize as the best orator of his time." (156) The addition of Muret's name along with the later clarification must have been elements of balance in this context, since the other persons enumerated were well known protestant figures: Nicholas Grouchy, Reformation advocate who died in the assault of La Rochelle; Buchanan, protestant poet already mentioned in objection 13, and Guillaume Guerente, a former employee of the Bordeaux College and good friend of Grouchy also accused of heresy.

In the case of the second textual reference, contained in this 26th objection, the censor pointed to chapter I.35 ("D'un defaut de nos polices"), where Montaigne shows respect for two more characters who had problems with Rome: Sebastian Castellio (1515 – 1563), and Giglio Gregorio Giraldi (1479 – 1552). The former was a French humanist who moved to Strassbourg in 1540, adopted the Protestantism, and begun his work of translating the Bible into French. Following several arguments with Calvin, who held the

[156] Once again the transcription of the document must not be accurate because the account mentioned by the censor is on page 235, not 239 of the 1580 edition, and we appreciate that the name "Ganessi" must also be an orthographic mistake for Grouchi, as Legros also speculates in his article "Montaigne face à ses censeurs…". p. 24

monopoly over the printers in Geneva, and who did not approve of his translation Castellio fell into disgrace and poverty. "Castellio had to endure hardship and extreme poverty because he was ostracized as someone who opposed the most powerful reformer. He spent about eight years trying to support his family as a proofreader at the printing houses of Oporin in Basel, a translator and manual laborer. Finally he became a lecturer on Greek at the University."[157] The latter was an Italian scholar and poet who lost everything during tha Sack of Rome in 1527 (including his patron Cardinal Rangone) and lived the rest of his days in poverty and illness.

> [A] J'entens, avec une grande honte de nostre siecle, qu'à nostre veue deux tres-excellens personnages en sçavoir sont morts en estat de n'avoir pas leur soul à manger: Lilius Gregorius Giraldus en Italie, et Sebastianus Castalio en Allemagne; et croy qu'il y a mil'hommes qui les eussent appellez avec tres-advantageuses conditions, [C] ou secourus où ils estoient, [A] s'ils l'eussent sçeu. (V-S, 223ac)
>
> [a] I hear with great shame for our century, that under our very eyes two personage most outstanding in learning have died so poor that they have not enough to eat: Lilius Gregorius Giraldus in Italy and Sebastianus Castalio in Germany. And I believe there are a thousand men who would have sent for them on very advantageous terms, [c] or helped where they were, [a] if they had known. (200)

As the letters A and C indicate in this text, Montaigne added on the Bordeaux copy a very small clarification on the nature of the help the two dignitaries could have received. This small textual insertion proves that Montaigne paid direct attention to this passage and decided that no change, or name exclustion was necessary, corroborating my argument that in Montaigne's view, the sole adherence to Protestantism, did not cancel out

[157] Marian Hillar, « Sebastian Castellio and the struggle for freedom of conscience ». *Essays in the Philosophy of Humanism*, eds, D. R. Finch and M. Hillar, Vol. 10, 2002, pp. 32.

prudence and competence in other fields. These two authors were also noted in the Roman Index of Prohibited Books: Castellio in 1557 and Giraldi in 1564. [158]

Objection 16 on the official document directs the first censor's reprimand to a passage from essay I. 25 "Du pedantisme". "16 Et nel primo libro pag.180: dice che la thologia non insegna ne a ben fare ne a ben pensare." The second censor does not comment in any way on this objection or this particular passage:

> Aussi ce n'est pas si grande merveille, comme on crie, que nos ancestres n'ayent pas faict grand estat des lettres, et qu'encores aujourd'huy elles ne se trouvent que par rencontre aux principaux conseils de nos Roys; et, si cette fin de s'en enrichir, qui seule nous est aujourd'huy proposée par le moyen de la Jurisprudence, de la Medecine, du pedantisme, et de la Theologie encore, ne les tenoit en credit, vous les verriez sans doubte aussi marmiteuses qu'elles furent onques. Quel dommage, si elles ne nous aprenent ny à bien penser, ny à bien faire? (V-S, 140a)
>
> [a]And so it is not so great a wonder as they claim that ancestors took no great account of letters, and that even today they come in only by chance in the principal councils of our kings; and if the aim of getting rich by them which alone is set before us today, by means of jurisprudence, medicine, teaching, and even theology, did not maintain them in credit, you would undoubtedly see them in as wretched as they ever were. And what loss would that be if they teach us neither to think well, nor to do well? (125)

In this chapter, Montaigne's argument is against pedantry, the false acquisition of science, contrasted to his admiration for the true humanists, and also his reservations regarding the overwhelming trust in science. The author offers a more detailed introspection of his view regarding the function of knowledge and its highly limited nature in essay II.12.[159] The indicated passage elaborates on the concept of education from the premise that it is quite advantageous to women not to be schooled and concludes

[158] Jesus Martinez de Bujanda, *Index des livres interdits VIII*, Geneva, Droz, 1990
[159] See *supra* p. 111.

in the general rejection of the scholastic approach, which is juxtaposed to a more liberal approach in the next essay I.26, "De l'institution des enfans"[160].

Later on, on the Bordeaux copy, Montaigne comes back to the objection of the Roman censor, and he adds on to the previously cited paragraph a more detailed explanation of his personal stand on the benefits of knowledge and its shortcomings.

> Toute autre science est dommageable à celuy qui n'a la science de la bonté. Mais la raison que je cherchoys tantost, seroit-elle point aussi de là: que nostre estude en France n'ayant quasi autre but que le proufit […]il ne reste plus ordinairement, pour s'engager tout à faict à l'estude, que les gens de basse fortune qui y questent des moyens à vivre. (V-S, 141c)
>
> Any other knowledge is harmful to man who has no knowledge of goodness. But perhps the reason that I was just looking for comes also from this, that our studies in France have almost no other aim but profit, […] hence there ordinarily remain none to involve themselves completely in study but people of humble means, who seek a living in it. (125-6)

He imparts his opinion that "science" is misused and misinterpreted by those who are in charge of disseminating it, especially in France: "Et de ces gens là les ames, estant et par nature et par domestique institution et example du plus bas aloy, rapportent faucement le fruit de la science." (V-S, 141c) "And the souls of those people being both by nature and by home upbringing and example of the basest alloy, bring forth false fruits of learning." (126) Montaigne further makes his pont using the relatable example of a showmaker poorly shod, or of "a doctor worse doctored, a theologian less reformed, a scholar less cometent than anyone else." (126) This long addition clarifies the role Montaigne assigns to theology whose function he separates from that of religion and the force of faith. He also distances his example from the Roman ecclesiastical establishment by directing his

[160] This essay and the proposed pedagogical approach are analysed in our previous chapter, *supra*, p. 81.

critique at the practices observed in France. His account underlines the incorect manipulation of "science", rather than its nature.

Observation 17 on the official document is the last one that we will discuss from the double censorial perspective, because it is the last left on the list A, compiled by the first censor.[161] " 17 Et nel libro 2 pag. 13: dice che è ben qualche volta imbricarsi. *Hec et his similia."* This remark directs us to a passage from II.2, "De l'yvrongnerie".

> [A]J'ay ouy dire à Silvius, excellant medecin de Paris, que, pour garder que les forces de nostre estomac ne s'apparessent, il est bon, une fois le mois, les esveiller par cet excez, et les picquer pour les garder de s'engourdir. [B] Et escrit-on que les Perses, apres le vin, consultoient de leurs principaux affaires.[A] Mon goust et ma complexion est plus ennemie de ce vice que mon discours. Car, outre ce que je captive aysément mes creances soubs l'authorité des opinions anciennes, je le trouve bien un vice lache et stupide, mais moins malicieux et dommageable que les autres, qui choquent quasi tous de plus droit fil la societé publique. (V-S, 342)[162]
>
> I have heard Sylvius, an excellent doctor from Paris say that to keep the digestive powers from getting lazy, it is good to rouse them once a month by this excess, and stimulate them to keep them from getting sluggish. [b] And they say that the Persians used to consult about their principal affairs after wine. [a] My taste and constitution are mre inimical to this vice than my reason. For, quite aside from tha fact that I easily submit my beliefs to the authority of ancient opinions, I find it indeed a loose and stupid vice, but less malicious and harmful than others, which almos all clash more directly with society in general. (299)

The second censor aknwledges that although Montaigne mentions plenty of authors overindulging in the act of drinking, the author himself has excluded himself from those who engage in such practices because of his weak complexion. "17 Al manco, doppo aver allegato molti autori in favor dell'imbriachezza, soggionge ch'il suo gusto et complessione e qui nemica di quell vita che'l suo discorso." In this segment of the

[161] There are, as previously mentioned 18 objections that appeared on list A, but objection 18 was discussed *supra* in this chapter's segment dedicated to corrections directed at chapter II.12

[162] This is the 1580 form of the text, excluding the phrase marked with B

chapter Montaigne suggests that many ancient authors have recommended drinking; even the Stoics, and Caton himself, was reproached with inebriation. 'Et la vraye image de la virtue Stoique, Caton, a esté reproché de trop boire."[163] In 1588 he reinforces the arguments of his claims by adding a few more examples from classical times, and quoting Horace about Cato.

> [c]Ce censeur et correcteur des autres, [a]Caton a esté reproché de bien boire,
> [b]*Narratur et prisci Catonis*
> *Saepe mero caluisse virtus*. (V-S, 342b)
>
> [c] That censor and corrector of others, [a] Cato was reproached for drinking well:
> [b]Old Cato's virtue drew from wine,
> so we are told a glow more fine.
> Horace. (299)

However, on the Bordeaux copy, Montaigne returns to this passage and replaces the 1580 phrase describing Cato, ("La vraye image de la vertu stoique") with "Ce censeur et correcteur des autres". This last slight change might be an indirect allusion to Montaigne's censorship experience, connecting the role of "censeur et correcteur des autres" to the act of drinking. However, we must also be aware of the distinction between Cato the Younger and Cato the Elder, who were both famous figures of the antiquity. The citation from Horace added in 1588 referrs to Cato the Elder. However, it is Cato the Younger who is better known for his stoicism, and he is the character referenced by Montaigne as the true image of the stoic virtue. Therefore, perhaps Montaigne wanted to correct any inaccuracy that might transpire in his text, and give a more appropriate description for Cato the Elder (eliminating any confusion with his son) as Cato Censorious. He also replaces the quantitative "trop boire" with the qualitative adverb

[163] *Essais* (1580) ed. Martin, II.2, p.13

"bien boire", which subsitutes a more general estimation to a rebuke for an excessive practice.

4. On Customs and Freedom of Conscience
(Objections 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 30, 37, 38)

We shall now explore the remaining objectable articles that were only raised by the second censor, and which were not numbered on the B list, but to which we will assign numbers for easier and more accurate identification, continuing where the previous list left off, at objection 19. This comment concerns the use of word "fortune" and was analyzed in depth in our previous chapter[164].

Objection 20 brings to the author's attention a passage that denounces some catholic practices that are ethically questionable. Montaigne mentions the men and women who on Good Friday engage in flagellation in exchange for money.

> Mais ne voit-on encore tous les jours le Vendredy Saint en divers lieux un grand nombre d'hommes et femmes se battre jusques à se déchirer la chair et percer jusques aux os? Cela ay-je veu souvent et sans enchantement: et, disoit-on (car ils vont masquez) qu'il y en avoit, qui pour de l'argent entreprenoient en cela de garantir la religion d'autruy, par un mespris de la douleur d'autant plus grand, que plus peuvent les éguillons de la devotion que de l'avarice. (V-S, 61a)
>
> [a]But do we not see every Good Friday in various places a large number of men and women beating themselves until they tear their flesh and cut to the bone? That I have often seen and without enchantment; and it was said that there were some (for they go masked) who for money undertook in this way to ensure other people's religion, with a contempt for pain all the greater as the spurs of piety are greater than those of avarice. (49)

The censor considers this passage a derision of religious discipline, and inappropriate for the Holy Week, even if it were true. "Per che si burla delle discipline che si suoleva fare

[164] See *supra* p. 30.

il venerdi santo, dicendo ch'alcuni ne fanno per danari. Al manco non accadeva dire tal cosa in questi tempi, ancor che fusse vera, lib.1, pag.73." The way the censor reacts to this passage is representative for the general religious position on the matter, which is: these practices are quite unethical, but they are customary within the Catholic institution, and they are generally accepted; however they cannot be publicly denigrated due to the current political context of the Reformation. Montaigne did not change or exclude this paragraph from the 1582 or any later editions, but he did add significant material to this argument, whose purpose seems to be to rehabilitate the Catholic image. The text added after this paragraph in 1588, and later on the Bordeaux copy, approximately doubles the body of the original essay, and the example added immediately after the censored passage articulates the virtuous story of Cardinal Charles Barromeo, a true example of Christian faith (and a future Saint of the Church):

> Combien en sçavons nous qui ont fuy la douceur d'une vie tranquille, en leurs maisons, parmi leurs cognoissans, pour suivre l'horreur des desers inhabitables; et qui se sont jettez à l'abjection, vilité, et mespris du monde, et s'y sont pleuz jusques à l'affectation. Le cardinal Borromé qui mourut dernierement à Milan, au milieu de la desbauche, à quoy le convioit et sa noblesse, et ses grandes richesses, et l'air de l'Italie, et sa jeunesse, se maintint en une forme de vie si austere, que la mesme robe qui luy servoit en esté, luy servoit en hyver; n'avoit pour son coucher que la paille; et les heures qui luy restoyent des occupations de sa charge, il les passoit estudiant continuellement, planté sur ses genouz, ayant un peu d'eau et de pain à costé de son livre, qui estoit toute la provision de ses repas, et tout le temps qu'il y employoit. (V-S, 61b)
>
> [b]How many we know who have fled the sweetness of a tranquil life in their homes, among theirs friends, to seek the horror of uninhabitable deserts; who have flung themselves into humiliation, degradation, and the contempt of the world and have enjoyed these and even sought them out. Cardinal Borromeo, who died lately in Milan, held to so austere a way of life in the midst of the debauchery to which his nobility, his great riches, the atmosphere of Italy, and his youth invited him, that the same robe that served him in summer

> served him in winter. He slept on straw only; and the hours he had left from the duties of his position in continual study, planted on his knees, having a little bread and water beside his book, but no other food and no other time for eating. (50)

Objection 21 challenges a paragraph from chapter I.16 "De la punition de la couardise", in which Montaigne discusses the capital punishment against heretics.

> A la vérité c'est raison qu'on face grande difference entre les fautes qui viennent de nostre foiblesse, et celles qui viennent de nostre malice. Car en celles icy nous nous sommes bandez à nostre escient contre les reigles de la raison, que nature a empreintes en nous; et en celles là, il semble que nous puissions appeller à garant cette mesme nature, pour nous avoir laissé en telle imperfection et deffaillance; de maniere que prou de gens ont pensé qu'on ne se pouvoit prendre à nous, que de ce que nous faisons contre nostre[165] conscience; et sur cette regle est en partie fondée l'opinion de ceux qui condamnent les punitions capitales aux heretiques et mescreans, et celle qui establit qu'un advocat et un juge ne puissent estre tenuz de ce que par ignorance ils ont failly en leur charge. (V-S, 70a)
>
> [a]In truth it is right to make a great distinction between the fault that come from our weakness and those that come from out malice. For the latter we have tensed ourselves deliberately against the rules of reason that nature has imprinted in us; and in the former it seems that we can call on this same nature as our warrantor, for having left us in such imperfection and weakness. This may people have thought that we could not be blamed except for what we do against our conscience; and on this rule is partly based the opinion f those who condemn capital punishment for heretics and unbelievers, and the belief that an advocate or a judge cannot be held responsible for having failed in his charge because of ignorance. (58)

Due to an incomplete transcription of the censorial remark from the official document, the extent and details of this objection are not perfectly clear. "79 Allega un fundamento dell'opinione di quei qui damnant punizione capitali ha <…>"[166]. Regardless of how this argument originally ended, the censor correctly understood that the dangerous statement

[165] This word "nostre" was added in the 1582 edition.
[166] « He provides support for the opinion of those who condemning capital punishment have…" (my translation)

which disagrees with capital punishment for heretics was not the author's view. It is a form of indirect speech in which Montaigne presents the reasoning behind the argument against capital punishment for heretics. He does not say that he agrees with them, but he recontextualizes this view. It is evident that Montaigne reconsidered this essay during the process of republishing of the 1582 edition, because he added the possessive "nostre" to the word "conscience", in the most important part of his argument. The addition of this possessive adjective reinforces the "reflexivity" of the condemned action: "ce que **nous** faisons contre **nostre** conscience." The act becomes a disservice to one's self as well as an act against faith, thus entailing a punishment in itself, and not necessitating excessive external castigation. This essay is a very short piece and its content has been changed very little over the several published editions, the word "nostre" being the only alteration made to this argument. Montaigne seems to withhold his views on the issue of capital punishment, or rather on the way he chooses to approach this topic in his text. Based on the reasoning behind the crime, "malice" or "couardise", the punishment should be instant death, or life-long dishonor and shame.

The 22nd objection reported on the official document is a critical statement regarding essay I.21 "De la force de l'imagination". The censor reproaches Montaigne with a possible anti-catholic position in his treatment of miracles. "122 Tribuit potentie imaginationis praecipuum assensum, qui datur miraculis. Titulus capitis est: fortis imaginatio facit casum." The paragraph that originally triggered the censor's warning was, as indicated in the document, on page 122 of the 1580 edition, and included the word "miracles" in a longer list of extraordinary and irrational acts, that are attributed to the force of imagination.

> Il est vray semblable que le principal credit des miracles, des visions, des enchantemens et de tels effects extraordinaires, vienne de la puissance de l'imagination agissant principalement contre les ames du vulgaire, ou il y a moins de resistence.[167] On leur a si fort saisi la creance, qu'ils pensent voir ce qu'ils ne voyent pas. (V-S, 99a)
>
> [a]It is probable that the principal credit of miracles, visions, enchantments, and such extraordinary occurrences comes from the power of imagination, acting principally upon the minds of the common people which are softer. Their belief has been so strongly seized that they think they see what they do not see. (84)

The context of the European Reformation once again resurfaces as a dangerous background for any affirmations that might cast any doubt on the Catholic faith and its practices. Disbelief in the power of miracles can easily be interpreted as a manifestation of such doubts, since the cults of saints and martyrs was the basis for the strongest examples of religious miracles, which were not recognized by the Reformers.

This chapter as a whole was greatly modified by Montaigne throughout the process of reediting for each republication of the *Essays*, and its size augmented considerably. Some arguments were developed and some other concepts were added for further clarification, and in support of the paragraph cited above, which plays the role of the main argument of the chapter. The textual additions take the form of a collection of individual stories, some from personal experiences, others from religious sources (St. Augustine), folk stories or classical examples. Through the diversity of their nature and finality, they attempt to redefine a more secular definition of the term "miracle", mentioned in the original passage. Consequently, although the paragraph in question was not altered, Montaigne payed close attention to the contents of his chapter, first in the 1582 edition, and later on the Bordeaux copy, in which he continuously reworded certain

[167] On the Bordeaux edition, Montaigne replaces "ou il y a moins de resistence" with "plus molles".

examples and paragraphs and added new material. A great example of such textual development is the explanatory paragraph that follows the passage indicated by the censor, and that expands and clarifies the concept that triggered the criticism. Its form increases greatly from the 1580 to the 1582 edition and to the Bordeaux copy, emphasizing the profane, human nature of the topic debated. See Appendix B *infra* for the sequential textual developments of this chapter "De la force de l'imagination" (I.21).

This particular example of text development gradually operated on the chapter suggests not only the development of an argument touched upon in 1580, but also a change in approach of the original concepts. The message of the text becomes more secular, less interested in the role played by the divine power, and more concerned with extraordinary experiences related in individual stories. This adjustment of the narrative method is further valorized in a new conclusive paragraph also added to the chapter on the Bordeaux copy, in which the author clearly states the profoundly humanistic quality of his text.

> Aussi en l'estude que je traitte de noz moeurs et mouvemens, les tesmoignages fabuleux, pourveu qu'ils soient possibles, y servent comme les vrais. Advenu ou non advenu, à Paris ou à Rome, à Jean ou à Pierre, c'est toujours un tour de l'humaine capacite, duquel je suis utilement advisé par ce recit. […] Sur ce propos, j'entre par fois en pensée qu'il puisse assez bien convenir à un Theologien, à un philosophe, et telles gens d'exquise et exacte conscience et prudence, d'escrire l'histoire. Comment peuvent ils engager leur foy sur une foy populaire? Comment respondre des pensées de personnes incognues et donner pour argent contant leurs conjectures? Des actions à divers membres, qui se passent en leur presence, ils refuseroient d'en rendre tesmoignage, assermentez par un juge: et n'ont homme si familier, des intentions duquel ils entreprennent de pleinement respondre. Je tien moins hazardeux d'escrire les choses passées que presentes: d'autant que l'escrivain n'a à rendre compte que d'une verité empruntée. (V-S, 106c)

> [c] So in the study that I am making of our behavior and motives, fabulous testimonies, provided they are possible, serve like true ones. Weather they have happened or no, in Paris or Rome, to John or Peter, they exemplified, at all events, some human potentiality, and thus their telling imparts useful information to me. […] In this connection, I sometimes fall to thinking whether it befits a theologian, a philosopher, and such people of exquisite and exact conscience and prudence, to write history. How can they stake their fidelity on the fidelity of an ordinary person? How be responsible for the thoughts of persons unknown and give their conjectures as coin of realm? Of complicated actions that happened in their presence they would refuse to give testimony if placed under oath by a judge; and they know no man so intimately that they would undertake to answer fully for his intentions. I consider it less hazardous to write of tings past than present, inasmuch as the writer has only to give an account of a borrowed truth. (91)

This final paragraph performs the same exculpatory function as the introductory paragraph of the chapter I.56, "Des prières", placing the authority of the author well outside the authority of the Church, in the wider space of the human existence. It seems that all these strategic rhetorical tricks to separate the word "miracle" from its intrinsic religious conotations were not convincing enough, and in the 1595 posthmous edition of the *Essays*, the word "miracle" disappears completely from the original paragraph designated by the censor. "Il est vray semblable, que le principal credit des visions, des enchantemens, et de tels effects extraordinaires, vienne de la puissance de l'imagination, agissant principalement contre les ames du vulgaire, plus molles. On leur a si fort saisi la creance, qu'ils pensent voir ce qu'ils ne voyent pas."[168] We must note that this final edition of the text was primarily prepared by Marie de Gournay, (from the final copy of

[168] *Les essais de Michel seigneur de Montaigne. Edition nouuelle, / trouuee après le deceds de l'autheur, reueuë & augmentée par luy d'vn tiers plus qu'aux precedentes impressions*. Paris: Michel Sonnius 1595, p. 47 (source: **http://www2.lib.virginia.edu/rmds/portfolio/gordon/literary/montaigne/index.html**, University of Virginia).

the Bordeaux edition, or from another lost copy that followed it),[169] and it contains certain textual changes that do not correspond to the Bordeaux copy of the text; this omission of the word "miracle" is one of this inconsistencies.

The 23rd objection pertains to essay I.22 ("Le Profit de l'Un Est Dommage de l'Autre"). This chapter is a very short text that exposes our world as a state of equilibrium based on the contiuous exchange of two opposing forces acting as supply and demand.

> Le marchand ne fait bien ses affaires qu'à la débauche de la jeunesse; le laboureur, à la cherté des bleds; l'architecte, à la ruine des maisons; les officiers de la justice, aux procez et querelles des hommes; l'honneur mesme et pratique des ministres de la religion se tire de nostre mort et de nos vices. Nul medecin ne prent plaisir à la santé de ses amis mesmes, dit l'ancien Comique Grec, ny soldat à la paix de sa ville: ainsi du reste. (V-S, 107a)
>
> [a] The merchant dos good business only by the extravagance of youth the ploughman by the high cost of grain; the architect by the ruin of houses; officers of justice by men's lawsuits and quarrels; the very honor and function of ministers of religion is derived from our death and our vices. No doctor takes pleasure in the health even of his friend says the ancient comic Greek writer, no soldier in the peace of his city; and so for the rest. (92)

The censor recognizes among the examples that validate this permanent state of balance the function of the Church, which is irreverently cited among other meager human activities: "133 Ministrorum religionis proficisci ex nostra morte et vitiis". The text reads as an impious judgement, inadequately referencing religious services, and focusing on the merely venal aspects of religious activities. The passage remained unchanged, and the text of the entire essay maintained its original form throughout all the republishings of the *Essays*.

[169] For more on this final form of the text, and its comparison with the Bordeaux copy, see « Preface » of *Les Essais*, Nouvelle édition de Jean Balsamo, Catherine Magnien-Simonin et Michel Magnien, Gallimard " Bibliothèque de la Pléiade", Paris, 2007.

The next censorial remark addresses a passage in chapter I. 23 ("De la Coustume et de ne Changer Aisément une Loy Receue"), in which Montaigne again handles religious activities in a supposedly inadequate context.

> Que ne peut elle [la coutume] en nos jugemens et en nos creances? Y a il opinion si bizarre (je laisse à part la grossiere imposture des religions, dequoy tant de grandes nations et tant de suffisans personnages se sont veux enyvrez: car cette partie estant hors de nos raisons humaines, il est plus excusable de s'y perdre, à qui n'y est extraordinairement esclairé par faveur divine) mais d'autres opinions y en a il de si estranges, qu'elle n'aye planté et estably par loix és regions que bon, luy a semblé? (V-S, 111a)
>
> [a] What power does she [it i.e. custom/habit] not have in or judgments and in our believes? Is there any opinion so bizarre – I leave aside the gross imposture of religions, with which so many great nations and so many able men have been seen to be besotted, for since this matter is beyond the scope of our human reason, it is more excusable for anyone who is not extraordinarily enlightened by divine favor to be lost in it; but of other opinions is there any so strange – that habit has not planted and established it by law in the regions where she saw fit to do so? (95-6)

The censor's reaction is a direct translation in Italian. "136 Il costume che cosa non può nelli nostri giudicii et fede. Ve'qualche opinione si fantastica (lasciando a parte la goffa importanza delle religioni)." In the follwing edition of 1588 and later on the Bordeaux copy, Montaigne seems to clarify his point by tracing it back to the previous accounts mentioned by the censor: "fortis imaginatio facit casum". In this example he works his reasoning backwards. Our imagination is the result of what surrounds us, and of "habits" associated with our lifestyle. Miracles are effects of our limited understanding of God's ways, not direct acts of God. This argument gradually gains consistency by the adding more and more examples. To the original 1580 passage cited above, in 1588 Montaigne adds the continuation:

> J'estime qu'il ne tombe en l'imagination humaine aucune fantasie si forcenée, qui ne rencontre l'exemple de quelque usage public, et par consequent que nostre discours n'estaie et ne fonde. Il est des peuples où on tourne le doz à celuy qu'on salue, et ne regarde l'on jamais celuy qu'on veut honorer. Il en est où, quand le Roy crache, la plus favorie des dames de sa Cour tend la main; et en autre nation les plus apparents qui sont autour de luy, se baissent à terre pour amasser en du linge son ordure. (V-S, 111b)
>
> [b] I think that there falls into man imagination no fantasy so wild that it does not match the example of some public practice, and for which consequently, our reason does not find a stay and a foundation. There are countries where they turn their back to the person they greet, and never look at the one they wish to honor. There are somewhere, when the king spits, the most favored of the ladies of his court holds out her hand; and in another nation the most imminent persons around him stoop to the ground to pick up his ordure in a linen cloth. (96)

On the Bordeaux M adds a personal example:

> Desrobons icy, la place d'un compte. Un Gentil-homme François se mouchoit tousjours de sa main: chose tres-ennemie de nostre usage. Defendant là-dessus son faict (et estoit fameux en bonnes rencontres) il me demanda quel privilege avoit ce salle excrement que nous allassions lui apprestant un beau linge delicat à le recevoir, et puis, qui plus est, à l'empaqueter et serrer soigneusement sur nous; que cela devoit faire plus de horreur et de mal au coeur, que de le voir verser où que ce fust, comme nous faisons tous autres excremens. Je trouvay qu'il ne parloit pas du tout sans raison: et m'avoit la coustume osté l'appercevance de cette estrangeté, laquelle pourtant nous trouvons si hideuse, quand elle est recitée d'un autre païs. Les miracles sont selon l'ignorance en quoy nous sommes de la nature, non selon l'estre de la nature. (V-S, 111-2c)
>
> [c] let us here steal room for a story. One French gentleman always used to blow his nose in his hand, a thing very repugnant to our practice. Defending his actions against this reproach (and he was famous for his original remarks), he asked me what privilege this dirty excrement had that we should prepare a fine delicate piece linen to receive it, and then, what is more, wrap it up and carry it carefully on us; for that should be much more horrifying and nauseating than to see it drop in any old place as we do all other excrements. I found that what he said was not entirely without

> reason; and habit had led me not to perceive the strangeness of this action, which nevertheless we find so hideous when it is told us about in other countries. Miracles arise from our ignorance of nature, not from the essence of nature. (96)

The same point is made in Chapter II.30 ("D'un enfant monstrueux"), in which Montaigne recounts meeting a child with one head and two connected bodies who functioned somewhat normal. In 1580 the text was just account of what he saw and the circumstances oh his encounter accompanied by a short disclosure in which he avowes that any commentary regarding such occurences might become dangerous and misinterpreted "mais, de peur que l'evenement ne le démente, il vaut mieux le laisser passer devant, car il n'est que de deviner en choses faictes." (V-S,713a) "But for fear that event should belie it, it is better to let it go its way, for there is nothing like divining about things past." (654). In the 1588 edition Montaigne added the mention of Epimenides (a Cretan author who claimed to have the gift of prophecy): "As they say of Epimenides that he prophesied backwards;" and a brief example of the recollection of a similar encounter with no sex. However in the Bordeaux, Montaigne adds a new ending to this chapter in which, as in chapter I.23 cited above, he reshapes his argument in the end with a development constructed around a quote from Cicero:

> Ce que nous appellons monstres, ne le sont pas à Dieu, qui voit en l'immensité de son ouvrage l'infinité des formes qu'il y a comprinses; et est à croire que cette figure qui nous estonne, se rapporte et tient à quelque autre figure de mesme genre inconnu à l'homme. […]*Quod crebro videt, non miratur, etiam si cur fiat nescit. Quod ante non vidit, id, si evenerit, ostentum esse censet.* Nous apelons contre nature ce qui advient contre la coustume: rien n'est que selon elle, quel qu'il soit. (V-S, 713c)
>
> What we call monsters are not so to God, who sees in the immensity of his work the infinity of forms that he has comprised in it and it is for us to believe that this figure that astonishes us is related and linked to some other figure unknown to man. […]

> "What he sees often he does not wonder at, even if he does not know why it is. If something happens which he has not seen before, he thinks it is a prodigy." – [Cicero] We cal contrary to nature what happens contrary to custom; nothing is anything but according to nature, whatever it may be. (654)

This new ending to the chapter clearly resonates with the textual develompments form the chapter I.23 ("De la coustume et de ne changer aisements une loy receue") cited above, which Lancius mentions in his 24th objection. Montaigne found in this observation the motivation to come back to the text and defend his opinion on the understanding of miracles as a result of human imagination, contextualized by the customs and habits rooted in a certain culture and geographical location. Montaigne's impressions developed in chapters, I.23 and II.30 also triggered the next objection of the censor, in which the latter reproached the author with his disrespectful treatment of clerical figures and their practices.

> 144 Pone fra I piu monstruosi modi di vesti le berrette quadrate, et *168 usurpat illud riduculum. Magis magnos clericos non sunt magis magnos serpents*, et 206 *ridicule narrat parochum suum tribuere irae divinae quod vites congelatas* et 488 *memorat exemplum ridiculum theologi, qui aequitabat foeminarum more*.

In this remark the censor draws together 4 different instances in which Montaigne mocks the dispositions of several clerics, without however implying any serious defamation or suggesting any significant criticism regarding their faith. The author's rather comical attitude towards the representatives of the Church was addressed in the literary context of the times, when most of the attacks against catholic dignitaries were coming from the reformed camp. The first passage mentioned by Lancius is the following:

> Quant aux choses indifferentes, comme vestemens, qui les voudra ramener à leur vraye fin, qui est le service et commodité du corps, d'où dépend leur grace et bien seance originelle, pour les plus

> monstrueux à mon gré qui se puissent imaginer, je luy donray entre autres nos bonnets carrez, cette longue queue de veloux plissé qui pend aux testes de nos femmes avec son attirail bigarré, et ce vain modelle et inutile d'un membre que nous ne pouvons seulement honnestement nommer, duquel toutesfois nous faisons montre et parade en public. (V-S, 118a)
>
> As for indifferent things such as clothes, if any man wants to restore them to their true purpose, which the service and comfort of the body, on which depend their original grace and fitness, I will offer him, among other examples, as in my opinion the most monstrous that can be imagined, our square bonnets, that long tail of pleated velvet that hangs from our women's heads with its many colored trappings, and that empty and useless model of a member that we cannot even decently mention by name, which however we show off and parade in public. (103)

In this paragraph, Montaigne discusses the current norms for dressing etiquette, and some items that, although universally accepted and used, when taken out of the cultural bounderies, appear as quite unsuitable, useless pieces. Among these mentioned items, the censor noted the "bonnets carrez", a visual emblem of the clerical figures. These illustrations were a great example for Montaigne's earlier argument that the customs and habits of a culture were more influential than any other institution. Montaigne did not change this paragraph in any of the following editions.

The next passage indicated in the censor's objection targeting the author's mockery of religious figures, leads us to chapter I.25, ("Du pedantisme"), which was already the object of observation 16. In the opening of this essay Montaigne discusses the ambiguous image of the teacher and confesses his realization later in life that most of the finest figures of the time, among which places Du Bellay, held the figure of the teacher in contempt:

> Depuis, avec l'eage, j'ay trouvé qu'on avoit une grandissime raison et que *magis magnos clericos non sunt magis magnos sapientes*.

> Mais d'où il puisse advenir qu'une ame riche de la connoissance de tant de choses n'en devienne pas plus vive et plus esveillée, et qu'un esprit grossier et vulgaire puisse loger en soy, sans s'amender, les discours et les jugemens des plus excellens esprits que le monde ait porté, j'en suis encore en doute.[170] (V-S, 134a)
>
> [a]Since then, as I grew older, I found that they had a very good reason for this and that *the greatest scholars are not the wisest men* (proverb quoted by Rabelais). But how it is possible that a soul rich in the knowledge of so many things should not thereby become keener and more alert, and that a crude and commonplace mind can harbor within itself, without being improved the reasonings and judgments of the greatest minds that the world has produced – that still has me puzzled. (118)

The paragraph cites the proverb used by Rabelais, *magis magnos clericos non sunt magis magnos sapientes,* and which mocks the figure of the Sorbonard, who is portrayed as icompetent in grammar and ignorant.[171] Although Montaigne did not change this paragraph, this chapter becomes more and more developed throughout the following editions, and gradually the author distances his arguments against pedantry from theology. His satire targets for the most part inadequate philosophers, sophists, and the learned people in general, thus removing any hidden insinuation that he targets the members of the Church. In the observation made by the censor, the word "sapientes" is replaced by the word "serpentes" (snakes), which is most likely a spelling error, or a transcription mistake. This is not the only graphic inconsistency in the text of this objection. We also note the wrong page number for another example given by the censor, 448 in stead 488, as it was marked in the document.[172] This wrongly referenced passage belongs to essay I.48 ("Des destries") and it briefly mentions a doctor in theology who was riding his horse sidesaddled, like a woman:

---

[170] *Essais*, V-S, I. 25, p. 134a
[171] Rabelais, *Gargantua*, ed. Gallimard collection "Folio Classique", Barcelona, 2004, ch.39, pp. 319
[172] Legros, "Montaigne face a ses censeurs…", p. 24 n.

> Encore ne faut-il pas oublier la plaisante assiette qu'avoit, sur sa mule, un maistre Pierre Pol, Docteur en Theologie, que Monstrelet recite avoir accoustumé se promener par la ville de Paris, assis de costé, comme les femmes. (V-S, 291a)
>
> [a] Still we must not forget the comical posture on his mule of one Master Pierre Paul, doctor in theology, who, Monstrelet reports, was accustomed to ride around the city of Paris seated side-saddle, like a woman. (258)

This short anecdote is a brief example among many that pertain to uses and practices involving horseback riding. The paragraph was not altered in the future editions, but just as with the previous passage, as the chapter grew and became more and more developed with considerable additions, which rendered more evident that Montaigne's emphasis was placed on the situatios presented rather than on the characters involved.

The last passage indicated in this 25th objection, belongs to I.26, "De l'institution des enfans", a chapter previously scrutinized by both censors due to several other controversial statements. The paragraph referenced in this case, alludes to a common practice of the period, namely the tendency to disregard the diversity in the world, and judge all situations within the cultural limitations of one's current state.
"Quand les vignes gelent en mon village, mon prebstre en argumente l'ire de Dieu sur la race humaine, et juge que la pepie en tienne des-jà les Cannibales." (V-S, 157a) "When the vines freeze in my village, my priest infers that the wrath of God is upon the human race, and judges that the cannibals already have the pip." (140) To the censor this shows that Montaigne finds the clerical figure as limited in his wisdom, and his teaching often absurd. We are back to Rabelais's "Magis magnos clericos non sunt magis magnos sapientes." (V-S, 134a) Montaigne, however, just as in the previous two cases, is describing a particular situation, involving a particular individual. He is not interested in

transforming these examples into gereral truths. This passage too, remains unaltered throughout the future editions of the *Essays*. All the references mentioned in the 25th objections are the product of Montaigne's own experience, that have no claim to damage the image of the Church and affect religious devotion. They are connected to a purely human understanding of the world, and all of them are maintained in the text. Montaigne uses the same approach to this matter as he did with the names of heretic authors. He is not challenging the Catholic Church's position on religious matters; rather he looks at them from a lay perspective, which, although within a limited sphere, enables him to speak freely.

The next observation, counted as 27th on our document hods against Montaigne the fact that in chapter I.46 ("Des noms") he praises those who choose names such as Mathusalem and Ezechiel rather than Charles and François, because this naming practice is typical with heretics. "423 *Laudat eos, malunt vocari Mathusalem, Ezechiel, Malachius quam Carolus, Ludowicus, Franciscus. Quod hereticis familiare est*." Obviously, the censor misread Montaigne who did not praise the heretics for using biblical names instead of saints' names, but wondered if in the future this decision would be viewed differently, just as names of old nobility acquired different connotations at later times.

> Item, dira pas la posterité que nostre reformation d'aujourd'huy ait esté delicate et exacte, de n'avoir pas seulement combatu les erreurs et les vices, et rempli le monde de devotion, d'humilité, d'obeissance, de paix et de toute espece de vertu, mais d'avoir passé jusque à combatre ces anciens noms de nos baptesmes, Charles, Loys, François, pour peupler le monde de Mathusalem, Ezechiel, Malachie, beaucoup mieux sentans de la foy? Un gentil'homme mien voisin, estimant les commoditez du vieux temps au pris du nostre, n'oublioit pas de mettre en conte la fierté et magnificence des noms de la noblesse de ce temps, Don Grumedan, Quedragan,

> Agesilan, et qu'à les ouïr seulement sonner, il se sentoit qu'ils avoyent esté bien autres gens que Pierre, Guillot et Michel. (V-S, 277a)
>
> [a] Item, will not posterity say that our present day reformation has been fastidious and precise, not only to have combated errors and vices and filled the world with devotion, humility, obedience, peace, and every sort of virtue, but to have gone so far as to combat our ancient baptismal names, Charles, Louis, Francois, in order to populate the world with Methuselahs, Ezekiels, and Malachis, which smack much more of the faith? A gentleman neighbor of mine, estimating the advantages of the olden times in comparaison with ours, did not forget to place in account the pride and magnificence of the name of the nobility of those days, Don Grumedan, Quedragan, Agesilan and the fact that in merely hearing them sounded he felt that they had been very different people from Pierre, Guillaume, and Michel. (245)

The text remains unchainged in the future editions.

Objection 28 combines two different textual references: the last censored passage from book I, and the first censored passage from book II. We believe that an error in the transcription of the documents may be responsible for placing together these two points that are otherwise dissimilar in nature. There is also no overarching argument that applies to both passages mentioned, and each of the two ideas is presented individualy. Also, the fact that the first observation is in Latin and the second in Italian is further evidence that the two objections were meant to appear separately.

> 333 *Non vult tribui vindicte divine infaustam mortem Arii heresiarche, aut saltem probat id non esse necessarium*. Parte 2a pagina 1: Ch'el Papa Bonifacio 8º (secondo si dice) entrò nel carico come volpe, vi si comportò come lione e morse come cane.

With the first textual reference, the censor criticizes Montaigne for refusing to connect extreme events, such as a violent death and divine providence, as proof of the

latter's power over humans. In reality, Montaigne's approach is a testimony to his reverent attitude regarding God's involvement in ordinary human affairs.

> Somme, il est mal-aysé de ramener les choses divines à nostre balance, qu'elles n'y souffrent du deschet. Et qui voudroit rendre raison de ce que Arrius et Leon, son Pape, chefs principaux de cette heresie, moururent en divers temps de mors si pareilles et si estranges (car, retirez de la dispute par douleur de ventre à la garderobe, tous deux y rendirent subitement l'ame), et exagerer cette vengeance divine par la circonstance du lieu, y pourroit bien encore adjouster la mort de Heliogabalus, qui fut aussi tué en un retraict. Mais quoy? Irenée se trouve engagé en mesme fortune. (V-S, 216a)

> [a] In short, it is difficult to bring down divine things to our scale without their suffering loss. And if someone wanted to give the reason why Arius and Leo, his Pope, the principal leaders of the Arian heresy, died at different times of such similar and strage deaths (for a bellyache having forced them to withdraw from the disputation to the toilet, they both suddenly gave up the ghost there), and were minded to dramatize this divine vengeance by the circumstance of the place, he could indeed further add the death of Heliogabalus, who was also killed in a privy. But what does this prove? Irenaeus happened to have suffered the same fate. (195)

In this paragraph, by rejecting any involvement of the divine wrath in castigating two heretical figures, Montaigne separates two un-matching spaces occupied by the divine and the profane. The place of God and His will is completely outside of human understanding, and attributing Him such acts is just as inappropriate as claiming to comprehend His will. This is a perfect example of the distinction Montaigne makes between "fortune" and "providence", a topic that also came under the scrutiny of the Roman censors, and explains why he continues to use the term "fortune" as a sign for his non-religious book, and his humility in front of divine subjects. On the Bordeaux copy Montaigne will add further explanatory elements to this problematic text.

> Dieu, nous voulant apprendre que les bons ont autre chose à esperer, et les mauvais autre chose à craindre que les fortunes ou

> infortunes de ce monde, il les manie et applique selon sa disposition occulte, et nous oste le moyen d'en faire sottement nostre profit. Et se moquent ceux qui s'en veulent prevaloir selon l'humaine raison. Ils n'en donnent jamais une touche, qu'ils n'en reçoivent deux. Saint Augustin en faict une belle preuve sur ses adversaires. C'est un conflict qui se decide par les armes de la memoire plus que par celles de la raison. […] *Quis hominum potest scire consilium dei? aut quis poterit cogitare quid velit dominus?* (V-S, 216-7c)
>
> [c] God, wishing to teach us that the good have something else to hope for, and the wicked something else to fear, than the fortunes and the misfortunes of this world, handles and allots these according to his occult disposition, and deprives us of the means of foolishly making our profit of them. And those people delude themselves who try to take advantage of them by human reason. They never score one hit but they receive two. Saint Augustine gives a fine proof of this against his adversaries. It is a conflict that is decided by the weapons of memory more than by those of reason […] [c] what man can know the counsel of God? Or who can think what is the will of the Lord? (Apocrypha Book of Wisdom). (195)

The second passage noted in this double objection is located in essay II. 1 ("De l'inconstance de nos actions"), and it consists of a brief mention of Pope Boniface VIII (1294-1303), closely inspired by the epitaph written by Jean Bouchet in his *Annales d'Aquitaine:* "Le Pape Boniface huictiesme entra, dit-on, en sa charge comme un renard, s'y porta comme un lion, et mourut comme un chien." (V-S, 332a) The image of this Pope was controversial for the Catholic institution due to his overt conflicts with Frederik the Third of Sicily (1272 – 1337), and with King Philip IV of France (1268-1314), who was allied with against the Pontif, and which both ended with the excommunication of the monarchs. In 1303 he was captured and badly beaten by the soldiers of king Philip IV aided by the Colonnas, the powerful Roman family, and although he was released from

captivity, he died humiliated a month later.[173] His legacy was posthumously rehabilitated. Montaigne did not exclude this sentence from his future editions of the text. However, in 1588 he added a paragraph that clearly states Montaigne's disapproval of certain authors' habit to simplify, and generalize the characteristics and behavior of a person, as was the case with Pope Boniface VIII.

> Il y a quelque apparence de faire jugement d'un homme par les plus communs traicts de sa vie; mais, veu la naturelle instabilité de nos meurs et opinions, il m'a semblé souvent que les bons autheurs mesmes ont tort de s'opiniastrer à former de nous une constante et solide contexture. Ils choisissent un air universel, et suyvant cette image, vont rengeant et interpretant toutes les actions d'un personnage, et, s'ils ne les peuvent assez tordre, les vont renvoyant à la dissimulation. Auguste leur est eschappé: car il se trouve en cet homme une varieté d'actions si apparente, soudaine et continuelle, tout le cours de sa vie, qu'il s'est faict lacher, entier et indeçis, aux plus hardis juges. Je croy des hommes plus mal aiséement la constance, que toute autre chose, et rien plus aiséement que l'inconstance. Qui en jugeroit en destail [C] et distinctement piece à piece, [B] rencontreroit plus souvent à dire vray. (V-S, 332bc)
>
> There is some justification for basing a judgement of a man on the most ordinary acts of his life; but in the view of the natural instability of our conduct and opinions, it had often seemed to me that even good authors are wrong to insist on fashioning a consistent and solid fabric out of us. They choose one general characteristic and go and arrange and interpret all a man's actions to fit their picture; and if they cannot twist them enough, they go and set them down to dissimulation. Augustus has escaped them; for there is in this man throughout the course of his life such an obvious, abrupt and continual variety of actions that even the bodest judges have had to let him go, intact and unsolved. Nothing is harder for me than to believe in men's consistency, nothing easier than to believe in their inconsistency. He who would judge them in detail [c] and distinctly, bit by bit, [b] would more often hit upon the truth. (290)

[173] Reardon, Wendy. *The Deaths of the Popes. Comprehensive Accounts Including Funeral, Burial Places and Epitaphs*. McFarland. pp. 120–123.

Objection 30 on our document disapproves Montaigne's rather favorable attitude toward Marguerite de Navarre's book, *The Heptameron*. Francis I's sister was a well-known defender and ally of the evangelical movement, and thus became suspicious in the eyes of Sorbonne. "139 Allega la regina de Navarra." The censor did not specify the details of the passage, or the nature of this comment, but the page number points to short phrase in which Montaigne mentions the example of a story from the *Heptameron*, in order to clarify his own point:

> Ie sçay qu'on peut aisément gourmender l'effort de ce plaisir (la volupté), et encore que ie luy donne plus de credit sur moy que ie ne deurois, si est ce que ie ne prens aucunement pour miracle, comme faict la Royne de Nauarre Marguerite, en l'vn des contes de son Heptameron (qui est vn gentil liure pour son estoffe), ny pour chose de grande difficulté, de passer plusieurs nuicts entieres, en toute commodité et liberté, auec vne maistresse de long temps desirée, maintenant la promesse qu'on luy aura faicte de se contenter des baisers et simples atouchemens.[174]

The Roman official was perhaps distracted by the short positive note in parenthesis following the title of Marguerite de Navarre's book, and he failed to notice that Montaigne's comment was actually refuting the argument of the story. In fact he uses Marguerite's book as a counter-argument in a frank discussion about sexual pleasure. This context shows no theological implications and thus the religious interests of the Queen are not brought into question. The authority of Marguerite de Navarre as an author is limited to affairs of the heart and other human acts, as he clearly states in a previous essay, I.56 ("Des prières"):

> La Royne de Navarre, Marguerite, recite d'un jeune prince, et, encore qu'elle ne le nomme pas, sa grandeur l'a rendu assez connoissable, qu'allant à une assignation amoureuse, et coucher avec la femme d'un Advocat de Paris, son chemin s'adonnant au travers d'une Eglise, il ne passoit jamais en ce lieu saint, alant ou

[174] *Essais* (1580), ed. Martin p. 139

> retournant de son entreprinse, qu'il ne fit ses prieres et oraisons. Je vous laisse à juger, l'ame pleine de ce beau pensement, à quoy il employoit la faveur divine: toutesfois elle allegue cela pour un tesmoignage de singuliere devotion. Mais ce n'est pas par cette preuve seulement qu'on pourroit verifier que les femmes ne sont guieres propres à traiter les matieres de la Theologie. (V-S, 324a)
>
> [a] Margaret, Queen of Navarre, tells of a yound prince – and although she does not name him, his greatness has made him recognizable enough – that when he went to an amorous assignation to sleep with the wife of Paris advocate, his route leading through a church, he never passed through that holy place in going to or coming from his enterprise without making his prayers and orisons. His soul filled with that fine thought, I leave you to judge for what purpose he employed the divine favor; yet she cites this as evidence of singular devotion. But it is not by this proof only that one could demonstrate that women are hardly to treat theological matters. (285)

In the passage alluded to in objection 30, Montaigne is faithful to his original views regarding Marguerite's book, mentioning the *Heptameron* as afine text among those in the same category ("pour son estoffe"), but does not credit its author with any other accolade. Furthermore, on the Bordeaux copy he comes back to this passage and slightly changes it.

> [a]Je sçay qu'on peut gourmander l'effort de ce plaisir; et [c] m'y cognoy bien; et si n'ay point trouvé Venus si imperieuse Deesse que plusieurs et plus chastes que moy la tesmoignent. [a] Je ne prens pour miracle, comme faict la Royne de Navarre en l'un des contes de son Heptameron (qui est un gentil livre pour son estoffe), ny pour chose d'extreme difficulté, de passer des nuicts entieres, en toute commodité et liberté, avec une maistresse de long temps desirée, maintenant la foy qu'on luy aura engagée de se contenter des baisers et simples attouchemens. (V-S, 430ac)
>
> [a]I know that it is possible to master the onset of this pleasure ; and [c] I am well versed in this; and I have not found Venus so imperious a goddess as many chaster men than I attest her. [a] I do not take it for a miracle as does the Queen of Navarre in one of the tales of her Heptameron (which is a nice book for one of its substance), or for an extremely difficult thing, to spend entire nights with every opportunity and in all freedom, with a long desired mistress, keeping

> the faith one has pledged to her, to be content with kisses and simple contacts. (380)

This new version of the text is more concise and the author's argument emerges more clearly. Montaigne also omits the first name of the Queen of Navarre, thus removing any shade of sympathy or direct rapport between himself and the queen.

Objection 37 returns our analysis to chapter II. 19 ("De la liberte de conscience"), which was also the context for objection 36, regarding Montaigne's apology of Emperor Julian.[175] This penultimate objection on the list of the second censor indicates that the author's discourse in the end of this chapter implies doubt regarding religious freedom, a matter officialy handled and resolved by ecclesiastic authorities. "486 facit dubium an debeat permitti libertas religionis illa, quam heretici tantopere requirunt, necne." The passage under review is the final argument that closes the essay on freedom of conscience, and it is rooted in Emperor Julian's consideration to establish freedom of religion in an effort to appease civic uproar.

> Voylà ses mots à peu prés: en quoy cela est digne de consideration, que l'Empereur Julian se sert, pour attiser le trouble de la dissention civile, de cette mesme recepte de liberté de conscience que nos Roys viennent d'employer pour l'estaindre. On peut dire, d'un costé, que de lacher la bride aux pars d'entretenir leur opinion, c'est espandre et semer la division; c'est préter quasi la main à l'augmenter, n'y ayant aucune barriere ny coerction des loix qui bride et empesche sa course. Mais, d'autre costé, on diroit aussi que de lascher la bride aux pars d'entretenir leur opinion, c'est les amolir et relacher par la facilité et par l'aisance, et que c'est émousser l'éguillon qui s'affine par la rareté, la nouvelleté et la difficulté. Et si croy mieux, pour l'honneur de la devotion de nos rois, c'est que, n'ayans peu ce qu'ils vouloient, ils ont fait semblant de vouloir ce qu'ils pouvoient. (V-S, 671-2)
>
> [a] Those are very nearly his words. Wherein this is worthy of consideration, that emperor Julian uses, to kindle the trouble of civil

[175] See chapter 1, *supra* p. 66.

> dissension, that some recipe of freedom of conscience that our kings have just been employing to extinguish it. It may be said, on the one hand, that to give factions a loose rein to entertain their own opinions is to scatter and sow division; it is almost lending a hand to augment it, there being no barrier or coercion of the laws to check or hinder its course. But, on the other hand one could also say that to give factions a loose rein to entertain their own opinions is to soften and relax them through facility and ease, and to dull the point, which is sharpened by rarity, novelty, and difficulty. And yet I prefer to think, for the reputation of our king's piety that, having been unable to do what they would, they have pretended to will what they could. (619)

In the beginning of this paragraph Montaigne alludes to the numerous political edicts and treaties that attempted to establish a peace between the king Henry III "que nos Roys viennent d'employer", and the Protestant wing, such as the Peace of Beaulieu of 1576, the Treaty of Bergerac and the Treaty of Poitiers 1577. As the censor noted, Montaigne indirectly advocates for freedom of religion, but his motives are strictly civic and political, stripped of any religious validity. This paragraph, as Montaigne's view on the matter, remained unchanged in the future life of the text.

The final objection of the document, number 38, brings under review the entire last chapter of the second book, II. 37 ("De la ressemlance des enfans aux peres"), as a discourse against medicine. The censor also identifies one specific passage on page 639, in which Montaigne's text is particularly arguing against the science of medicine and its usefulness:

> L'ultimo capo e quasi tutto contra la medicina, et particolarmente nella pag. 639. Dice che se'gli havesse ad accettare alcuna sorte di medicina accettarebbe piu presto che nessuna altra quella che danno le donnicelle con certe parole et scritti, perché al manco non v'è niun danno a temere.

The passage indicated by the censor is a brief comparaison between the science applied by the doctors and the use of magic applied by certain "little women", and Montaigne's avowed preference for the latter method. "Il n'est pas une simple femmelette de qui nous n'employons les barbotages et les brevets; et, selon mon humeur, si j'avoy à en accepter quelqu'une, j'accepterois plus volontiers cette medecine qu'aucune autre, d'autant qu'au-moins il n'y a nul dommage à craindre." (V-S, 781) "There is not the simplest little woman whose mumblings and magic formulas we do not employ; and for my taste, if I had to take any, I would accept this medicine more willingly than any other, inasmuch as at least there is no harm to be feared from it." (720)

Regarding this last objection, Alain Legros maintains that the censor might be defending the present institutions and the current knowledge, as an extension of theology and theologians. "…prend la défense des institutions et des savoirs en place, bien qu'ici le propos ne vise pas les théologiens, seulement les médecins."[176] However, we must also note that in a different paragraph in close proximity to this passage, Montaigne also rejects the biblical precept about the usefulness of medicine[177], which constitutes another reason for the censor's censure. "Au demeurant, i'honore les medecins, non pas, suyuant le precepte, pour la necessité (car a ce passage on en oppose vn autre du prophete reprenant le Roy Asa d'auoir eu recours au medecin), mais pour l'amour d'eux mesmes, en ayant veu beaucoup d'honnestes hommes, et dignes d'estres aimés. Ce n'est pas a eus que i'en veus, c'est à leur art;"[178]

Inspired by the censor's remark, and perhaps also by the location of this essay

[176] Legros, "Montaigne face à ses censeurs" p. 28
[177] *Ecclesiasticus* 38:1 "Honour a physician with the honour due unto him for the uses which ye may have of him…"
[178] *Essais* (1580), ed. Martin p. 636

(the final one in the 1580 edition), Montaigne goes back to these final pages of his book, and significantly alters the text for the 1582 edition. Without changing his arguments regarding the inefficacity of medicine as a science, he cuts out some paragraphs, adds several new ones in order to develop already existing arguments and enrich them with examples and personal impressions gathered during his trip to Italy. This chapter provides the reader with an exact definition and an application of Montaigne's writing technique, to which he remained faithful until his death. "Ainsin il [the text] s'est basty à diverses poses et intervalles, comme les occasions me detiennent ailleurs par fois plusieurs moys. Au demeurant, je ne corrige point mes premieres imaginations par les secondes; [C] ouy à l'aventure quelque mot, mais pour diversifier, non pour oster. [A] Je veux representer le progrez de mes humeurs, et qu'on voye chaque piece en sa naissance."(V-S, 758) "[a] Thus it has built itself up with diverse interuptions and intervals, as occasions sometimes detain me elsewhere for several months. Moreover, I do not correct my first imaginings by my second – [c] well, yes, perhaps a word or so, but only to vary, not to delete. [a] I want to represent the course of my humors, and I want people to see each part at its birth. » (696) The additions brought to this chapter in 1582 precisely reflect the progress and developments underwent by Montaigne during his trip. Some paragraphs pertain to the author's new experiences with the baths of Lucca and della Villa in Italy, and those of Plombières in France. These new experiences allowed him to develop his paragraph on the usefulness (or rather the uselessness) of waters in the treatment of kidney stones and other afflictions, and to reinforce his original argument that the great variation in the practice of medicine from nation to nation, vadidates his theory that this science is too limited to provide any real benefits. There is another

paragraph in this section, much shorter than the one discussing the effect of baths, which Montaigne added upon his return from Italy, in the 1582 edition of the *Essays*:

> J'entans bien que ce n'est rien faire pour eux, d'autant que l'aigreur et l'estrangeté sont accidans de l'essance propre de la medecine. Licurgus ordonnoit le vin aux Spartiates malades. Pourquoy? par ce qu'ils en haissoyent l'usage, sains: tout ainsi qu'un gentil'homme, mon voisin, s'en sert pour drogue tres-salutaire à ses fiebvres, parce que de sa nature il en hait mortellement le goust. (V-S, 780a)
>
> I quite understand that this is doing nothing for them, since bitterness and strangeness are qualities of the very essence of medicine. Lycurgus ordered wine for the sick Spartans. Why? Because healthy, they hated the use of it, just as a gentleman a neighbor of mine uses it as a very salutary drug for his fevers, because naturally he mortally hates the taste of it. (720)

This paragraph develops the same argument against the existence of any certainty in the science of medicine. On the Bordeaux copy, we note a short addition that directly addresses Montaigne's statement from 1580 in disagreement with the biblical text that advises the honoring of medicine and the doctor cited above.. "…de mesme, en la medecine, j'honnore bien ce glorieux nom, sa proposition, sa promesse si utile au genre humain, mais ce qu'il designe entre nous, je ne l'honnore ny l'estime." (V-S, 766c) "[c]... so in medicine I do indeed honor that glorious name, its purpose, its promise so useful to the human race; but what designates among us I neither honor nor esteem." (704) This new addition clarifies his previous statement without refuting it.

PART II

The 1582 Edition of the *Essays*

Chapter 3

Literary Sources Added in the 1582 Edition of the *Essays*

In addition to the textual emendations inspired by Montaigne's interaction with the Roman censors, we must also consider the importance of Montaigne's journey to Rome reflected in the literary quotations that the author added in the 1582 edition of the *Essays* as a major step in the overall development of the text. These allongeails represent a total of 17 new citations: 8 Latin ones (3 from Lucretius, 2 from Virgil, 1 from Horace, 1 from Catullus, and 1 from Persius); 8 Italian (2 from Dante, 2 from Petrarch and 4 from Tasso); and one quotation from Propertius translated into Italian.

1. The Latin Quotations in the 1582 Edition

The Latin quotations added in 1582 do not come as much of a surprise since their sources were already present in the earlier text. Marcel Françon remarked in the preface to his 1969 edition of the 1582 the *Essays* that the authors Montaigne uses are already mentioned as the author's favorites in the 1580 edition. " Il n'y a rien à remarquer sur ces citations, puisque Montaigne avait déjà dit, dans la partie de l'essai II.10 qui a paru dès 1580, que 'Lucrèce, Catulle et Horace tiennent de bien loing le premier rang'"[179] Pierre Villey had also noted that Montaigne used in his 1580 text 48 quotations from

[179] *Essais* (1580), ed. Françon p. 14.

Lucretius, 80 from Horace and 26 from Virgil.[180] These authors are thus the most quoted classical sources for Montaigne before and after the 1582 edition. There are numerous studies regarding the inspiration and influence that Lucretius had over Montaigne and his *Essais*[181]. In the case of the 1582 edition all the quotations from Lucretius are inserted in chapter II. 12 ("Apologie de Raimond Sebond"). The first two are directly related to a questionable representation of women, an approach that was also criticized by the censors during their meeting in Rome.[182] The third quotation from Lucretius is inserted in very close proximity to the first two, and Montaigne uses it to better articulate his contempt of human arrogance, a vain quality to which all men surrender.

The first two passages are added in the segment of the chapter in which Montaigne compares humans to animals in an attempt to illustrate the futility of human knowledge as a sign of their vanity and downfall. In the first instance, as he talks about the principal human purpose, which is the reproduction of species, Montaigne adds the new quotation immediately following an already existing passage from Lucretius in which the author explains why the most efficient way for humans to procreate is to follow the example of quadrupeds:

> *more ferarum*
> *Quadrupedumque magis ritu, plerumque putantur*
> *Concipere uxores; quia sic loca sumere possunt,*
> *Pectoribus positis, sublatis semina lumbis.* (V-S, 470a)[183]
>
> [a]And they say
> That wives conceive best in the wildbeasts's way,
> Like quadrupeds; for thus, loins high, breasts low

[180] *Les Sources et l'évolution des* Essais, Tome I, pp. 170, 150, and 237.
[181] In *Montaigne's Annotated copy of Lucretius*, (Geneva, 1998) – Screech carefully studies Montaigne's own copy of Lucretius published by Denis Lambin; G.. Mathieu-Castellani, *Monataigne et l'écriture de l'essai*, Paris 1998, G. Defaux, *Montaigne et le travail de l'amitié,* Orléans, 2001 are just a few of the pertinent works published regarding Montaigne and Lucretius's work.
[182] See *supra* I.2 objections 18, 4, and 15
[183] Lucretius *De rerum natura* IV, 1261

The seeds can to their destination go. (419)

In 1582, immediately after this citation, Montaigne adds one explicatory sentence and continues to quote Lucretius:

> Et rejettent comme nuisibles ces mouvements indiscrets et insolents que les femmes y ont meslé de leur creu, les ramenant à l'exemple et usage des bestes de leur sexe, plus modeste et rassis:
> *Nam mulier prohibet se concipere atque repugnat,*
> *Clunibus ipsa viri venerem si laeta retractet,*
> *Atque exossato ciet omni pectore fluctus.*
> *Ejicit enim sulci recta regione viaque*
> *Vomerem, atque locis avertit seminis ictum.* (V-S, 470-471a)[184]
>
> [a] And they condemn as harmful those indecent and unusual motion which the women have brought into it on their own, recalling them to the more modest and sedate exemple and practice of the animal of their sex:
> For thus a woman may oppose conception,
> If, writhing in her joy she makes improvements,
> Draws back his part from hers upsets his movements.
> For thus she turn the plowshare from its way
> And sends the vital spurt of seed astray. (419)

In this case women should be thus brought back to the natural human state, in which copulation's only purpose is procreation. Montaigne makes the case that carnal pleasures distract form the original function of sexual intercourse. Following the Biblical example expressed in the metaphor of the original sin, the author portrays women as farther removed form the original state than men, which constitutes a dangerous influence. This same idea that women are further distanced than men from the natural human condition is revealed in the second 1582 quotation inserted in this chapter. With this example from his favorite author, Montaigne explains how women, much aware of the imperfections of the human body, use all sorts of seductive cover-ups when they want to enslave men with their love:

[184] Lucretius, VI, 1266.

Nec veneres nostras hoc fallit: quo magis ipsae
Omnia summopere hos vitae post scenia celant,
Quos retinere volunt adstrictoque esse in amore; (V-S, 485a)[185]

Of this our Venuses are well aware ;
Wherefore they hide the backstage with great care
From those they wish to hold in love's sweet snare; (433)

These two quotations pertaining to women's behavior play an important role in the greater project of the author for this section of the essay, which is to relate the human condition with its animal counterpart. In this segment the women are seen as a principal factor in the process of divorcing man from his natural state. They are a source of moral corruption that can best be addressed via Lucretius's authority. While doing so, Montaigne addresses two different points; the first is to better articulate his argument in the essay, and the second is to clarify his position regarding the contemporary behavior of women, which was criticized by the censors in Rome, as much too liberal and dishonorable. "Et pag. 30 dice che basta alle donne quando sono richieste dire di no e lasciarsi violare. Onde loda una che, essendo capitata in mano de soldati, ringraciava Dio che s'era saciata de atti carnali senza peccato."[186] Montaigne is very careful in choosing his quotes because of his already risky topic. The theologian Raymond Sebond, who was already on the Roman Index and ranked in the "second category" as the Church had condemned the preface of his *Theologia Naturalis*. Montaigne had a major interest in this author because, at his father's request, he had provided a French translation of Sebond's book. A first edition was published in 1569, and a second appeared in 1581, the very year of his return from Rome, and one year before the second edition of the *Essays*. Therefore, Montaigne's attitude in his "Apologie de Raimond Sebond" must be understood in the

[185] Lucretius, IV, 1182.
[186] See more on this objection *infra* p. 88.

context of Sebond's problematic theological status in Rome. This seems to be the main reason why Montaigne added his reflections on the unethical nature and conduct of contemporary women. Since the 1580 approach to this topic had been criticized in Rome for its leniency, and its ironic ambiguity, Montaigne reinforces his moral stand in 1582 by adding these explicatory passages, in a context that does not tolerate any shade of irony.[187]

The third and last quotation from Lucretius added for the 1582 edition is only two pages away from the other two, and it is accompanied by a brief sentence that attests to the beauty of Lucretius' words. However, Montaigne's argument is to use the elegance of these words and their uplifting sense all the better to demonstrate the ease with which men fall in the trap of their own vanity:

> *[1582]*Deus ille fuit, Deus, inclute Memmi,
> Qui princeps vitae rationem invenit eam, quae
> Nunc appellatur sapientia, quique per artem
> Fluctibus è tantis vitam tantisque tenebris
> In tam tranquillo et tam clara luce locavit.
> Voylà des paroles tres-magnifiques et belles; mais un bien legier accidant mist l'entendement de cettuy-cy [Lucretius] en pire estat que celuy du moindre bergier, nonobstant ce Dieu praecepteur [Epicurus] et cette divine sapience. *[1580]* […] Il n'est rien si ordinaire que de rencontrer des traicts de pareille temerité. Il n'y a aucun de nous qui s'offence tant de se voir apparier à Dieu, comme il faict de se voir deprimer au reng des autres animaux: tant nous sommes plus jaloux de nostre interest que de celuy de nostre createur. Mais il faut mettre aux pieds cette sote vanité, et secouer vivement et hardiment les fondemens ridicules sur quoy ces fausses opinions se bastissent. Tant qu'il pensera avoir quelque moyen et quelque force de soy, jamais l'homme ne recognoistra ce qu'il doit à son maistre; il fera tousjours de ses oeufs poules, comme on dit: il le faut mettre en chemise. (V-S, 489)[188]
>
> [1582]A god it was, great Memmius, a god,

[187] See *supra* p. 102.
[188] Lucretius, V. 8.

> Who was the first that way of life to find
> Which we all call wisdom now; whose artful mind
> Brought life from such great storms, such depths of night,
> Safe into such a heaven, such clear light.
> Those are very magnificent and beautiful words; but a very slight accident put this man's understanding into a worse state than that of the lowest shepard, notwithstanding that Teacher-God [Epicurus] of his and that divine wisdom. [1580] […] Nothing is so commom as to encounter cases of similar temerity. There is not one of us who is so offended to see himself compared to God as he is to see himself brought down to the rank of the other animals: so much more jealous are we of our own interest than of that of our creator. But we must tread this stupid vanity under foot, and sharply and boldly shake the ridiculous fundations on which these false opinions are built. As long as he thinks he has some resources and power by himself, never will man recognize wat he owes to his master; he will always make chicken of his eggs, as they say. He must be stripped to his shirt. (438)

Montaigne makes the distinction between human reason, which is faulty and presumptuous, and God's wisdom that is perfect and omnipresent. Human beings must accept their limitations and surrender through faith to obey God. Any other temerity attempted by men to go beyond these limitations results invariably in miserable failure. In this paragraph as well as in the passages following this quotation, Montaigne proves this point by using the example of classical philosophers who were unable to sustain by living example the morality they advocated in their teachings. Such as Lucretius who articulated the philosophy of Epicurus so beautifully, and who in real life he ended up in a situation contrary to his professed wisdom. In the passage from 1582, Montaigne refers to the unfortunate death of Lucretius which, according to Saint Jerome and later Christian beliefs, was caused by a love potion: his association with women brought him to madness and then to suicide. It should be noted that Montaigne's vocabulary in the 1582 additions is also linked to the actual philosophy of Lucretius. The expression "legier accident"

alludes to the epicurean atomic theory (to which Lucretius adhered), according to which the "clinamen" refers to an accident, a spontaneous deviance in the movements of the atoms in the universe that explains the existence of humans and the formation of the world as we know it. Montaigne's choice of words reveals of course his irony, but at the same time demonstrates a profound knowledge of the schools of thought that defined the classical authors he admired so much. Yet, one may wonder: if Lucretius's writings were entirely faulty and without any authority why does Montaigne quote him at leangth in a chapter devoted to the apology of Sebond? In the subsequent edition of 1588 he will praise the eloquence and the beauty of Lucretius's love verses, especially in chapter III. 5 where he finds them superior even to Virgil's: "Ce que Virgile dict de Venus et de Vulcan, Lucrece l'avoit dict plus sortablement d'une jouissance desrobée d'elle et de Mars." (V-S, 872b) " What Virgil says of Venus and Vulcan, Lucretius had said it more appropriately of a stolen enjoyment between her and Mars." (806) In the 1582 apology, Montaigne brings into play more than his eloquence, treating his writings as reliable sources regarding the sexual appetite and behavior of women. Lucretius's authority is thus established within the realm of human desire and earthly actions. It is not however worthy of any serious consideration, his philosophy failing just like any other pagan approaches. The beauty and elegance of his words do not go beyond the worldly teachings reserved for humans, and any transcendental efforts are futile.

The quotation from Virgil is inserted in cahpter II.15 ("Que notre desir s'accroit par la malaisance"). It is part of a longer textual development added in 1582 and placed in a similar context as the first two quotations from Lucretius, namely, regarding the

immoral comportment of women in matters of love and sex appeal.[189] As we have mentioned above, Montaigne is clarifying his position regarding the irreverent behavior of women, for which he was reprimanded by the Roman censors.[190] In chapter II.15 he comes back to an issue he discussed previously in chapter II.3, "Coustume de l'Isle de Cea", when he ironically stated that in order to maintain their integrity, women must only pretend to say "no" to sexual advances, and they will be absolved of any immoral act in which they are tempted to engage for their own pleasures.

> Il nous sera à l'adventure honnorable aux siecles advenir qu'un sçavant autheur de ce temps, et notamment Parisien [Henry Estienne], se met en peine de persuader aux Dames de nostre siecle de prendre plustost tout autre party que d'entrer en l'horrible conseil d'un tel des-espoir. Je suis marry qu'il n'a sceu, pour mesler à ses comptes, le bon mot que j'apprins à Toulouse, d'une femme passée par les mains de quelques soldats: Dieu soit loué, disoit-elle, qu'au moins une fois en ma vie je m'en suis soulée sans peché. A la verité, ces cruautez ne sont pas dignes de la douceur Françoise; aussi, Dieu mercy, nostre air s'en voit infiniment purgé depuis ce bon advertissement: suffit qu'elles dient nenny en le faisant, suyvant la reigle du bon Marot.[191] (V-S, 357a)
>
> [a]It will perhaps be to our honor in the centuries to come that a learned author of this day and a Parisian at that, takes pains to persuade the ladies of out time to make up their minds to anything rather than adopt the horrible counsel of such despair. I am sorry that he did not know and insert among his stories the good one I heard at tOulouse of a woman who had passed through the hands of some soldiers: " God be praised," she said, " that at least once in my life I have had my fill without sin!" In truth these cruelties are not worthy of the gentle ways of France; and so thank God, our atmosphere has been throughly purged of them by that man's good advice. Enough for them to say No while doing it, following the rule of our good Marot. (312)

[189] Due to its length and complexity, we will come back to the narrative part of this 1582 addition in the next chapter II.2, which analyses the narrative passages added by Montaigne in the 1582 edition.
[190] See *supra,* p. 102.
[191] See *infra* pp. 247-249 for the commentary on this allusion to Marot's epigram.

This ironical approach alluding to Marot's epigram (discussed supra) is replaced in 1582 by a lengthy development regarding women's coquetries and the way they distract men. This chapter is a particularly adequate context for Montaigne's argument that the seductive art that women employ to subdue men stems from the instinctual human desire for what lies out of reach. The Virgil quotation that Montaigne uses in the 1582 addition is a very short but significant verse:

Et fugit ad salices, et se cupit ante videri.[192] (V-S, 614a)

She flees into willows, and hopes first to be seen. (565)

In the third Bucolic this line belongs to a poetic duel in which two shepherds, Menaclas and Damoetas, rival for superiority. This verse refers to Galatea and appears in Damoetas' discourse. The greek myth was adopted by the Roman classical tradition and Galatea became a symbol for the object of desire.[193] Evidently, the ideas behind Montaigne's argument and Damoetas' poem are identical, since the false modesty of the feminine figure triggers an increased masculine desire.

The passage added in 1582 continues with Montaigne's personal views of feminine behavior in general patterned after specific examples taken from his recent experience in Italy[194]. This substantial passage added in 1582 is progressively fragmented by later textual additions for the 1588 edition and on the Bordeaux copy. As in the case of Lucretius, there is no great surprise that Montaigne uses Virgil in this passage. His

[192] Virgil, *Bucolics*, III.65

[193] A Cyclop and a mortal soul, Akis, were her main contenders. The legend is also adopted in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, and later the name Galatea becomes synonymous with the statue of Pygmalion.

[194] See *infra* part II, pp. 230.

authority in the domain of erotic poetry, and Montaigne's admiration for his work makes him an ideal source for this argument.[195]

It is unquestionable that Montaigne's insistence in reevaluating and clarifying his own position regarding the dishonorable behavior of women in the 1582 edition must have been suggested by the censor's repeated notes that reproached the author with his pronounced sense of irony that could be misunderstood by his readers: " 4 Forse risponderà l'autore che quelle dice per ironia burlandosi di Parigini, ma ancor che fosse cosi, quel luogho è molto periculoso per esser la cosa si brutta e la ironia si nascosta" and "15 Gia dissi che quel luogo si puo piglare per ironia, ma non tutti il pigleranno cosi forse."[196] The fact that Montaigne chose to address the censors' objections by adding new text rather than just excluding the passages that were censored, indicates the author's commitment to the integrity of his work. As we showed in Part I, he managed to address their objections without compromising his own voice, treating the official process of censorship as material for reflection, and reworking the fabric of the text in subsequent editions and on the Bordeaux copy. Immediately following the Virgil quotation Montaigne explains on a more respectful tone the same idea that Marot's text alluded in a less moral fashion:

> Pourquoy a l'on voylé jusques au dessoubs des talons ces beautez que chacune desire montrer, que chacun desire voir? Pourquoy couvrent elles de tant d'empeschemens les uns sur les autres les parties où loge principallement nostre desir et le leur? Et à quoy servent ces gros bastions, dequoy les nostres viennent d'armer leurs

[195] Montaigne particularly praises the talents of this author in chapter III. 5 "Sur des vers de Virgile"

[196] See Vatican document in Appendix A, from *The Saint as Censor, Robert Bellarmine between Inquisition and Index*, document 32, " perhaps the author will reply that it is irony and that he is mocking the Parisians, but even if that is the case, that passage is very dangerous because it speaks of such a horrible thing, and the irony is not very obvious. I already said that place could be understood as irony, but maybe not everybody will understand it as such. (my translation)

> flancs, qu'à lurrer nostre appetit et nous attirer à elles en nous esloignant? (V-S, 614a)
>
> Why have they veiled even down to the heels, those beauties that every woman wants to show, that every man wants to see? Why do they cover with so many impediments, one on top of the other, the parts in which our desire and theirs principally dwells? And what is the use of those great bastions with which our women have just taken to arming their flanks, except to allure our appetite and to attract us to them by keeping us at distance? (565)

The second quotation from Virgil appears in chapter I. 46, ("Des noms"). Montaigne adds a short verse "Id cinerem et manes credis curare sepultos?"[197] (V-S, 280a) "Do you think buried ghosts, or ashes, care for this?" (247) This line is taken from the fourth book of the *Aeneid*. In its original context, these words belonged to Anna, who attempted to convince her sister Dido to accept her own love for Aeneas and disregard the promise she had made to her now dead husband, whose remains have no use for her promise. In Montaigne's text, the author refers to the concept of fame that is attached to a name, its inconsistent and futile nature. Just as with everything human, there is a certain worthlessness attached to this concept due to our mortal condition. We can infer, due to the general, proverb-like and sententious nature of some of these quotes, that Montaigne had memorized them, and could have inserted them in a number of contexts. In this case, he probably had in mind an objection form one of the Roman censors, regarding the beginning of this essay, at which point Montaigne's text seems sympathetic with the Protestants' custom of choosing biblical names for their children.[198] Although, due to its later placement in the text, Montaigne's comment doesn't appear to address the censor's concern directly, it is highly probable that the objection made in Rome prompted the

[197] Virgil, *Aeneid*, IV, 34
[198] See *supra* objection 27, p. 159.

insertion of this short line. Montaigne's intention regarding the criticism of his *Essays* by the Vatican censors was once again to find a way to acknowledge the comments, without compromising his own views.

The other three Latin quotations are inserted in the text without any other supplementary paragraphs, or explanations. They appear to be part of the proofreading process that Montaigne must have performed for this second edition of his book, in which he changed a few words, completed some sentences or added short memorized lines that came to him while reading a passage. Horace is quoted in chapter I. 37, "Du jeune Caton" when Montaigne discusses the corrupt state of his times, and expresses his discontent with his contemporaries' behavior that seems increasingly distanced from the exemplarity: "Virtutem verba putant, ut Lucum ligna."[199] (V-S, 230a) "And they think that virtue's just a word, and a sacred grove mere sticks" (205) Horace's original context for this sentence needs to be recalled. In his sixth epistle to Numicius, the poet urges his friend to discover the "real meaning" of virtue, which must represent everything for a wise man. Yet he ultimately advises Numicius to do whatever makes him happy, whether is virtuous or not. Montaigne attaches no personal commitment to this line. He may simply have been struck by the power of the Horatian concise language that matched so well the current contemporary context. We know that in 1580 Montaigne already held this classical author in high esteem, among the best poets in the company of Lucretius, Catullus, and Virgil. (V-S, 410a) But as the 1582 quotation demonstrates, at that time Montaigne was more impressed by Horace's astute social and literary critical sense, and in the future edition of 1588 Montaigne captured the introspective essence of Horace's text and the role it played in relation to his own book.

[199] Horace, *Epistles* VI. 31

> Horace ne se contente point d'une superficielle expression, elle le trahiroit. Il voit plus cler et plus outre dans la chose; son esprit crochette et furette tout le magasin des mots et des figures pour se représenter; et les luy faut outre l'ordinaire, comme sa conception est outre l'ordinaire. (V-S, 873b)
>
> Horace is not content with a superficial expression; it would betray him. He sees more clearly and deeply into the thing. His mind unlocks and ransacks the whole storehouse of words and figures in order to express itself; and he needs them to be beyond the commonplace, as his conception is beyond the commonplace. (807)

As Mary McKinley puts it in her book *Words in a Corner. Studies in Montaigne's Latin Quotations*, Montaigne's earlier interest in Horace's work (before 1588) is primarily directed at the text of his *Satires* and *Epistles*, which present the author as literary critic. Later on, for his 1588 edition Motaigne's attention shifted to Horace's *Odes* and *Epistles*:[200]

> The pattern of this quoting suggests that Horace the critic dominated in the early stages of Montaigne's writing and that the lyrical poet of the Odes and Epodes gradually took his place after the Essais were first published. Horace's early role as the arbiter of literary subject matter and style illuminates aspects of Montaigne's own literary invention.[201]

The quotation from Persius in chapter II.17 ("De la praesumption") follows the same pattern in terms of its correlation with the existing text. It is also a very short sentence with a powerful message, and a captivating resonance: " nemo in sese tentat descendere"[202] (V-S, 658a) "No man tries to descend into himself. " Interestingly there are no additional comments or explanations from Montaigne. We do know however, that

[200] In the 1580 edition there were 19 quotations from lyrical works and 61 quotqtions presenting his commentaries in *Satires* and *Epistles*. In 1588, however, he added 52 qutations from his *Odes* and *Epodes*, and only 12 from *Satires* and *Epistles*. (See note 3 in Mary McKinley's book, p. 116) The quotation added in 1582 is from his *Epitres*,

[201] Mary Mc Kinnley, *Words in a Corner. Studies in Montaigne's Latin Quotations,* French Forum Publishers, Lexington, 1981, pp. 37

[202] Persius, *Satires* IV, 23

this chapter was carefully reread for the 1582 edition, and several small modifications were made to its content, such as spelling corrections, a few changes of words and some minor emendations, in addition to a more important quotation from Guazzo's *Civil Conversatione,* and a longer passage on the power of imagination, which we will discuss in the next chapters.[203] In the direct proximity to the line inserted from Persius, we note another very short textual addendum regarding Montaigne's own capacity to discern truth from falsehood.

> [1580] Les autres vont tousjours ailleurs, s'ils y pensent bien; ils vont tousjours avant,
> *[1582] nemo in sese tentat descendere,*
> [1580] moy je me roulle en moy mesme. Cette capacité de trier le vray, [1582] quelle qu'elle soit en moy, [1580] et cett'humeur libre de n'assubjectir aisément ma creance, je la dois principalement à moy. (V-S, 658)
>
> [1580] Others always go elsewhere, if they stop to think about it; they always go forward;
> [1582] No man tries to descend into himself (Persius)
> [1580] as for me, I roll about in myself. This capacity for sifting truth, [1582] whatever it may amount to in me, [1580] and this free will not to enslave my belief easily, I owe principally to myself. (606)

Persius's line is from the fourth satire; there the poet recommends a lifestyle based on self-awareness and self-discipline. People spend theit time judging judging others and being judged by others. Instead, they should make themselves the object of their own gaze, a far more suitable and beneficial attitude. Montaigne is using this line in the same context but with a less virtuous undertone, assessing his personal capacity of his as a modest endeavor, easy to accomplish and appropriate for his mild character, supposedly lacking any civic or social ambition.

[203] See *infra* pp. 220 and 250

Montaigne only used one other quotation from this author in the 1580 edition, in the chapter I.56 ("Des prières"):

> *Haud cuivis promptum est murmurque humilesque susurros*
> *Tollere de templis, et aperto vivere voto*.[204]
>
> It is hard for any man to quit the low voiced whispers
> Within the shrine and bare his prayers to the world. (286)

Here the underlined message is the same as in the line inserted in 1582, and it concerns the difficulty incurred by humans to break away and not be affected by the judgment of others. The remarkable nature of these lines is actually their simple, humble appearance in the text, because they mark the onset of a prolific rapport between the *Essays* and Persius's *Satires* that will peak in the 1588 edition, in which Montaigne will add a total of 20 more quotations from the Roman poet. There will be no other additions form Persius's work on the Bordeaux copy, and and only one more in the 1595 edition.[205]

The last Latin quotation inserted in the 1582 edition belongs to Catullus and Montaigne inserted it in chapter II. 10 ("Des livres"): "O seclum insipiens et infacetum!"[206] (V-S, 411a) "O foolish and dull-witted age!" (362) (The 1580 context in which it is inserted is a tour de force exposing the ups and downs of poetry from its classical roots to its modern imitators. The line from Catullus condenses Montaigne's general feelings regarding the modern authors compared to their classical counterparts. He sets this particular examination of poetry with a list of his favorite classical authors (Virgil, Lucretius, Catullus, and Horace), and his argument becomes clearer when he brings up the judgment of some contemporaries who compare Ariosto to Virgil with the same ease that contemporaries of Virgil compared him to Lucretius. Montaigne bursts

[204] Persius, *Satires* II.6
[205] Villey, *Les Sources et l'évolution des Essais,* I p. 209
[206] Catullus, *Carmina*, XII, 8

with indignation only at the thought that of this moderate association, and wonders what Ariosto himself would say about it:

> [A]Ceux des temps voisins à Vergile se plaignoient dequoy aucuns luy comparoient Lucrece. Je suis d'opinion que c'est à la verité une comparaison inegale; mais j'ay bien à faire à me r'asseurer en cette creance, quand je me treuve attaché à quelque beau lieu de ceux de Lucrece. S'ils se piquoient de cette comparaison, que diroient ils de la bestise et stupidité barbaresque de ceux qui luy comparent à cette heure Arioste? et qu'en diroit Arioste luy-mesme?
> [1582] *O seclum insipiens et infacetum* (V-S, 411a)
>
> Those who lived near Virgil's time used to complain that some compare Lucretius to him. I am of the opinion that that is in truth an unequal comparison; but I have much to do to confirm myself in this belief when I find myself fixed on one of the beautiful passages in Lucretius. If they were stung by this comparison, what would they say of the barbarous brutishness and stupidity of those who nowadays compare Ariosto to him? And what would Ariosto himself say?
> O foolish and dull-witted age! (Catullus) (362)

Montaigne's opinion of Ariosto is far less flattering than his attitude towards Tasso, another modern Italian poet whose personal life and work are brought up in the 1582 edition of the *Essays*.[207] The literary context in which Montaigne develops his critical stand against Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso*, which enjoyed at the time a staggering success, is framed by the contemporary quarrel regarding the comparison between the epic poem and the *romanzo*, and their equally positive reception. Montaigne comes back to this issue a few paragraphs later in the same essay, when he clearly states his allegiance to the classical model of the epic, to the even farther disrespect of Ariosto's poetic art:

> [A] Cette mienne conception se reconnoit mieux qu'en tout autre lieu, en la comparaison de l'Aeneide et du Furieux. Celuy-là, on le voit aller à tire d'aisle, d'un vol haut et ferme, suyvant tousjours sa pointe; cettuy-cy, voleter et sauteler de conte en conte comme de

[207] See next chapter regarding the 1582 quotations from Italian authors.

> branche en branche, ne se fiant à ses aisles que pour une bien courte traverse, et prendre pied à chaque bout de champ, de peur que l'haleine et la force luy faille. (V-S, 412a)
>
> [a] This idea of mine is easier to recognize in the comparison of the *Aneid* and the *Orlando Furioso* than anywhere else. We see the former on outspread wings in lofty and sustained flight always pursuing his point; the latter fluttering and hopping from tale to tale as from branch to branch, not trusting his wings except for a very short hop, and alighting at every turn for fear his breath and strength should fail. (364)

This comparison is revealing of the way in which these two poetic models formulate their subject and choose their style. The epic examplar adopts a direct, straight way for its hero, whereas the paradigm of digression and wandering ("errance") typifies the character of *romanzo*.[208]

Montaigne was familiar with Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso* well before his trip to Rome, and the 1580 edition of the *Essais* contains five citations from the Italian author, and several other mentions of his *romanzo*. After 1588, however, the references to Ariosto fade almost completely. Montaigne does not add any other references to or citations from this work (with the exception of one more allusion to the poem on the Bordeaux copy regarding his two main female characters, Angelica and Bradamante.) (V-S, 162) This gradually decreased interest in the work of the Italian poet is probably unintentional, a natural reaction to a text that was an integral part of Montaigne's earlier years. (V-S, 175) This interest was still strong during his trip to Italy, when Montaigne visited Ariosto's tomb in Ferrara. His secretary records the event in the *Journal* as follows:

> Nous vismes en une eglise, l'effigie de l'Arioste, un peu plus plein

[208] For a commentary on this debate see Rigolot, *L'Erreur de la Renaissance,* chapter 7 and chapter 10 p.338.

> de visage qu'il n'est en ses livres ; il mourut aagé de cinquante neuf ans, le 6 de Juin 1533. (*JV*, 75)
>
> We saw in a church the effigy of Ariosto, a little fuller in face than he appears in his books; he died at the age of fifty-nine, on 6th of June, 1533. (61)

During the same trip Montaigne himself enters the name of the Italian author two more times in contexts that demonstrate the immense popularity Ariosto enjoyed at the time, and also the accessibility of his writings among all social classes. Both entries were written by Montaigne in Italian, during the part of his trip in which he decided to practice"this other language". "Assaggiamo di parlar un poco questa altra lingua…"[209] (*JV*, 167) The first mention is during his first sojourn at the spa resort of La Villa, when Montaigne organized a party and placed a remarkably talented peasant woman at the table of honorable gentlemen. Ariosto's poetry was part of her culture:

> Fuora che feci mettere a tavola Divizia. Questa è una povera Contadina vicina duo miglia dei bagni, che non ha, né il marito, altro modo di vivere che del travaglio di lor propie mani: brutta del età di 37 anni, la gola gonfiata; no sa né scrivere né leggere. Ma nella sua tenera età, avendo in casa del patre un zio che leggeva tuttavia in sua presenzia L'Ariosto et altri poeti, si trovò il suo animo tanto nato alla poesia, che non solamente fa versi d'una prontezza la piu mirabile che si posa, ma ancora ci mescola le favole antiche, nomi delli Dei, paesi, scienzie, uomini clari, come se fusse alevata alli studi. [210]
>
> …; except that I had Divizia sit at the table. She is a poor peasant woman of the neighborhood, living about two miles from the baths, who, like her husband, has no other way of earning a living except by the work of her own hands; ugly, thirty-seven years old,

[209] "Essayons de parler un peu cette autre langue" (p. 235)

[210] *JV*, p. 173 – "Mais je fis mettre à table Divizia, pauvre paysanne qui demeure à deux mille des bains. Cette femme, aussi que son mari, vit du travail de ses mains. Elle est laide, âgée de trente-sept ans, avec un goêtre à la gorge, & ne sait ni lire ni écrire. Mais, comme des sa tendre jeunesse il y avoit dans la maison de son pere un de ses oncles qui lisoit toujours en sa présence l'Arioste & quelques autres poëtes, son esprit s'est trouvé tellement propre à la poësie, que non-seulement elle fait des vers d'une promptitude extraordinaire, mais encore y fait entrer les fables anciennes, les noms des Dieux, des pays, des sciences & des hommes illustres, comme si elle avoit fait un cours d'étude réglé. » - translation provided by François Rigolot, *JV*, p.241.

> with a swollen neck. She can neither write nor read. But in her tender youth there was an uncle in her father's house who was always reading Ariosto and other poets in her presence and her mind was found to be so born to poetry that she not only composes verses with the most wonderful readiness possible, but also brings into them ancient fables, names of gods, countries, sciences, famous men, as if she had been brought up to study. (131)

The second reference to Ariosto appears in the text that documents Montaigne's departure from Florence, through the countryside, on his route to Scala. He then enjoys watching "questi contadini il liuto in mano, e fin alle pastorelle L'Ariosto in bocca. Questo si vede per tutta Italia."[211] (*JV*, 188) " these country people lute in hand, and even the shepherd girls with Ariosto in their mouth; this is to be seen throughout Italy" (144)

The appearance of the figure of Ariosto in the Italian part of *Journal* indicates the great extent to which his *Furioso* was assimilated in the popular Italian culture, and became one of its most representative illustration of modern narrative. One interesting detail of these accounts is that in both instances Ariosto's text is recited by feminine figures of the lowest social condition. Considering that Montaigne witnessed first hand the easiness with which Ariosto's text was appropriated and disseminated by such unlearned women, which he refered to as "femmelettes"[212], we can infer that this Italian experience might have actually influenced Montaigne's skeptical attitude regarding the literary authority of the popular Italian author.

2. The Italian Ciatations in the 1582 Edition

---

[211] « Ces paysans un luth à la main, et de leur côté les bergeres, ayant l'Arioste dans la bouche: mais c'est ce qu'on voit dans toute l'Italie; » - *JV*, p. 259

[212] "Il n'est pas une simple femmelette de qui nous n'employons les barbotages et les brevets; et, selon mon humeur, si j'avoy à en accepter quelqu'une, j'accepterois plus volontiers cette medecine qu'aucune autre, d'autant qu'au-moins il n'y a nul dommage à craindre." (V-S, II.37, p. 781) "There is not the simplest little woman whose mumblings and magic formulas we do not employ; and for my taste, if I had to take any, I would accept this medicine more willingly than any other, inasmuch as at least there is no harm to be feared from it." (720)

Moving to Montaigne's appreciation of Italian literature, I will now continue my analysis of the additions and changes made to the text of *Essais* in the 1582 edition, with the Italian quotations that Montaigne inserted following his return from Rome in 1581.There are a total of 9 quotes in Italian: four from Torquato Tasso, two from Dante, two from Petrarch and one Latin quotation from Propertius translated into Italian.[213] Three of these citations, one from Dante, one from Petrarch and the one from Propertius were actually obtained from a secondary Italian source, *La Civile Conversatione* by Stefano Guazzo. Villey advanced the theory that Montaigne must have read Guazzo's edition in its original language during his trip and used it for these sources. This seems to be the case, since Propertius's quotation is left in Italian, in the very form it appears in *La Civil Conversatione*.

This primary source from Montaigne's trip to Italy is a treatise in four books that deals with the manners, adequate conduct, the nature and duties of the courtier. Guazzo's book enjoyed a great success at the time of its publication in 1574 (Bozzola, Brescia), and numerous copies were printed in Italian, French, Dutch and German.[214] *La Civil Conversatione*, together with *Il Cortegiano* by Castiglione (first published in 1528) established cultural norms and intellectual standards for the period, and Montaigne is aware of these trends. Consequently, considering the great impact this text had on its public, and on Montaigne himself, there is no surprise to find these three quotations in 1582, upon the return from his Italy. All three citations appear in contexts directly related

[213] Françon, *Essais. Reproduction Photographique* rectifies Villey's original count which mentioned 5 quotations from Tasso in the 1582 edition (p.13)

[214] "34 editions italiennes ont paru entre la fin du XVIe siècle et le debut du XVIIe siècle; 14 traductions en latin, toutes publiees en Almagne entre 1585-1613, 1 en allemande, 2 en Hollandais, 10 en francais (la premiere en 1579), 6 en anglais." (*Dictionnaire de Montaigne*, p. 448). Montaigne's copy was not recovered.

to arguments developed in Guazzo's book, having to do with the way one forms and informs one's judgments, and how to communicate certain principles tactfully. All three quotes are simply inserted in the 1580 text, without any comments or explanations.

We cannot discuss the intertextuality of these additions without situating this work as a whole within the context of the *Essays*. Prior to the 1582 edition, there were no references to Guazzo or his work in the text of the *Essays*. The main development regarding the Italian text outside this second edition (1582) occured in the later one, in 1588, in which Montaigne appropriately addressed the Italian text in the essay entitled "L'art de conferer" (III.8). He does not mention Guazzo's name in the chapter (or anywhere else in the *Essais)*, but openly addresses the competence of contemporary Italian authors in the art of conversation, and he acknowledges their work collectively.

> Le plus fructueux et naturel exercice de nostre esprit, c'est à mon gré la conference. J'en trouve l'usage plus doux que d'aucune autre action de nostre vie; et c'est la raison pourquoy, si j'estois asture forcé de choisir, je consentirois plustost, ce crois-je, de perdre la veue que l'ouir ou le parler. Les Atheniens, et encore les Romains, conservoient en grand honneur cet exercice en leurs Academies. De nostre temps, les Italiens en retiennent quelques vestiges, à leur grand profict, comme il se voit par la comparaison de nos entendemens aux leurs. (V-S, 922-3b)
>
> [b] The most fruitful and natural exercise of our mind, in my opinion, is discussion. I find it sweeter than any other action of our life; and that is the reason why if I were right now forced to choose, I believe I would rather consent to loose my sight than my hearing of speech. The Athenians, and the Romans too, preserved this practice in great honor in their academies. In our time the Italian retain some vestiges of it, to their great advantage, as is seen by a comparison of our intelligence with theirs. (855)

Guazzo's text is structured in the form of an eloquent and contradictory dialog between two characters, the author, Cavaliere Guazzo, and his friend, a doctor and intellectual, Annibale Magnocavalli. Guazzo seems to be the overall advocate of the

contemplative life while his interlocutor prefers a more active existence, and the company of his fellow men[215]. As Marcel Tetel remarks in his book, this type of antithetical interaction accentuates the very complementarity of these two positions encompassing major humanist themes found in the works of the Renaissance as well as in Montaigne's text. In the same essay in which he praises the ease of Italian authors in the art of conversation, Montaigne recognizes the value of this binary structure of contrasting opposite views. "Les contradictions donc des jugemens ne m'offencent ny m'alterent; elles m'esveillent seulement et m'exercent. […] Quand on me contrarie, on esveille mon attention, non pas ma cholere; je m'avance vers celuy qui me contredit, qui m'instruit. » (V-S, 924b) "So contradictions of opinions neither offend nor affect me; they merely arouse and exercise me. […] When someone opposes me, he arouses my attention, not my anger. I go to meet a man who contradicts me, who instructs me." (856)

The first quotation appears in the opening paragraph of chapter I.17, ("Un Traict de quelques ambassadeurs"). Tétel remarks that even the title of this essay brings to mind the diplomacy theme of Guazzo's text, the profession of ambassadors implying the art of social interactions in a complex multicultural setting. In addition to Tétel's reading of the chapter's title, the context Montaigne chose for this quotation intuitively brings forward his own traveling experience, opening the chapter with a personal observation on his travels. What better location for a quotation pertaining to a book he read during his trip to Italy.

> [1580] J'observe en mes voyages cette practique, pour apprendre tousjours quelque chose par la communication d'autruy (qui est une des plus belles escholes qui puisse estre), de ramener tousjours ceux avec qui je confere, aux propos des choses qu'ils sçavent le mieux.

[215] Marcel Tétel, *Présences italiennes dans les* Essais *de Montaigne*, Paris, Champion, 1992, ch1.

[1582] Basti al nocchiero ragionar de'venti,
Al bifolco dei tori, e le sue piaghe
Conti'l guerrier, conti'l pastor gli armenti. (V-S, 72a)

[a]In order always to be learning something by communication with others (which is one of the finest schools there can be), I observe in my travels this practice: I always steer those I talk with back to the subjects they know best.

To winds the sailor should confine his words,
The farmer to his oxen. Let the man of war
Tell of his wounds, the shepherd of his herds. (59)

The 1580 paragraph justifies and anticipates the Italian quotation inserted two years later, as it expresses Montaigne's wish always to engage in dialogs with various people, and to learn something new from their conversations. This exchange of experience is particularly effective during his travels, in which it is very easy to meet new people with different backgrounds from his own. The art of conversing is thus not only a pleasant pastime, but a wonderful learning tool and, as this passage suggests, Montaigne's greatest desire is to learn always something new outside his library. In chapter I.9, « De la vanité », a chapter where the author expresses his love to travel and his experiences during his various trips, we read :

[C] Quand j'ay esté ailleurs qu'en France et que, pour me faire courtoisie, on m'a demandé si je vouloy estre servy à la Françoise, je m'en suis mocqué et me suis tousjours jetté aux tables les plus espesses d'estrangers. […] [B] On dict bien vray qu'un honneste homme c'est un homme meslé. Au rebours, je peregrine tres-saoul de nos façons, non pour cercher des Gascons en Sicile (j'en ay assez laissé au logis); je cerche des Grecs plustost, et des Persans: j'acointe ceux-là, je les considere; c'est là où je me preste et où je m'employe. Et qui plus est, il me semble que je n'ay rencontré guere de manieres qui ne vaillent les nostres. (V-S, 985bc)

[c] When I have been outside of France and people have asked me out of courtesy if I wanted to be served in French fashion, I have laughed at the idea and made straight for the tables thickest with foreigners. […] [b]It is very truly said that a well-bread man is an all-round man. On the contrary, I travel very fed up with our own

> ways, not to look for Gascons in Sicily – I have enough of them at home; I rather look for Greeks and Persians; these men I talk to, I study; it is to them I attune and apply myself. And what is more it seems to me that I have encountered hardly any customs that are not as good as ours. (916)

Even in his *Journal*, the secretary who records the first part of the journey notes : " M. de Montaigne pour essayer tout à fait la diversité des meurs et façons, se lassoit partout servir à la mode de chaque pais, quelque difficulté qu'il y trouvast." (*JV*, 23) Montaigne always cultivated an appreciation for traveling, and in essay I.26, "De l'institution des enfans", in which he presents his theories on the best methods of learning for children, geographical and cultural explorations are among the most important techniques:

> [A] A cette cause, le commerce des hommes y est merveilleusement propre, et la visite des pays estrangers, non pour en rapporter seulement, à la mode de nostre noblesse Françoise, combien de pas a Santa Rotonda, ou la richesse des calessons de la Signora Livia, ou, comme d'autres, combien le visage de Neron, de quelque vieille ruyne de là, est plus long ou plus large que celuy de quelque pareille medaille, mais pour en raporter principalement les humeurs de ces nations et leurs façons, et pour frotter et limer nostre cervelle contre celle d'autruy. Je voudrois qu'on commençast à le promener des sa tendre enfance, et premierement, pour faire d'une pierre deux coups, par les nations voisines où le langage est plus esloigné du nostre, et auquel, si vous ne la formez de bon'heure, la langue ne se peut plier. (V-S, 153a)
>
> [a] For this reason, mixing with men is wonderfully useful, and visiting foreign countries, not merely to bring back, in the manner of our French noble men, knowledge of the measurements of the Santa Rotonda, or of the richness of Signora Livia's drawers, or, like some others, how much longer or wider Nero's face is in some old ruin there than on some similar medallion; but to bring back knowledge of the characters and ways of those nations, and to rub and polish our brains by contact with those of others. I should like the tutor to start taking him abroad at a tender age, and first, to kill two birds with one stone, in those neighboring nations where the language is farthest

> from our own and where the tongue cannot be bent to it unless you train it early. (136)

This same essay, I. 26 "De l'institution des enfans", is also the context for the second Guazzo quotation inserted in the 1582 edition, which was originally taken from Dante's Infrno: "Che non men che saper dubbiar m'aggrada"[216] (V-S, 151a) "For doubting pleases me no less than knowing" (135). As seen in the previous paragraph, Montaigne proposes in this essay a type of broadminded education, in which a child should be brought up for the most diverse occupations. Afford him to make up his own judgement by experiencing different things, and exposing him to different ideas, and he will learn by himself to do the right things. This method is opposed to a more rigid approach of teaching by following authoritarian models. When Montaigne adds the Dante quotation via Guazzo he inserts it after a paragraph from 1580, which compares two ways of knowledge, one based on authority versus one based personal experience:

> Qu'il luy face tout passer par l'estamine, et ne loge rien en sa teste par simple authorité et à credit […] Qu'on luy propose cette diversité de jugemens : il choisira s'il peut, sinon il en demeurera en doubte. (V-S, 151a)

> Let the tutor make his charge pass everything through a sieve and lodge nothing in his head on mere authority and trust: […] let this variety of ideas be set before him; he will choose if he can; if not, he will remain in doubt. (135)

This is a way for Montaigne to reinforce the effectiveness of such a learning method. Even if the student lacks the ability to form his/her own opinions and beliefs, or the circumstances presented are not clear enough for him or her to discern the truth unmistakably, the alternative would be to suspend judgment all together and remain

[216] Dante, *Inferno* XI 93.

neutral (following the philosophical tradition of skepticism), a situation which provides the student with an adequate alternative. However, following the irony of the argument, Montaigne is using the authority of Dante's text in making his argument about rejecting authoritiy.

In the 1582 edition there are no other textual additions connected to this citation; but in the 1588 edition, Montaigne adds a new paragraph immediately preceding the original passage from 1580 that contains the 1582 line, which provides a more elaborate context for the verse added in 1582. This new textual addition is not coincidently drawn from a personal experience from his Italian trip. It is the story of an Aristotelian philosopher whom Montaigne is supposed to have met in Pisa, and who was a devout believer in the strict Aristotelian doctrine, to the point that he saw and understood everything through this philosophy. Due to his convictions he was questioned and faced with a great danger by the Roman Inquisition.

> [B] Je vy privéement à Pise un honneste homme, mais si Aristotélicien, que le plus general de ses dogmes est : que la touche et regle de toutes imaginations solides et de toute verité c'est la conformité à la doctrine d'Aristote; que hors de là ce ne sont que chimeres et inanité; qu'il a tout veu et tout dict. Cette proposition, pour avoir esté un peu trop largement et iniquement interpretée, le mit autrefois et tint longtemps en grand accessoire à l'inquisition à Rome.(V-S, 151b)
>
> [b] I had a private talk with a man at Pisa, a good man, but such an Aristotelian that the most sweeping of his dogmas is that the touchstone and measure of all solid speculations and of all truth is conformity with the teaching of Aristotle; that outside of this there is nothing but chimeras and inanity; that Aristotle saw everything and said everything. This proposition, having been interpreted a little to broadly and unfairly, put him once, and kept him long, in great danger of the inquisition at Rome. (134)

This paragraph from 1588 is clearly an indication that the Italian citation inserted previously in 1582, once part of the text, brought back more memories and provided inspiration for further developments. Also, by placing this paragraph that mentions the Roman Inquisition in this chapter, Montaigne is perhaps hinting to those who might be able to recognize the allusion. There is a clear difference between the philosophy developed in the *Essays* and the bad example set by some self-proclaimed philosophers like the said Aristotelian (perhaps an indirect sign of supprt for Sisto Fabri, the Maestro del Sacro Palazzo who showed a great deal of understanding and support to Monatigne's text).[217] As I have already mentioned, Montaigne's added citation in 1582 is an intrinsic part of the process of building the whole text of the Essays and not just a brief disconnected reaction to the Roman censorship. This succinct addition, a single line from Dante, acts as an ignition mechanism which may enable him to retrace his thoughts and elaborate them six years later.

The main idea of chapter I.26 is clear: it emphasizes the importance of forming one's judgment by way of personal experiences and deliberations, exposing the subject to a diversity of sources and allowing the liberty of forming personal opinions, rather than using the authority of books and principles already established by a canon of authors, or schools: "Or, à cet apprentissage, tout ce qui se presente à nos yeux sert de livre suffisant: la malice d'un page, la sottise d'un valet, un propos de table, ce sont autant de nouvelles matieres." (V-S, 153a) "[a] Now for this apprenticeship , everything that comes to our eyes is book enough: a page's prank, a servant's brunder, a remark at table are so many new materials." (136) This view is also consistent with, and connected to the act of

[217] I have discussed in great detail this meeting with the Roman censors in and with Sisto Fabri in Part I of my paper. See *infra* pp. 17 and 87.

traveling that has the advantage of exposing the person to numerous and diverse experiences in a short amount of time. This is the reason why Montaigne strongly advocates traveling in this chapter as a most valuable lesson.

The third and last quotation from Guazzo's *Civil Conversatione* appears in chapter II. 17, "De la praesumption", and it is a verse from Petrarch's *Sonnets*, CXXXV: "*Ne si ne no, nel cor mi suona intero*." "Nor yes nor nomy inmost heart will say." (654) This line is inserted in the context of the concept of irresolution that admittedly is one of Montaigne's characteristics discussed at length throughout the *Essays*. The paragraph preceding the quotation announces this imperfection in his personality:

> Je ne veux donc pas oublier encor cette cicatrice, bien mal propre à produire, en public: c'est l'irresolution, defaut tres-incommode à la negociation des affaires du monde. Je ne sçay pas prendre party és entreprinses doubteuses: *Ne si ne no, nel cor mi suona intero*. (V-S, 654a)
>
> So I do not want to forget this further scar, very unfit to produce in public: irresolution, a most harmful failing in negotiating worldly affairs. I do not know which side to take in doubtful eneterprises: "Nor yes, nor no my inmost heart will say." (602)

However, the following sentences develop a slightly different view, suggesting that this "fault" is just a consequence of the human nature. By recognizing in himself this state of irresolution, Montaigne confirms his own position as an effective representative of the entire human race, and projects his discourse from the personal realm to the universal, "La raison humaine est un glaive double et dangereux" (V-S, 654) "[c] Human reason is a two-edged and dangerous sword"(603), and he returns his arguments to the state of "doubt" as he had developed in chapter I. 26, commented above. In this case, human uncertainty is a natural response to a weakness in the human judgment and, as Tétel also notes, by recognizing this dilemma Montaigne reveals the superiority of his

conscience.[218] Such terms as knowledge and wisdom are secondary to the fickleness or our fate.

> *[1582]Ne si, ne no, nel cor mi suona intero.*
> [B] Je sçay bien soustenir une opinion, mais non pas la choisir. [1580] Par ce que és choses humaines, à quelque bande qu'on panche, il se presente force apparences qui nous y confirment [C] (et le philosophe Chrysippus disoit qu'il ne vouloit apprendre de Zenon et Cleanthez, ses maistres, que les dogmes simplement: car, quant aux preuves et raisons, qu'il en fourniroit assez de luy mesme), [1580] de quelque costé que je me tourne, je me fournis tousjours assez de cause et de vraysemblance pour m'y maintenir. Ainsi j'arreste chez moi le doubte et la liberté de choisir, jusques à ce que l'occasion me presse. (V-S, 654)
>
> [b] Nor yes nor no my inmost heart will say. (Petrarch)
> I can easily maintain an opinion, but not choose one. [a] Because in human matters, whatever side we lean to, we find many probabilities to confirm us in it – [c] and a philosopher Chrisippus said he wanted to learn for Zeno and Cleantes, his masters, nothing but their tenets, for when it came to proofs and reasons, he would furnish enough by himself- [a] so in whatever direction I turn, I can always provide myself with enough causes and probabilities to keep me that way. So I keep within me doubt and freedom of choice until the occasion is urgent. (602)

If we turn now to the original context of the verse in Petrarch's *Canzoniere*, we can see that the Tuscan poet communicates the same concepts, but in the context of love. He lingers in doubt just as Montaigne does because he finally understands that love is not the definite answer, the existential revelation that he expected.

> Amor mi manda quel dolce pensero
> che secretario anticho è fra noi due,
> et mi conforta, et dice che non fue
> mai come or presto a quel ch'io bramo et spero.
>
> Io, che talor menzogna et talor vero
> ò ritrovato le parole sue,

[218] *Présences italiennes dans les* Essais *de Montaigne*, p. 38.

non so s'i' 'l creda, et vivomi intra due,
né sí né no nel cor mi sona intero. [219]

Marcel Tétel sees in this correspondence between the two works a sort of indirect fraternity of the two authors who understand the dilemma of their condition turn to writing as their only approach to knowledge. " Grâce à leur échec, Pétrarque et Montaigne se renouvellent, renaissent et reviennent à l'écriture. Voilà aussi pourquoi, dans une certaine mesure, ils se roulent dans l'irrésolution." [220]

This line is not the only quotion from Petrarch Montaigne adds to the 1582 edition. The French essayst borrows from the great Tuscan writer, who himself borrowed from the Tuscan folklore, what Montaigne calls a "proverbe Thoscan". He uses this verse as the voice of popular wisdom accompanied by two short explanatory phrases: « Tenez vous dans la route commune, il ne faict mie bon estre si subtil et si fin. Souvienne vous de ce que dit le proverbe Thoscan: *Chi troppo s'assottiglia si scavezza*. » (V-S, 558) " Stay on the high road; it is no good to be soubtle and clever. Remember what the Tuscan prverb says: He who grows too keen cuts himself" (509)

Montaigne talks about the necessity of staying within the natural limits of the human nature. He advocates for a temperate conduct in all matters, including the art of communicating: « Je vous conseille, en vos opinions et en vos discours, autant qu'en vos moeurs et en toute autre chose, la moderation et l'attrempance, et la fuite de la nouvelleté et de l'estrangeté. » (V-S, 558a) "[a] In your opinions and remarks, as well as in your conduct and everything else, I advise moderation and temperance and avoidance of

---

[219] "*Love sends me a sweet thought,/ an ancient messenger between us two, / to comfort me, saying he was never / readier than now to grant what I hope and wish.*
I, who have found his words sometimes true, / and sometimes false, still not certain / whether to believe him, live between the two, / neither yes nor no sounds wholly in my heart." Canzoniere, CLXVIII, translated by A.S. Kline.

[220] *Présences italiennes dans les* Essais *de Montaigne*, p. 39.

novelty and strangeness." (509) In the context of maintaining a simpler, direct manner of speaking, a proverb is the ideal textual insertion, since proverbs are the epitome of conciseness and directness in the art of communication. Of course, with Montaigne, this unsophisticated discourse becomes a highly sophisticated "objet d'art". So, if Montaigne indeed committed a mistake and confused his sources, the citation works perfectly in his context. Most critics have identified this line as a direct quotation from Petrarch, indicating its exact placement in the poet's work. [221] Concetta Cavallini argues convincingly in her book *L'Italianisme de Michel de Montaigne* that the latter's work was so well known in Tuscany that it became assimilated in the oral culture as a mark of popular wisdom.

> *In medio stat virtus*, disait le proverbe latin; pour marquer les effets des extrémismes, Montaigne cite "le proverbe Thoscan: Chi troppo s'assottiglia si scavezza". Nous savons aujourd'hui qu'il s'agit d'un vers du *Canzoniere* de Pétrarque, alors que pour lui ce n'était peut-être qu'un proverbe toscan. La littérature passée dans l'oralité populaire, se fait sagesse et se transforme en règle qui doit être transmise et respectée. (221)

Cavallini is right to observe the natural transition of popular, widespread literature into the folkloric collection of a certain region or culture, losing thus in this process the authority its original source. However, she also recognizes the classical concept of the "golden mean" as its earlier inspiration. I believe that the officially accepted reference of this verse as being a quotation from Petrarch is incomplete at best, since Petrarch himself appropriated it from a whole corpus of popular culture. There are several other proverbs that stemmed from the classical example cited by Cavallini, and which follow an

[221] Villey, *Essais de Montraigne* ; Cavallini, *L'Italianisme de Montaigne*; Françon, *Essais 1582 Reproduction photographique*. Villey mistakenly identifies the quote in the note of his edition (p. 558n) as part of poem XXII of the *Canzoniere*, instead of the poem CV.

identical syntactical structure: *Il troppo stroppia* – Too much of anything is a deficiency. *Il troppo e il poco guasta il gioco*. – The too much and the too little ruins the game. *Chi troppo vuole, nulla stringe*. –Those who want too much acquire nothing. *Chi troppo intraprende, poco finisce*. – Those who start too many things, finish very few. *Chi troppo si assottiglia, si scavezza*. – Those who go too high, fall down. *Chi troppo scende, con fatica rimonta*. – Those who go down, come back up with great effort. These similar proverbs attest to the existence of the line in question as already a recognized part of the « sagesse populaire » from which Petrarch also borrowed it. In the Petrarchan context, the poet uses proverbs and simple language in order to present his love situation, paradoxically achieving a poem that is more complex than the ordinary speech it comes from. He plays on the oxymoron derived from the clarity and brevity of proverbs, and the singularity and complexity of his own situation. (See appendix C for Petrarch's text). Montaigne uses Petrarch's quote in chapter II.12 (Apologie de Raimond Sebond). As Donald Frame explains in his translation of the *Essays,* this text takes an unexpected turn from what the title suggests, having only a tenth of the chapter that deals with Sebond and his text. "This chapter, by far the longest of the *Essays*, has been the most influential and remains one of the most perplexing. […] most of the chapter was written with no thought of Sebond, as a treatise on human presumption and the vanity of human reason;" (386) Towards the end of the essay, Motaigne addresses directly Margaret of Valois, wife of Henri de Navarre, the future Henri IV of France, who supposedly asked Montaigne to defend the author he had already translated.[222] The paragraph in which Montaigne added

[222] Montaigne had translated the text of Sebond *Theologia Naturalis* at his father's request, and published it in 1569.

the Italian quotation discussed above, belongs to this part of the chapter, and represents the strategy on which Montaigne built his entire the apology.

> [A] Vous, pour qui j'ay pris la peine d'estendre un si long corps contre ma coustume, ne refuyrez poinct de maintenir vostre Sebond par la forme ordinaire d'argumenter dequoy vous estes tous les jours instruite, et exercerez en cela vostre esprit et vostre estude: car ce dernier tour d'escrime icy, il ne le faut employer que comme un extreme remede. C'est un coup desesperé, auquel il faut abandonner vos armes pour faire perdre à vostre adversaire les siennes, et un tour secret, duquel il se faut servir rarement et reservéement. C'est grande temerité de vous perdre vous mesmes pour perdre un autre […]Nous secouons icy les limites et dernieres clotures des sciences, ausquelles l'extremité est vitieuse, comme en la vertu. [1582] Tenez vous dans la route commune, il ne faict mie bon estre si subtil et si fin. Souvienne vous de ce que dit le proverbe Thoscan: *Chi troppo s'assottiglia si scavezza*. [A] Je vous conseille, en vos opinions et en vos discours, autant qu'en vos moeurs et en toute autre chose, la moderation et l'attrempance, et la fuite de la nouvelleté et de l'estrangeté. Toutes les voyes extravagantes me fachent. Vous qui, par l'authorité que vostre grandeur vous apporte, et encore plus par les avantages que vous donnent les qualitez plus vostres, pouvez d'un clin d'oeil commander à qui il vous plaist, deviez donner cette charge à quelqu'un qui fist profession des lettres, qui vous eust bien autrement appuyé et enrichy cette fantasie. Toutesfois en voicy assez pour ce que vous en avez à faire. [223] (V-S, 557-8a)

> [a] You, for whom I have taken the pains to extend so long a work contrary to my custom, will not shrink from upholding your Sebond by the ordinary form of argument in which you are instructed everyday and in that you will exercise your mind and your learning. For this final fencer's trick must not be employed except as an extreme remedy. It is a desperate stroke in which you must abandon your weapons to make your adversary loose his, and a secret trick that must be used rarely and reservedly. It is great rashness to ruin yourself in order to run another. […] Here we are shaking the barriers and last fences of knowledge, in which extremity is a vice, as in virtue. Stay on the high road; it is no good to be so subtle and clever. Remember what the Tuscan proverb says: he who grows to keen cuts himself." In your opinions and remarks, as well as in your conduct and everything else, I advise moderation and temperance, and avoidance of novelty and strangeness. All eccentric ways irritate me. You who, by the authority that your greatness brings you, and

[223] I have skipped two paragraphs that were inserted after the 1582 edition in order to present a more accurate version of the text as it appeared at the time of his second publication).

> still more by the advantages which the qualities that are more your own give you, can by the flicker of an eye commend whomever you please, should have given this assignment to some professional man of letters, who would have supported and enriched this theme for you in quite another way. However, here is enough for your needs. (508)

I also see a similarity between the project of this entire chapter of the *Essays,* which is to defend Sebond through the artifice of language, and the paradoxical poem of Petrarch. Montaigne's defense strategy is indeed a witty discourse that uses the reverse tactic of attacking and defeating the accusations brought to Sebond's text, rather than directly defending the Spanish author's position. In the complicated structure of this vast essay, Montaigne inserts the Tuscan proverb also used by Petrarch at the crucial moment when he warns Margaret de Valois to maintain a straight route, and not engage or associate with subtle or extreme ways that might lead her astray. Paradoxically, jus as in Petrarch's poem, the very use of this proverb adds subtlety and a deeper layer to the text, which claims to embody the very textual straightforwardness advised by the proverb. This passage reinforces the implicit connection between the two authors suggested by Tétel and discussed in the previous paragraph.

In the same chapter, II. 12, ("Apologie de Raimond Sebond") we also find the second quotation from Dante added in the 1582 edition. Dante's first presence in the 1582 text of the *Essays*, was, as I have previously discussed, a quotation taken actually from a different work, Guazzo's *La Civil Conversatione*, and this second textual insertion follows the same example. This time the recognized source for this piece is another Italian author, Benedetto Varchi in his book *L'Ercolano*. The complete title of the book is actually *Ercolano, dialogo nel quale si ragiona generalmente delle lingue e in particolare della fiorentina e della Toscana,* and it is a treatise in the form of a dialog that

presents the contemporary debates regarding the correct usage of the Italian language. The two colliding theories oppose the literary usage of the archaic form of language used in the 14th century by Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio, a theory supported chiefly by Pietro Bembo (a Venetian scholar, poet, literary critic and cardinal who resurrected the literary interest for the earlier Italian authors and works), and a more modern approach to language that supported the literary usage of the current Florentine tongue, favored by philologists and authors such as Anibal Caro and Claudio Tolomei. The art of rhetoric and the linguistic debates regarding the usage of vernacular versus a more classical style were some of the most prevalent themes debated among Humanists. Montaigne who writes in contemporary French, but whose first language was Latin was probably very interested in the topic.

> Quant à moy, j'avois plus de six ans avant que j'entendisse non plus de François ou de Perigordin que d'Arabesque. Et, sans art, sans livre, sans grammaire ou precepte, sans fouet et sans larmes, j'avois appris du latin, tout aussi pur que mon maistre d'eschole le sçavoit: car je ne le pouvois avoir meslé ny alteré. (V-S, 173a)
>
> [a] As for me, I was over six before I understood any more French or Perigordian than Arabic. And without artificial means, without a book, without grammar or precept, without the whip and without tears I had learned a Latin quite as pure as what my schoolmaster knew for I could not have contaminated or altered it. (156)

In the "Apologie de Raimond Sebond" he touches on this subject of language in the context of the comparison between humans and animals. It is no surprise that he is inspired by a source such as Varchi's *Ercolano* which was one of the best-known works discussing contemporary linguistic theories. However he uses this resource in a covert way by reutilizing a citation from Dante used by Varchi in his argument.

> Cosi pe entro loro schera bruna
> S'ammusa l'una con l'altra formica

> Forse a spiar lor via e lor fortuna.[224] (V-S, 458a)
>
> So ants amidst their sable-colored band
> Greet one another, and inquire perchance
> The road each follows, and the prize in hand. (407)

In the 1582 edition, Montaigne inserts this quotation accompanied by another phrase: " Il me semble que Lactance attribue aux bestes, non le parler seulement, mais le rire encore." (V-S, 458) "It seems to me that Lactantius attributes to beasts not only speech but also laughter." (407) This textual addition might seem as a composed addition: a citation from Dante followed by a brief explicatory or contextualizing sentence. However a closer look at the entire passage and its authentic source (Varchi) tells us that we have to do with a paraphrase from Varchi's *Ercolano*. Here is the entire passage in Italian:

> C : Dante disse pure: Così per entro loro schiera bruna S'ammusa l'una coll'altra formica Forse a spiar lor via, e lor fortuna.
> V : Dante favellò come buon poeta, e di più v'aggiunse, come ottimo filosofo, quella particella forse, la quale è avverbio di dubitazione.
> C : Ditemi un poco, gli stornelli, i tordi, le putte, ovvero gazze, e le ghiandaje, e gli altri uccelli i quali hanno la lingua alquanto più larga degli altri, non favellano?
> V : Signor no.
> C : Lattanzio fimiano scrive pure nel principio del decimo capitolo della falsa sapienza, che gli animali non solamente favellano, ma ridono ancora.
> V : Egli non dice (sebben mi rammento) che gli animali, né favellino, né ridano, ma che pare che ridano, e favellino. [225]

So, what Montaigne does in his adaptation of Varchi's text is to transcribe only the arguments of one of the two interlocutors, excluding thus one side of the debate, that of Varchi himself, and presenting to his reader only the words of Conte Cesare Ercolani

[224] Dante, *Purgatorio*, XXVI, 34
[225] Varchi, Benedetto *Ercolano* – integral text online http://bepi1949.altervista.org/ercolano/dialogo_1.html

the other presupposed interlocutor. I find thus erroneous to consider this textual insertion a quotation from Dante borrowed from Varchi. It is clear that Montaigne uses the arguments of the Italian linguist rather than those of Dante, maintaining the literal form of his text, using the citation from Dante and the allusion to Lactantius. It is worth noting that Montaigne makes a total of four direct allusions to Varchi's text, all in the chapter II. 12, but only this one contains an exact quotation.[226] Montaigne does not mention Varchi's name or even Dante's, but he does bring up the name of "Lactance", a Christian author whose entire work was concerned with the defense and rationalization of the Christianity.To be sure, he was a far more suitable figure for the subject of the "apology"[227]. However, when discussing this passage we must also remark the reappearance of the word "fortuna", which had been criticized by the Roman censors in 1580[228].

The four remaining Italian quotations that Montaigne inserted in the 1582 edition of the *Essays* are borrowed from Torquato Tasso, a controversial contemporary poet who was institutionalized in 1579 at the Sant'Anna asylum in Ferrara, where he remained during Montaigne's travels through Italy. Historians are still debating whether or not Montaigne saw Tasso when he visited Ferrara, as he claims in the *Essais*, although he does not mention anything about such an event in his *Journal*. The opinions are divided but so far there is no new evidence on either side except for Montaigne's own allusion in the text of his *Essays*.[229] Nevertheless, one thing is certain: Montaigne's interest in the

---

[226] Pierre Villey, *Les Sources et l'évolution des Essais,* p.261

[227] Benedetto Varchi, although not an established figure in France, was a rather controversial figure, involved in several unethical scandals, and his works revealed Reformation tendencies.

[228] This subject was previously discussed at length, *supra*, p. 30.

[229] Pierre Villey, *Les Sources et l'évolution des Essais* and Marcel Françon "Preface" to *Essais 1582 Reproduction photographique,* E. Vittorini, "Montaigne, Ferrara and Tasso" in *Il Rinascimento a Ferrara ei suoiorizzonti europei* are convinced that the meeting between the two took place while

work of the Italian poet was triggered sometimes during his trip, as the textual development of the *Essays* proves it. In 1580 there is no mention of Tasso or any of his works; in 1582 when a more advanced version of the text went to print, Montaigne added no less than 4 quotations from Tasso (three from his religious epic *Gerusaleme Liberata*, and one from his pastoral play, *Aminta*) as well as a brief paragraph that recounts the supposed meeting with the poet in Ferrara. In the 1588 edition Montaigne added three more quotations from Tasso's work. Going back to the 1582 edition, we must note that the relative small number of total textual additions operated in this form of the text (50)[230] casts an even brighter light on the various references to Tasso and his work, from a quantitative perspective. The Italian poet must have made a real impact on the author of the *Essais* sometimes during his trip, although the *Journal* does not mention anything about it. Before proceeding to the literary analysis of the quotations used in 1582 and to the examination of any possible relationships between the two authors, I would like to consider briefly the historical and cultural context that surrounded Tasso's life and work, as well as his connections with the French humanistic and political community at the time. At the time of Montaigne's visit to Ferrara on November 15th 1580, Tasso's reputation was already in question, as he had been hospitalized in the mental asylum the *Ospedale Sant'Anna* in Ferrara since March 1579, where he was going to remain for

---

Montaigne spent 2 days there; Marcel Tetel *Présences italiennes dans le Essais* and Jean Balsamo "Montaigne et le saut de Tasse" are more doubtful that this meeting took place, but they both analyse the relationship between the two as a purely literary one, and if the encounter did happen, it is just a detail of no literary consequence. Balsamo considers also set-up visit arranged by the Duke Alphonso II of Ferrara himself in order to show and prove Tasso's insanity for political reasons. More recently Concetta Cavalinni sheds more light on the topic from a historical perspective in her article "Les Mosti intermédiaires entre Montaigne et le Tasse ", *Montaigne Studies*, 2003, but, as she recognizes, there are just hypothesis.

[230] Pierre Villey, *Les Sources et l'évolution des Essais*

more than seven years until July 1586.[231] Before this unfortunate event, Tasso enjoyed a flourishing life and career in the service of Duke Alphonso II of Este in Ferrara starting in 1571: in the spring of 1573 he finished the play *Aminta,* which became an instant success after its first representation in July of the same year (although it was published only in 1581); in 1575 he finished the first version of his epic poem, *Gerusaleme liberata*. Historians seem to agree that at this point the dark period of his life began to unfold. He was accused of unmotivated bursts of violence against several courtiers while his mental state slowly declined. He became increasingly melancholic and developed a religious obsession related to his poem. The legend of his folly was fully established when he was finally locked up in the Sant'Anna mental asylum. His story has since resonated with the myth of the melancholic genius that lost his mind in the fury of artistic creation, and later he became a real inspiration for authors and painters culminating with the Romantic Movement in the 19th century. Among these figures we count Goethe who wrote a play *Torquato Tasso* in 1790, Giacomo Leopardi wrote *Dialogo di Torquato Tasso e del suo Genio familiare* (*Operette morali*, 1824), Gaetano Donizetti wrote an opera on the subject of Tasso in 1833, and countless portraits and paintings were inspired by scenes of his life. [232] Philippe Desan counts seven paintings and sketches that depict Montaigne's visit at Sant'Anna and his meeting with the mad poet, all dated between 1820 and 1837, and which consolidate the artistic myth created around Tasso's destiny[233].

However, at the time of Montaigne's journey, Tasso was an unknown figure for the French intellectual community, despite the fact that the Italian poet had already spent

[231] Chandler B. Beall, *La Fortune du Tasse en France*, p. 6.
[232] A. Solerti, *Vita di Torquato Tasso*, XXI, p. 836 – 860.
[233] Philipe Desan, *Portraits à l'essai: iconographie de Montaigne*, 2003.

almost a year in France in 1570.[234] Jean Balsamo credits Montaigne with introducing Tasso's work for the very first time to the French readers, without however mentioning him as an author: " En revanche, on ne saurait surestimer le rôle de Montaigne, qui introduisait littéralement l'œuvre du Tasse dans la littérature française, en quasi-simultanéité avec la diffusion des éditions italiennes. »[235]

As Marcel Tétel noted in his study[236], all the textual additions pertaining to Tasso and his work, beginning with the brief mention of their supposed meeting, allude to the alienated mental state of the poet, and contain a certain literary fascination with his condition. The longest and most emotionally charged passage introduced in the 1582 edition of the *Essays* is not a quotation of his work but a long paragraph that speaks of his supposed meeting with the mad poet in Ferrara. This paragraph is an incontestable proof of the extent to which Montaigne was impressed with the work and personal fate of the mad poet, whether or not he actually visited him during his trip.

> [1582] Aux actions des hommes insansez, nous voyons combien proprement s'avient la folie avecq les plus vigoureuses operations de nostre ame. Qui ne sçait combien est imperceptible le voisinage d'entre la folie avecq les gaillardes elevations d'un esprit libre et les effects d'une vertu supreme et extraordinaire? Platon dict les melancholiques plus disciplinables et excellans: aussi n'en est-il point qui ayent tant de propencion à la folie. Infinis esprits se treuvent ruinez par leur propre force et soupplesse. Quel saut vient de prendre, de sa propre agitation et allegresse, l'un des plus judicieux, ingenieux et plus formés à l'air de cette antique et pure poisie, qu'autre poete Italien aye de long temps esté? N'a il pas dequoy sçavoir gré à cette sienne vivacité meurtrière? à cette clarté qui l'a aveuglé? à cette exacte et tendue apprehension de la raison qui l'a mis sans raison? à la curieuse et laborieuse queste des sciences qui l'a conduit à la bestise? à cette rare aptitude aux

[234]He spent the first few months in Paris where he worked and then he went to the abbey of Chalis where he spent almost a year. However based on the evidence collected by A. Solerti and M. G. Maugain, Tasso did not establish any relationship with contemporary French authors.
[235] « L'Arioste et le Tasse » *L'Arioste et le Tasse en France au XVIe siècle*, CVLS, 2003, p.19.
[236] *Présences italiennes dans les* Essais, pp. 121-122

> exercices de l'ame, qui l'a rendu sans exercice et sans ame? J'eus plus de despit encore que de compassion, de le voir à Ferrare en si piteux estat, survivant à soy-mesmes, mesconnoissant et soy et ses ouvrages, lesquels, sans son sçeu, et toutesfois à sa veue, on a mis en lumiere incorrigez et informes. Voulez vous un homme sain, le voulez vous reglé et en ferme et seure posteure? affublez le de tenebres, d'oisiveté et de pesanteur. (V-S, 492a)

> In the actions of the insane we saw how neatly madness combines with the most vigorous operations of our soul. Who does not know how imperceptibly near is madness to the lusty flights of a free mind and the effects of supreme and extraordinary virtue? Plato says that melancholy minds are the most teachable and excellent: likewise there are none with so much propensity to madness. Countless minds have been ruined by their very power and suppleness. What a leap has just been taken, because of the very restlessness and liveliness of his mind, by one of the most judicious and ingenious of men, a man more closely molded by the pure poetry of antiquity than any other Italian poet has been for a long time [Torquato Tasso]? Does he not have reason to be grateful to that murderous vivacity of his mind? To that brilliance that has blinded him? To that exact and intent apprehension of his reason, which has deprived him of reason? To the careful and laborious pursuit of the sciences, which has led him to stupidity? To that rare aptitude of the exercises of the mind, which has left him without exercise and without mind? I felt even more vexation than compassion to see him in Ferrara in so piteous a state, surviving himself, not recognizing himself or his works, which, without his knowledge and yet before his eyes have been brought out uncorrected and shapeless. Do you want a man to be healthy, do you want him disciplined and firmly and securely poised? Wrap him in darkness, idleness and dullness. (440)

It is clear, even though Montaigne does not use any names in this paragraph entirely added in 1582, that the author refers to Tasso and his condition. We can see in this passage the double reaction that Montaigne experiences: on one side there is a clear admiration towards Tasso's literary production, and on the other a distinct feeling of pity triggered by the physical and mental state of the Italian poet. Although without the context of the entire essay in which the passage was introduced, it might appear as a

contradictory paragraph, the passage is very much part of the larger project of the "Apologie de Raimond Sebond" (II.12). The artistic genius of creation, just as any other product of the human brain is counterbalanced by the religious faith. No human reason can rise beyond its condition, and if it attempts such an endeavor it is condemned to self-destruction. This is the main concept that Jean Balsamo[237] explored when he approached Montaigne's representation of Tasso from the perspective of the mythological figure of Icarus, basing his hypothesis on the metaphor of the "saut", the deep plunge that made the poet dive from the extreme clarity of mind to complete blindness. As Vittorini also remarks, the figure of Tasso plunged into the darkness of the mind corresponds to the destiny of another poet whose work was much appreciated by Montaigne, namely Lucretius. "For Montaigne is not singling out Tasso as an individual, but deliberately assimilating his known condition (as he did that of Lucretius) to a general rule." [238] The difference, as Balsamo correctly remarks, is that while Lucretius lost his senses because of a love potion, Tasso became the victim of his own presumption, trying to surpass the limits of the human mind. I should keep in mind the context provided by Montaigne in this passage when we I look at each individual quotation from Tasso's work in the text of 1582.

The first quotation appears in chapter I. 41, "De ne communiquer sa gloire":

> La fama, ch'invaghisce a un dolce suono
> Gli superbi mortali, et par si bella,
> E un echo, un sogno, anzi d'un sogno un ombra
> Ch'ad ogni vento si dilegua et sgombra.[239]
>
> The fame that charms proud mortals with swet sound,

[237] « Montaigne et le "saut" du Tasse », *Rivista di letterature moderne e comparate*, 54/4 2001, p. 389.
[238] Edwina Vittorini, "Montaigne, Ferrara and Tasso", *The Renaissance in Ferrara and Its European Horizons*, ed. June Salmons and Walter Moretti (Swansea: University of Wales Press, 1984) p. 158.
[239] *Essais*, V-S, I.41, p.255a, *Gerusaleme Liberata*, XIV, stanza 63

> And seems so fair, is but an echo, a dream,
> The shadow of a dream, beyond repair
> Dispersed and scattered by a puff of air. (227)

Montaigne makes a modification to the original form of the verse, changing "Voi superbi" in "Gli superbi", in order to better incorporate the essence of the lyrics into his own argument. The function of these four lines matches the perspective of the meeting cited above: " Le contexte de rêve précise de nouveau l'univers tassien selon Montaigne; en fait c'est bien ce domaine « insensé » auquel est associé le poète italien ».[240]

Montaigne introduces these lines s in an already existing context that alludes to the dream-like setting, and thus corresponds to the universe of Tasso's work:

> De toutes les resveries du monde, la plus receue et plus universelle est le soing de la reputation et de la gloire, que nous espousons jusques à quitter les richesses, le repos, la vie et la santé, qui sont bien effectuels et substantiaux, pour suyvre cette vaine image et cette simple voix qui n'a ny corps ny prise. (V-S, 255a)
>
> Of all the illusions in the world, the most universally received is the concern for reputation and glory, which we espose even to the point of giving up riches, rest, life, and health, which are effectual and substantial goods, to follow that vain phantom and mere sound that has neither body nor substance. (227)

In the original context, the lines used by Montaigne belonged to a beautiful nymph who, being part of a revenge plot arranged by Armida (a sensual witch looking for vengeance against Rinaldo, the heroic knight), lures the courageous knight into enchanted sleep through her magical song in order to give up all desire for glory, virtue and heroic deeds, and surrender himself to the sensuality of carnal desire[241]. The quotation thus changes

[240] Tetel, *Présences italiennes dans les* Essais, p. 125
[241] A scene inspired by Homer, in which Armida and Rinaldo's relationship corresponds to that of Circe and Odysseus's, in *Odyssey*, Book X.

from deceptive discourse in Tasso's work to pertinent argument in Montaigne's essay. The only constant remaining is this daze-like quality that surrounds both contexts.

The second quotation from the *Gerusaleme Liberata* that appears in the 1582 *Essais* is in chapter II. 6 ("De l'exercitation"). In this essay, Montaigne takes up again the concept of death and the different ways in which it haunts him.[242] He recalls the personal experience of falling off his horse, an accident that made him collapse senseless on the spot and remain in bed for a month. This shock of the fall and the short loss of consciousness are compared to a brief passing, an event that had him linger between life and death:

> Il me sembloit que ma vie ne me tenoit plus qu'au bout des lèvres: je fermois les yeux pour ayder, ce me sembloit, à la pousser hors, et prenois plaisir à m'alanguir et à me laisser aller. C'estoit une imagination qui ne faisoit que nager superficiellement en mon ame, aussi tendre et aussi foible que tout le reste, mais à la verité non seulement exempte de desplaisir, ains meslée à cette douceur que sentent ceux qui se laissent glisser au sommeil. (V-S, 374a)
>
> It seemed to me that my life was hanging only by the tip of my lips; I closed my eyes in order, it seemed to me, to help push it out, and took pleasure in growing languid and letting myself go. It was an idea that was only floating on the surface of my soul, as delicate and feeble as the rest, but in truth not only free from distress, but mingled with that sweet feeling that people have who let themselves slide into sleep. (325)

The experience of fainting brings about the metaphor of a peculiar state of sleep which is once again associated with Tasso and his universe. For the depiction of his gradual revitalization Montaigne chooses two lines from the eighth canto of the *Gerusaleme Liberata*, from a passage where a knight recalls his own encounter with death on the battlefield, and his slow recovery:

[242] The previous chapter exclusively dedicated to discussing death was I. 20 "Que philosopler c'est apprendre à mourir".

come quel ch'or apre or chiude
Gli occhi, mezzo tra'l sonno è l'esser desto.[243] (V-S, 375a)

As one's twixt wakefulness and doze,
Whose eyes now open , now again they close. (325)

Although Montaigne's accident did not happen on the battlefield, there are a few converging points in the two stories. The first indication is the mention that the episode took place during one of the religious wars: "pendant nos troisiesmes troubles ou deuxiesmes (il ne me souvient pas bien de cela), m'estant allé un jour promener à une lieue de chez moy, qui suis assis dans le moiau de tout le trouble des guerres civiles de France"(V-S, 373a). "During our third civil war, or the second (I do not quite remember which), I went riding one day about a league from my house, which is situated at the very hub of all the turmoilof the civil wars of France." (326) Furthermore, Montaigne also describes his accident as a completely unforeseen assault in which he was at a great disadvantage because of his horse.

> A mon retour, une occasion soudaine s'estant presentée de m'aider de ce cheval à un service qui n'estoit pas bien de son usage, un de mes gens, grand et fort, monté sur un puissant roussin qui avoit une bouche desesperée, frais au demeurant et vigoureux, pour faire le hardy et devancer ses compaignons vint à le pousser à toute bride droict dans ma route, et fondre comme un colosse sur le petit homme et petit cheval, et le foudroier de sa roideur et de sa pesanteur, nous envoyant l'un et l'autre les pieds contremont(V-S, 373)
>
> On my return, when a sudden occasion came up for me to use this horse for a service to which it was not accustomed, one f my men big and strong, riding a powerful work horse who had a desperately hard mouth and was moreover fresh and vigorous – this man in order to show his daring and get afead of his companions, spurred his horse at full speed up the path behind me, came down like a colossus on the little man and the little horse and

[243] *GL*, Canto VIII, stanza 26

hit us like a thunderbolt with all his strengths and weight, sending us both head over heels. (326)

Similarly, but in a much more dramatic scene of a violent attack, the Danish Prince Sven who was leading the Christian army lost his life to the Palestinian army of infidels:

> Era la notte ancor ne la stagione
> ch'è piú del sonno e del silenzio amica,
> allor che d'urli barbareschi udissi
> romor che giunse al cielo ed a gli abissi.
>
> Si grida `A l'armi! a l'armi!', e Sveno involto
> ne l'armi inanzi a tutti oltre si spinge,
> e magnanimamente i lumi e 'l volto
> di color d'ardimento infiamma e tinge.
> Ecco siamo assaliti, e un cerchio folto
> da tutti i lati ne circonda e stringe,
> e intorno un bosco abbiam d'aste e di spade
> e sovra noi di strali un nembo cade.
>
> Ne la pugna inegual (però che venti
> gli assalitori sono incontra ad uno).[244]

Montaigne associates thus his situation to that of the knight who managed to escape the great ambush and lived to tell the story. In both cases the near-death

---

[244] *Now had the stillness of the quiet night*
Drowned all the world in silence and in sleep,
When suddenly we heard a dreadful sound,
Which deafed the earth, and tremble made the ground.

'Arm, arm,' they cried; Prince Sweno at the same,
Glistering in shining steel leaped foremost out,
His visage shone, his noble looks did flame,
With kindled brand of courage bold and stout,
When lo, the Pagans to assault us came,
And with huge numbers hemmed us round about,
A forest thick of spears about us grew,
And over us a cloud of arrows flew:

"Uneven the fight, unequal was the fray,
Our enemies were twenty men to one,
Jerusalem Delivered, a Poem, translated by Edward Fairfax, ed. Henry Morley, LL.D. (New York, 1901), electronic edition was edited, proofed, and prepared by Douglas B. Killings, 1995. http://omacl.org/Tasso/, Canto VIII, stanzas 16-18.

experience is the fundamental element that authorizes the act of speaking or writing. Montaigne resorts to writing as a way of internalizing his experience, and the knight in Tasso's poem, externalizing the episode, assumes the role of the narrator and claims this canto within the plot of the poem.

Montaigne perceived such a strong connection between Tasso and his own near-death experience, that in 1588 he enriched this episode by adding another citation from Tasso's epic poem, placing it only two lines before the one added in 1582:

> [B]*Perche, dubbiosa anchor del suo ritorno,*
> *Non s'assecura attonita la mente*[245] (V-S, 373b)
>
> [b] Because the shaken soul, uncertain yet
> Of its return, is still not firmly set. (327)

In Tasso's poem this passage is in a slightly different context than the first one. The setting remains that of a battle, but this time there are only two protagonists: the knight who wounds and kills the woman he loves without knowing who she was. When he realizes what he did, he mortally injures himself and abandons himself to death until his men find him and revive his soul. The image that Montaigne uses is the depiction of the heroic knight coming back to life in order to carry on his sacred duty of fighting all infidels and reclaiming Jerusalem in the name of Christianity. Of course Montaigne does not claim any literal association with the character of Tancred, Tasso's hero in this episode; however the connection lies in the fact that in both cases the wounded was revived without any knowledge on his part. There was a distinct division between the body and the mind, an empty space where Montaigne situated death. At the end of the anecdote, the author of the *Essays* concludes that death in itself, as seen in the experience he had, does not comprise pain or any discomfort, and the most frightening part are the

[245] *GL*, Canto XII, stanza 74,

mental images we create in envisioning this ultimate human experience. The conclusion draws the reader back to the dangers of the human mind, which is the most fickle and uncertain quality one possesses. The poetic images used by Montaigne in this essay become even more pertinent in light of Tasso's own destiny, which was marked by his own rupture with reality. Although in a different, more dramatic case, Tasso's reality became infused with fictions and ended up in an intense loss of sanity, equated with the genius of artistic creation.

The next appearance of Tasso's epic poem in the text of the 1582 edition of the *Essais* is in chapter II. 8 "De l'affection des peres aux enfans". This time Montaigne zooms in on the description of the marginal character Orcano, who is on the other side of the Christian camp, in the Arab council. In the poem he is presented as an esteemed figure of great virtue, respected by all those in attendance, but who left the active life of a warrior, now married and with young children.

> Tanto sol disse il generoso Argante
> quasi uom che parli di non dubbia cosa.
> Poi sorse in autorevole sembiante
> Orcano, uom d'alta nobiltà famosa,
> e già ne l'arme d'alcun pregio inante;
> ma or congiunto a giovanetta sposa,
> e lieto omai di figli, era invilito
> ne gli affetti di padre e di marito.[246]

[246]*Thus spoke Argantes; nothing more he chose*
To say, as useless in so clear case;
When with an air of state Orcano rose,
A peer descended from a princely race:
With warriors once he held respected place;
But, married, to a young and beauteous bride,
His courage melted in her sweet embrace;
And in his babes now placing his chief pride,
Sad o'er the risks of war the sire and husband sighed.
(*Jerusalem delivered*, Canto X, stanza 39)

In his appropriation of the passage, Montaigne omits the positive aspects of this reputable figure keeping only the final idea expressed in the last three lines. The context of the *Essais* deforms the original connotation of Tasso's text, but this edited form serves Montaigne's argument who claims that sexual desires negatively affect and detract men from all involvement in public life, propelling them into the domestic space too early.

> [1580] Les anciens Gaulois estimoient à extreme reproche d'avoir eu accointance de femme avant l'aage de vingt ans, et recommandoient singulierement aux hommes qui se vouloient dresser pour la guerre, de conserver bien avant en l'aage leur pucellage, [1582] d'autant que les courages s'amolissent et divertissent par l'accouplage des femmes.
>
> *Ma hor congiunto à giovinetta sposa,*
> *Lieto homai de'figli, era invilito*
> *Ne gli affetti di padre e di marito.*
>
> […] [1580]Un gentil-homme qui a trente cinq ans, il n'est pas temps qu'il face place à son fils qui en a vingt: il est luy-mesme au train de paroistre et aux voyages des guerres et en la court de son Prince; il a besoin de ses pieces, et en doit certainement faire part, mais telle part qu'il ne s'oublie pas pour autruy. (V-S, 390)

> [1580] The ancient Gauls considered it extremely reprehensible for a man aunder twenty to have had knowledge of a woman, and particlularly recommended to the men who wanted to train for war, to keep thwir virginity until well along in years, since courage is softened and diverted by intercourse with women.
>
> Happy in children, wed to a young wife,
> For exploits he had lost his predilection
> Through fatherly and marital affection. (Tasso)
>
> […] [1580] When a gentleman is thirty-five, it is not time for him to give place to his son who is twenty: he is himself in the midst of appearing of military expeditions and in the court of his prince; he needs his ressources, and should certainlt share them, but not so as to forget himself for others. (342)

The last quotation from Tasso's work inserted in the text of the *Essays* in 1582, immediately after the return from his journey, is borrowed from *Aminta*, a pastoral drama that portrays the love between a shepherd and a shepherdess who, after a few unfortunate events are separated, and then come together at the end reunited by prevailing love for

each other. Montaigne uses two short lines from the play in one of his arguments developed in the "Apologie de Raimond Sebond" (II.12). In the paragraphs preceding the citation, he claims that humans are by no means above animals, and communication through language, which is one of the most valuable human resources, is not always necessary.

> [1580] les amoureux se courroussent, se reconcilient, se prient, se remercient, s'assignent et disent enfin toutes choses des yeux:
> [1582]*E'l silentio ancor suole*
> *Haver prieghi e parole*.[247] (V-S, 454a)
>
> [1580]Lovers grow angry, are reconciled, entreat, thank, make assignations, and in fine say everything, with their eyes:
> [1582] And silence too records
> Our prayers and our words. (403)

Although Montaigne inserts the lines when describing the powerful influence of love, he once again, in the process of appropriation, twists the original context in which the lines were used in the play. While in Tasso's work love elevated and defined the human condition, in Montaigne's essay this selfless emotion integral to our social universe which inspired so much poetic production, is viewed as an instinctual act with of no exceptional consequence. Although recognizing the value of silence, Tasso praises the merits and beauty of love expressed through poetry. Marcel Tetel argues that by valorizing the language of signs and the silence, Montaigne stresses the enriching experience of the poetic imagination. However, we must remember, as Jean Balsamo points out, that the debate over language and its functions was a rather fashionable topic of the period, and the Italians were chief participants in this trend. As I mentioned previously, Montaigne praises the interest of Italian authors in the art of communication, and when he returned from his journey he enriched his text with newly discovered

[247] *Aminta*, Act II, C.34,

passages from Italian authors that exemplify this movement: [248] "Une politique de la bigarrure linguistique et de la surprise conduisait Montaigne, dans un premier temps, à augmenter le nombre de ses citations en italien."[249]

Here ends the list of Italian citations inserted in the text immediately after Montaigne's return from his long journey to Rome. The overall textual contribution brought to the text of the *Essais* at this time, compiled in the 1582 edition, is of great importance for those studying the development of this book as we know it today, and its role in the literary arena of its time. This edition marks the first steps in the continuing process of building the text. As I analyzed earlier in this first part of my thesis, the textual modifications entailed by the meeting with the Roman censors are much more than just basic rectifications, and the literary textual additions (in the form of eight Latin and nine Italian citations) have a great impact on changing original text of 1580; they also outline future developments which will be materialized in subsequent editions.

[248] See *supra* on Guazzo, p. 198, and *Essays* III. 8 ("De l'art de conferer").
[249] J. Balsamo, "Montaigne et le "saut" du Tasse", p. 399.

Chapter 4

Montaigne's European Experience in the 1582 Text of the *Essays*.

The 1582 edition of the *Essays* has been for a long time unjustly classified in the same category as the 1580 edition and regarded as an early state of the text, featuring very few and unremarkable changes in relation to the 1580 edition. Pierre Villey included both 1580 and 1582 texts within the A text label, as if it were a single textual layer. The main reasons for this categorization are: 1) the relative small number of emendations operated on the original text published in 1582; and 2) both editions were printed and distributed in Bordeaux in the printing shop of Simon Millanges. This smaller provinicial "atelier" was replaced in future publications of *Essays* by bigger and more prestigious publishing houses, such as the establishment of Abel L'angelier in Paris, where the 1588 edition, and the 1595 posthumous version were published.

As we have seen so far in the preceding chapters of this study, the 1582 edition unquestionably holds the key to a better understanding of the process of writing the *Essays*, as we perceive it today. We have connected this valuable "in-progress" version of the text with several other contributing factors, the accounts left by the author himself in his *Journal*, as well as a newly discovered document regarding the censorship to which the book was submitted in Rome, and we were able to recreate in good part the contextual space behind these textual transformations, and to understand how and why Montaigne developed this approach of remodeling and reviving his wok that will continue to flourish throughout the rest of his life.

According to Pierre Villey, the 1582 edition contains 250 modifications "sans importance" and 50 additions (including the 17 newly inserted quotes commented *supra*),

these findings corroborate those of Dezeimeris and Barckhausen and cited by Françon and Legros, who found in the same edition 17 new citations and 34 other additions of two lines or more. [250] The high volume of corrections and modifications made to this edition proves that Montaigne took upon himself the task of adjusting the original edition of 1580, cleaning up the printing mistakes and other syntactical or spelling errors. Such a tedious task must have taken a great deal of time, and as Blum notes, it is very possible that he accomplished this project during his long trip in Italy. "Ce travail de préparation d'épreuves a été fait durant les dix-huit mois de voyage."[251] The nature of these corrections varies greatly, from correcting misspellings to syntactical reconsiderations, and to one or two words substitutions, exclusions or additions. Take the example of the following sentence from the 1580 edition, essay I. 31 ("Des canibales") "Il atache un cordon a l'un des bras du prisonnier" [252]. In 1582 Montaigne changed the word "un cordon" with the variation "une corde"[253]: "Il atache une corde a l'un des bras du prisonnier"[254]. It is important to note that Montaigne did not change other occurrences of the word "cordon" form the 1580 edition, such as in the case of a sentence from the same chapter (I.31) only a few pages before the phrase commented above:

> Il se void en plusieurs lieus, et entre autres chez moy, la forme de leurs lits, de leurs cordons, de leurs espées et brasseletz de bois, de quoy ils couurent leurs poignets aus combats, et des grandes cannes ouuertes par vn bout, par le son desquelles ils soustiennent la cadence de leur dance.[255]

---

[250] *Les Sources et l'évolution des* Essais *de Montaigne*, tableau final, Essais. *Reproduction photographique de la deuxième édition (Bordeaux 1582),* p. 13 ; Alain Legros, "Édition de 1582", in *Dictionnaire de Michel de Montaigne*, p. 301

[251] Claude Blum, "Dans l'atelier de Millanges. Les conditions de fabrication des editions bordelaises des *Essais*. (1580,1582)", Editer les essais de Montaigne, éds. C. Blum, A. Tournon, Paris 1997, p. 96

[252] Daniel Martin, *Reproduction photographique de l'édition originale de 1580,* vol.I, p. 316,

[253] Both terms are translated as "rope".

[254] Philippe Desan, *Reproduction photographique de la deuxieme édition (Bordeaux 1582)*, p. 195

[255] Daniel Martin, *Reproduction photographique de l'édition originale de 1580,* vol.I, p. 313 and, Philippe Desan, *Reproduction photographique de la deuxieme édition (Bordeaux 1582)*, p. 194

As we note in Jean Nicot's *Thresor de la langue françoyse, tant ancienne que moderne* (1606), the semantic relation between the two terms, a "corde" is made up of two or more "cordons" is consistent with the modern definition of the words[256]. Therefore, Montaigne sensibly decided to change "cordon" into "corde" in the first instance mentioned, in order to reinforce the accuracy of his text. In the handeling of prisoners (articulated in the first sentence), the terme "corde" refers to a sturdier article needed in order to restrict the captive, although no difference is noted in the Engish translations in which both terms "corde" and "cordon" are translated as "rope".

In essay I.8 ("De l'oisivete"), Montaigne corrects the misspelling of one of his quotations from Lucan: from "vanam semper dant otia mentem" in the 1580 edition to "variam semper dant otia mentem" in the 1582 edition "Ever idle hours breed wandering thoughts." (25)[257] Sometimes Montaigne adds words or small explanatory notes as in Chapter I.44 ("Du dormir"). In the follwing sentence he adds the adjective "grands" to the noun "menasses": "auquel decret Caton seul insistoit, et en auoient eu Metellus et luy de grosses parolles et *grands* menasses au Senat;"[258] "which decree [the dercree published by Matellus recalling Pompey to the city with his army at the time of Cataline's conspiracy] Cato alone opposed, and Matellus and he exchanged strong words and great threats in the Senate." (241) In this case I believe Motaigne added the adjective "grands" in order to achieve symetry at the syntactic level, matching the structure of the

[256] Jean Nicot, *Thresor de la langue françoyse, tant ancienne que moderne,* 1606 *: Un cordon, Les trois cordons d'une corde*. Source, Unversity of Chicago's the ARTFL project, Dictionnairess d'autres fois: http://artflx.uchicago.edu/cgibin/dicos/pubdico1look.pl?strippedhw=cordon

[257] Lucan IV, 704, Martin, *Reproduction photographique*, p. 31, Desan *Reproduction photographique,* p. 19

[258] D. Martin, *Reproduction photographique,* 1580, p. 415, P. Desan, *Reproduction photographique,* 1582, p.215

first direct object “grosses paroles” (modified by an intenfisying adjective) with a similar structure “grands menaces”.

There are also textual modifications that exclude certain words, and sometimes short sentences. That is the case of chapter II.1 “De l’nconstance de nos actions”, in which Montaigne completely eliminates the French paraphrase of a Publilius Syrus Latin citation (after a text of Aulus Gellus) that immediately followed the quote in the 1580 version of the text. “c'est vn mauuais conseil, qui ne se peut changer.”

> veu que l'irresolution me semble le plus commun et apparent vice de nostre nature, tesmoing ce fameus verset de Publius le farseur: *Malum consilium est quod mutari non potest*. [c'est vn mauuais conseil, qui ne se peut changer.] Et, de toute l'antieneté, il est malaisé de choisir vne douzaine d'hommes qui ayent dressé leur vie a vn certain et asseuré train, qui est le principal but de la sagesse:[259]

Montaigne perhaps eliminated this phrse because of its redundant meaning, adding nothing to the context.[260]

These slight text variations of the text that are visible in the 1582 edition do not in any way alter the original arguments and I will not devote more time here to these small linguistic changes. I will now direct my attention to the longer and more contextually significant textual developments that Montaigne added in the 1582 edition, and in order to better organize their role and development, I shall divide them in two principal categories that seem to shed significant light on nature of this new edition: 1, references to the trip to Italy and, 2, reaffirmation of Montaigne’s catholic faith.[261]

---

[259] D. Martin, *Reproduction photographique*, 1580, II, p. 2.

[260] In 1588 Montaigne made a substantial textual addition to this passage, which I commented *supra*, part I, chapter 2, objection 30.

[261] Some of these additions were amply developed in chapters I.1 and I.2, such as the passage on the execution of Catena, an episode witnessed by Montaigne in Rome, and inserted in essay II. 11 (« De la

1. Montaigne's Personal Encounters in the Trip to Italy

Among the passages referring to Montaigne's trip to Italy that emerge in the 1582 edition, we will first look at a short paragraph added in chapter I. 36, "De l'usage de se vestir".

> Celuy [Etienne Bathory] que les Polonnois ont choisi pour leur Roy apres le nostre, qui est à la verité un des plus grands Princes de nostre siecle, ne porte jamais gans, ny ne change, pour hyver et temps qu'il face, le mesme bonnet qu'il porte au couvert. (V-S, 227)
>
> The man whom the Poles chose for their king after ours, and who is in truth one of the greatest princes of our century, never wears gloves, or changes, for winter or any weather whatever, the bonnet that he he weares indoors. (203)

In the 1582 edition this sort passage is added following a paragraph that discusses other head covering traditions with examples from Egyptians, Persians and Caesar. The paragraph that follows the text is a reference to Martin du Bellay's voyage to Luxembourg, which might have sparked Montaigne's own memory of his trip to Rome, and his first-hand experience with this culture. In April 1581 Montaigne met with a Polish author, probably Stanislas Reske a good friend of the also Polish Cardinal Stanislaus Hosius, for whom the former wrote an "oraison funèbre" in 1579. [262]

> En ce tamps là je prins, entre autres, congnoissance à un Polonois le plus privé ami qu'eust le Cardinal Hosius, lequel me fit present de deux examplaires du livret qu'il a fait de sa mort, et les corrigea de sa main. (*JV*, 131)
>
> At this time I made the acquaintance, among others, of a Pole, the most intimate friend of the late cardinal Hosyusz, who presented me with two copies of the booklet he had written on the cardinal's death and corrected with his own hand. (101)

---

cruauté ») or the famous incipit to the chapter I. 56 « Des prières », or the short addition on Tasso from essai II.12. I will not come back to them in this chapter.

[262] See note 118 in *JV*, p. 131

This meeting made a good impression on Montaigne, as we clearly see from another comment in the 1588 edition of the *Essays*, III.9: "j'estime tous les hommes mes compatriotes, et embrasse un Polonois comme un François." (V-S, 973b) "I consider all men my compatriots, and embrace a Pole as I do a Frenchman." (903) Montaigne probably had a different episode from his trip in mind when he wrote this 1582. This other episode, a longer anecdote narrated in the *Journal*, presents the visit to Rome of the Russian Ambassador (from the court of Ivan the Terrible IV), and talks in more detail of the political climate between Poland and Russia, two countries which were at war with each other and with the Turks. The passage opens with a brief description of the ambassador's clothes that connects it visually with the paragraph added in 1582.

> L'Ambassadeur du Moscovite vint aussi ce jour là à cette station, vestu d'un manteau d'escarlate, et une soutane de drap d'or, le chapeau en forme de bonnet de nuit de drap d'or fourré, et au-dessous une calotte de toile d'argent. […] On tenoit là que sa charge portoit d'esmouvoir le Pape à s'interposer à la guerre que le Roy de Poloigne faisoit à son maistre, alleguant que c'etoit à lui à soutenir le premier effort du Turc ; & si son voisin l'affaiblissoit, qu'il demeureroit incapable à l'autre guerre, qui seroit une grande fenestre ouverte au Turc, pour venir à nous. (*JV*, 110-111)
>
> The ambassador from the tsar of Muscovy also came that day to this station, dressed in a scarlet mantle and a cassock of cloth of gold, with a hat in the form of a nightcap, of cloth of gold, furred and beneath it a skullcap of cloth of silver. […] There they maintained that the mission was to move the Pope to interpose in the was that the king of Poland was making on his master, alleging that it was up to his master to sustain the first attack of the Turk, and that if his neighbor weakened him he would remain incapable of the other war, which would be a great window opened to the Turk. (85)

Etienne Bathory was elected king of Poland after his predecessor, Henri of Anjou, left Poland where he was appointed king, to return to France and take over the throne as Henri III after his brother Charles IX died. Bathory was a disseminator of Catholicism in

the region and he was an ally to the Pope against the Turcs, so it is no wonder that Montaigne refers to him as "un des plus grands Princes de nostre siècle."

Another reference of the author's trip to Rome inserted in the 1582 edition is a short phrase added in essay II. 33 ("L'Histoire de Spurina"). In the beginning of this chapter Montaigne speaks of the primacy of reason over physical desires and passions, and he presents examples that support his argument. Among these, we find a depiction of Julius Cesar as a handsome man devoured by carnal desires.

> [1580] Le seul exemple de Julius Caesar peut suffire à nous montrer la disparité de ces appetits, car jamais homme ne fut plus adonné aux plaisirs amoureux. Le soin curieux qu'il avoit de sa personne, en est un tesmoignage, jusques à se servir à cela des moyens les plus lascifs qui fussent lors en usage, comme de se faire pinceter tout le corps et farder de parfums d'une extreme curiosité. Et de soy il estoit beau personnage, blanc, de belle et allegre taille, le visage plein, les yeux bruns et vifs [1582] s'il en faut croire Suetone, car les statues qui se voyent de luy à Rome, ne raportent pas bien par tout à cette peinture. (V-S, 729)
>
> [1580] The sole example of Julius Caesar may suffice to show us the disparity of these appetites, for never was a man more addicted to amorous pleasures. One evidence of this is his fastidious care he took of his person, even to using for that the most lascivious means then in vogue, such as having all the hairs plucked of his body and covering himself with perfumes of exquisite choice. And he was naturally a handsome person, fair with a tall and active figure, a full face, and dark, black eyes, [1582] if we are to believe Suetonius, for the statues that are seen of him in Rome do not correspond in every respect wit this picture. (668-9)

In 1582, Montaigne revisits this portrait with more factual evidence he acquired during his trip, adding the last phrase to the above-cited paragraph. During his stay in Rome Montaigne saw the classical monuments depicting the great emperors and found that these visual representations did not always correspond to the written accounts left by

historians. In his Jouranl he briefly mentions the Roman statues that impressed him most, and Cesar's are not it in his list:

> l'*Adonis* qui est chez l'Eveque d'Aquino ; la *Louve* de bronze et l'*Enfant qui s'arrache l'espine*, du Capitole ; le *Laocoon* et l'*Antinoüs*, de Belvedere ; la *Comedie*, du Capitole ; le *Satyre,* de la vigne du Cardinal Sforza ; et de la nouvelle besoigne, le *Moïse*, en la sepulture de *San Pietro in Vincula* ; la belle femme qui est aux pieds du Pape Paul III, en la nouvelle eglise de Saint Pierre; ce sont les statues qui m'ont le plus agréé à Rome. (*JV*, 129)
>
> the Adonis in the home of the Bishop of Aquino; the bronze she-wolfand the boy taking out a thorn, in the Capitol; the Locoon and the Antinous of the Belvedere; the Comedy in the Capitol; the Satyr in the vineyard of Cardinal Sforza; and the modern workmanship, the Moses in the sepulcher of San Pietro in Vinculis, the beautiful woman at the feet of Pope Paul III in the new Church of Saint Peter – these are the statues I have liked best in Rome. (99)

The mention of a visual representation of Cesar in the *Journal*, is a brief account of Montaigne's secretary who notes Montaigne's admiration of a fresco in *Castello del Buon Consiglio* in Trent, which depicts Cesar's nocturnal triumph.

> Nous y vismes aussi, parmy les autres peintures du planchier, un triomphe nocturne aus flambeaux, que M. de Montaigne admira fort. (*JV*, 59)
>
> Here we also saw, among the other paintings on the ceiling a nocturnal triumph by torchlight, which Monsieur de Montaigne greatly admired. (49)

This image of the emperor, although not in the form of a statue portrays a highly erotic representation of the Roman emperor that corresponds to his earlier description of a highly sexual being, in essay II.33. As Rigolot notes, "l'ensemble du tableau baigne dans une fumeuse atmosphere erotisante."[263]

In essay I. 49, "Des cousumes anciennes", Montaigne alludes to his recent trip in the 1582 by comparing ancient greeting customs in classical Rome with similar ways he

[263] *JV*, Introduction, p. xxxii

had observed in Venice. "[1580] Ils [the ancient Romans] baisoyent les mains aux grands pour les honnorer et caresser; et, entre les amis, ils s'entrebaisoyent en se saluant, [1582] comme font les Venitiens." (V-S, 297) "[1580] They kissed the hands of the great to show them honor and affection; and among friends they kissed one another in saluatation, [1582] as Venetians do." (263)

The next 1582 textual addition pertaining to Montaigne's traveling experience from 1580 is a passage which was progressively developed in the following editions of the *Essays*. The original passage which also contains a quotation from Virgil "Et fugit ad salices, et se cupit ante videri" (V-S, 614), "Shee flees into the willows and hopes to be seen" (565) is added in chapter II.15 ("Que nostre desir s'accroit par la malaisance")[264]. This added text serves as an example to support the argument developed in this chapter, mainly that people are more attracted to things and people that are not accessible to them, than to others that are readily available. The passge that directly references Montaignes trip to Italy within the longer 1582 textual addition is the following:

> Voyez en Italie, où il y a plus de beauté à vendre, et de la plus fine comment il faut qu'elle cherche d'autres moyens estrangers et d'autres arts pour se rendre aggreable; et si, à la verité, quoy qu'elle face, estant venale et publique, elle demeure foible et languissante: tout ainsi que, mesme en la vertu, de deux effets pareils, nous tenons ce neantmoins celuy-là le plus beau et plus digne auquel il y a plus d'empeschement et de hazard proposé. (V-S, 615a)
>
> See how in Italy, where thete is more beauty for sale, and of the most elegant, it must seek extraneous means and other arts to make itself agreeable; and yet in truth, do what it will, being venal and public it remains weak and languishing. Just as, even in the case of valor, of two similar acts we still consider that one fairer and more worthy in which more obstacle and risk is offered. (566)

[264] I have already discussed the function of the Virgil quotation, *supra* p. 181.

During his stay in Venice, Montaigne commented on the role of courtesans in Italian society, as his secretary remarked when he reported on his marster's exchange with Veronica Franco, a famous courtesan and writer.

> Le lundi à souper, 7 de Novembre, la Signora Veronica Franco, gentifemme Venitienne, envoya vers luy pour luy presenter, un petit livre de *Lettres* qu'elle a composé ; il fit donner deux escus audict home. […] Il n'y trouva pas cette fameuse beauté qu'on attribue aus dames de Venise; et si vit les plus nobles de celles qui en font traficque; mais cela luy sembla autant admirable que nulle autre chose d'en voir un tel nombre, comme de cent cinquante ou environ, faisant une despense en meubles et vestemens de princesses; n'ayant autre fonds à se maintenir que de cette traficque; et plusieurs de la noblesse de là mesme, avoir des courtisanes à leurs despens, au veu et sceu d'un chacun.(*JV*, 69)
>
> On Monday, November 7th, at supper, Signora Veronica Franca, a Venetian gentlewoman, sent a man to present him with a little book of letter that she had composed; he had the said man given two crowns. […] He did not find here that famous beauty that they attribute to the ladies of Venice, and yet he saw the noblest of those who make a traffic of it; but it seemed to him as wonderful as anything else to see such a number of them as a hundred and fifty or thereabouts spending like princesses on furniture and cloths, having no other funds to live on except from this traffic; and many of the nobles of the place even keeping courtesans at their expense in the sight and knowledge of all. (56)

François Rigolot underlines the purely literary relationship that the two authors enjoy.[265] He is focusing on the similarity of writing style that Motaigne and Franco adopt in their books: the informal "essay" for the French gentilhomme, and the epistolary form for the Venetian "gentifemme". Montaigne even confesses in chapter I.40 ("Consideration sur Ciceron") that he would have rather written letters instead of essays, if he had a writing partner. "J'eusse prins plus volontiers ceste forrme [epistolaire] a publier mes verves si j'eusse eu a qui parler." (V-S, 252c) "[c] And I would have preferred to adopt this form

[265] "Montaigne and Veronica Franco" in *The Renaissance World*, ed. John Jeffries Martin, New York, London: Routledge, 2007 p. 231- 233

[epistolary] to publish my sallies, if I had someone to talk to." (225) Rigolot further defends Montaigne's avowed writing preference:

> Montaigne is fond of epistolary style because it is unpretentious, devoid of rethorical ornaments, and represents the writer's self in unmitigated ways. This is precisely what he will find in Franco's *Lettere*: and artless art, as close as possible to natural conversation, which spring spontaneously from an alert and animated mind.[266]

Franco's "frank" writing contrasts thus with the courtesan's lifestyle observed by Montaigne in the *Journal* passage cited above. Her "unpretentious", "artless art" contradicts the noble pretenses of the courtesan's everyday life that she embodies. This dichotomy of Veronica Franco's image is why Montaigne can appreciate her as a "femme de lettres", while remaining unmoved by the Venetian courtesans'charms she so famously represents.

Venice however, was not the only Italian town in which Motaigne commented on its courtesans. During his stay in Florence, he also recounts his impressions of the "dames qui se laissent voir à qui veut":

> Quel giorno andai solo, per mio diporto, a veder le donne che si lasciano veder a chi vuole. Viddi le più famose: niente di raro. Gli alloggiamenti raunati in un particolare della città, e per questo spregievoli, oltra ciò cattivi e che non si fanno in nissun modo a quelli delle puttane Romane o Veneziane: ne anco esse in bellezza, o grazia, o gravità. Se alcuna vuole starsi fuora di questi limiti, bisogna che sia di poco conto, e faccia qualche mestiere per celarsi. (*JV*, 186)
>
> On this day I went alone for fun to see the women who let themselves be seen by anyone who wants. I saw the most famous: nothing exceptional. The lodgings are gathered in one particular part of town, and are therefore contemptible, and wretched besides, and they do not approach in any way those of the Roman or Venetian prostitutes; nor do they themselves in beauty or grace or dignity. If one of them wants to live outside these limits, she must

[266] "Montaigne and Veronica Franco", p. 231

> be of little account and must perform some other trade for concealment. (143)

Montaigne seems very interested in the different displays of beauty and femininity throughout his trip, and his secretary makes several notes regarding the presence or absence of beautiful women in different cities or at different events: in Baden (Argovia), "sont communement belles femmes, grandes et blanches"(p. 23), "They are generally handsome women tall and fair" (20); in Ausbourg, "nous ne vismes nulle belle femme;" (40) "We did not see one beautiful woman" (34), and only a couple of pages later at a wedding in the same town, "Nous n'y vismes nulle belle femme" (42), "we saw not one beautiful woman there" (36); in Verona " Nous vismes aussi d'autres eglises, ou il n'y avoit rien de singulier, ny, entre autres choses, en ornement et beauté des femmes" (64), "We also ssaw some other churches, in which there was nothing singular – nothing in the adornment or beauty of the women amng other things" (53); in Florence "M. de Montaigne disoit jusques lors n'avoir jamais veu nation où il y eust si peu de belles femmes que l'Italiene." (81) "Monsieur de Montaigne said that he had never until then seen a nation where there were so few beautiful women" (65). This last statement is actually contradicted in 1588 when Montaigne writes in III.5 that Italy has more beautiful women in general than France:

> Ceux qui cognoissent l'Italie ne trouveront jamais estrange si, pour ce subject [les rapports amoureaux entre les femmes et les hommes], je ne cerche ailleurs des exemples; car cette nation se peut dire regente du reste du monde en cela. Ils ont plus communement des belles femmes et moins de laydes que nous; mais des rares et excellentes beautez, j'estime que nous allons à pair. (V-S, 883b)
>
> Those who know Italy will never find it strange if for this subject [the relationships between men and women] I do not seek examples

> elsewhere; for that nation may be called the teacher of the world in this. They have generally more beautifull women and fewer ugly ones than we; but in rare and outstanding beauties I think we are on a par. (817)

Another reference to his trip to Rome that appears in the 1582 edition of the *Essays* is the short passage narrating the execution of Catena, which he inserted in essay II.11 ("De la cruaute").[267] In the *Journal*, the secretary narrates in detail the event of this execution as well as Montaigne's reaction and his comments regarding the ways of putting to death prisonners without torturing them first.

> L'onzieme de Janvier, au matin, comme M. de Montaigne rencontra qu'on sortoit de prison Catena, un fameux voleur, et Capitaine des bandits, qui avoit tenu en crainte toute l'Italie, et duquel il se comptoit des meurtres enormes, et notammant de deux capucins ausquels il avoit fait renier Dieu, prometant sur cete condition leur sauver la vie, et les avoit massacrés après cela, sans aucune occasion ny de commodité ny de vengeance. Il s'arresta pour voir ce spectacle. Outre la forme de France, ils font marcher devant le criminel un grand crucifix couvert d'un rideau noir, et à pied un grand nombre d'hommes vestus et masqués de toile qu'on dict estre des gentils-hommes et autres apparens de Rome, qui se vouent à ce service d'accompaigner les criminels qu'on mene au supplice et les corps des trespassés, et en font une confrerie. […] Il [Catena] fit une mort commune, sans mouvement et sans parole ; estoit homme noir, de trente ans ou environ. Après qu'il fut estranglé, on le detrancha en quatre quartiers. Ils ne font guiere mourir les hommes que d'une mort simple, et exercent leur rudesse après la mort. M. de Montaigne y remerqua ce qu'il a dit ailleurs, combien le peuple s'effraye des rigueurs qui s'exercent sur les corps morts ; car le peuple, qui n'avoit pas senti de le voir estrangler, à chaque coup qu'on donnoit pour le hacher, s'escrioit d'une voix piteuse. (*JV*, 97-98)

> On January 11th, in the morning, as Monsieur de Montaigne was leaving the house on horseback to go to the bankers', it happened that they were taking out of prison Catena, a famous robber and bandit captain who had kept all Italy in fear and to whom some monstruous murders were ascribed, especially those of two capuchins who he had made to deny God, promising on that condition to save their lives and than massacred without any reason

[267] See *supra* p. 77, on Montaigne's response to the censors regarding his views on the use of cruelty.

> either of advantage or of vengeance. Monsieur de Montaigne stopped to see the spectacle. Besides the formalitie used in France, they carry in front of the criminal a big crucifix covered with a black curtain, and on foot go a lrge nuber of men dressed and maked in linen, who, they say, are gentlemen and other proeminent people of Rome who devote themselves to this service of accomagning criminals led to execution and the bodies of the dead; and there is a brotherhood of them. […] He [Catena] made an ordinary death, without movement or word; he was a dark man of thirty or thereabouts. After he was strangled, they cut him into four quarters. The hardly ever kill men except by a simple death, and exercise their severity after death. Monsieur de Montaigne here remarked what he had said elsewhere, how much the people are frightened by the rigors exercised on their bodies; for these people, who had appear to feel nothing at seeing him strangled, at every bow that was given to cut him up cried out in a piteous voice. (77-8)

This episode resurfaces in the 1582 edition of chapter II.11 as a positive example for the way executions should be handled. The visual representation of the event is reproduced in conformity with the Journal entry, although the details of the procession are omitted as they serve no purpose in his argument.

> Je me rencontray un jour à Rome sur le point qu'on défaisoit Catena, un voleur insigne. On l'estrangla sans aucune émotion de l'assistance; mais, quand on vint à le mettre à quartiers, le bourreau ne donnoit coup, que le peuple ne suivit d'une vois pleintive et d'une exclamation, comme si chacun eut presté son sentiment à cette charongne. (V-S, 432)
>
> I happened to be in Rome one day at the moment when they were doing away with Catena, a notorious robber. They strangled him without any emotion among the crowd; but when they came to quarter him, the executioner struck no blow that the people did not follow with a plaintiff cry and exclamation as if everyone has lent his own sense of feeling to that carcass. (382)

The second 1582 insertion in this essay (II.11), which could be traced back to Montaigne's experience during his trip, is a Turkish reference regarding the various cultural practices involving the relationship between men and beasts around the world: "Les Turcs ont des aumosnes et des hospitaux pour les bestes." (V-S, 435) "The Turks

have alms and hospitals for animals." (685) There are several mentions regarding the Turkish customs in the *Journal*, such as the reference to their barbaric invasions in the towns of Loretto (138) and Ostia (116), or the cultural diversity witnessed in Ancona, which is highly populated by Greeks, Turks and Slavics: "Elle est fort peuplée et notamment de Grecs, Turcs, & Esclavons," (*JV*, 143) "It is thickly populated, especially with Greeks, Turks and Sclavonians" (110); but the source for Montaigne's 1582 statement probably comes from his stay at the baths of La Villa, where he met a man from Genoa who told him how he was taken prisoner by the Turks and how he became a Muslim, living and getting married among them, only to be recaptured by Christians and made prisoner again. His story was so fascination that he regained his freedom:

> Un habitant du lieu, soldat qui vit encore, nomé Giuseppe, et comande à l'une des galeres des Genevois en forçat, de qui je vis plusieurs parens proches, estant à la guerre sur mer, fut pris par les Turcs. Pour se mettre en liberté, il se fit Turc, (et de cette condition il y en a plusieurs, et notammant des montaignes voisines de ce lieu, encore vivans), fut circoncis, se maria là. Estant venu piller cette coste, il s'esloingna tant de sa retraite que le voilà, avec quelques autres Turcs, attrapé par le peuple qui s'estoit soublevé. Il s'avise soudain de dire qu'il s'estoit venu rendre à escient, qu'il estoit Chrestien, fut mis en liberté quelques jours après, vint en ce lieu, et en la maison qui est vis à vis de cele où je loge. (JV, 160)
>
> An inhabitant of this place, a soldier named Giuseppe, who is still alive and commands [the oarsmen on] one of the galleys of the Genoese as a convict, and several of whose near realtions I saw, was captured by the Turks in a battle at sea. To regain his liberty, he became a Turk (and there are many of this condition, and especially in the mountins near this place still alive), was circumcised and married in their territory. Coming to pillage this coast, he went so far from his base that there he was, with a few other Turks, caught by the people who had risen up. He had a presence of mind to say that he had come to surrender deliberately, that he was a Christian. He was set at liberty a few days later, came to this place, and to the house opposite the one I am lodging in. (123)

Among the notable persons Montaigne met during his trip, and which reappeared

in the text of the *Essays* in 1582, are the humanist Marc-Antoine Muret (1526-1585) and the Italian poet Torquato Tasso (1544-1595).[268] Montaigne's meeting with the former is recorded in the *Journal* by the author himself: "Disnant un jour à Rome avecq nostre Ambassadeur, où estoit Muret & autres sçavans, je me mis sur le propos de la traduction Françoise de Plutarche." (*JV*, 113-4) "Dining one day in Rome with our ambassador, with Muret and other learned men present, I got on the subject of the French translation of Plutarch." (87) In the case of Tasso, the *Journal* makes no note of Montaigne's meeting with the famous poet who was at the time of his trip in the Sant'Anna asylum in Ferrara. This omission from the *Journal*, however, might be the mistake of the secretary, who does mentions a variety of places visited by Montaigne during his stay in Ferrara, his meeting with the Duke Alphonse II of Este, and even a monument of Ariosto.

> Nous fusmes tout ce jour-là à Ferrare, et y vismes plusieurs belles eglises, jardins et maisons privées, et tout ce qu'on nous dit estre remerquable : entre autres, aux Jesuates, un pied de rosier qui porte fleur tous les mois de l'an; et lors mesmes s'y en treuva une qui fut donnée à M. de Montaigne. Nous vismes aussi le Bucentaure que le Duc avoit fait faire pour sa nouvelle femme, qui est belle et trop jeune pour lui, à l'envy de celui de Venise, pour la conduire sur la riviere du Po. Nous vismes aussi l'arsenal du Duc, où il y a une piece longue de trente cinq pans, qui porte un pied de diametere. (*JV*, 76)

> We were all that at Ferrara and there are so many beautiful churches, gardens, private houses, and everything that they told was remarkable: among other things, at the Jesuates, a rose tree that bears flowers every month of the year; and even then there was one, which was given to Monsieur de Montaigne. We also saw the Bucentaur, which the duke, to emulate the one at Venice, had had made for his new wife who is beautiful and too young for him, to take her around on the river Po. We also saw the duke's arsenal, in which there is a piece of ordnance thirty-five spans long which carries a shot one foot in diameter. (61)

[268] I have already discussed both entries on Muret and Tasso *supra* pp. 137 and 216-220 respectively.

In the 1582 edition of the *Essais* the figure of Tasso emerges as the symbolic representation for the unfortunate circumstance when the extreme exercise of reason pushes the human mind beyond its limits and becomes insanity. The power of this passage stems from the authority of Montaigne's insight as a direct witness of the state of this unfortunate poet.

> N'a il pas dequoy sçavoir gré à cette sienne vivacité meurtrière? à cette clarté qui l'a aveuglé? à cette exacte et tendue apprehension de la raison qui l'a mis sans raison? à la curieuse et laborieuse queste des sciences qui l'a conduit à la bestise? à cette rare aptitude aux exercices de l'ame, qui l'a rendu sans exercice et sans ame? J'eus plus de despit encore que de compassion, de le voir à Ferrare en si piteux estat, survivant à soy-mesmes, mesconnoissant et soy et ses ouvrages, lesquels, sans son sçeu, et toutesfois à sa veue, on a mis en lumiere incorrigez et informes. Voulez vous un homme sain, le voulez vous reglé et en ferme et seure posteure? affublez le de tenebres, d'oisiveté et de pesanteur. (V-S, 492)
>
> Does he not have reason to be grateful to that murderous vivacity of his mind? To that brilliance that has blinded him? To that exact and intent apprehension of his reason, which has deprived him of reason? To the careful and laborious pursuit of the sciences, which has led him to stupidity? To that rare aptitude of the exercises of the mind, which has left him without exercise and without mind? I felt even more vexation than compassion to see him in Ferrara in so piteous a state, surviving himself, not recognizing himself or his works, which, without his knowledge and yet before his eyes have been brought out uncorrected and shapeless. Do you want a man to be healthy, do you want him disciplined and firmly and securely poised? Wrap him in darkness, idleness and dullness. (440)

Montaigne's argument in this section of the essay in which he introduces the passage on Tasso and his unfortunate state, is an indictment of the value of human reason, which is not a powerful enough tool to comprehend divine will. A direct result of the weakness of the human mind is this pitiful state in which Tasso lingers, due to his hubris to exceed the limits of his condition.

The longest addition made in the 1582 edition is an elaborate description of Montaigne's experience at the water spas along his trip though Europe, starting with the French Baths of Plombières in Vosges, the Baden baths in Switzerland, wat Those of La Villa near Lucca in Italy (which he prefered above all), and the sulfurous waters around Viterbo also in Italy. Montaigne's *Journal* keeps a detailed account of the author's various treatments and the results obtained in every location. The detailed descriptions of the cures and exactitude of water measurements and daily routines offered by the author while visiting these spas is so prevalent in text of the journal that at times the entries resemble medical records. Ironically however, Montaigne uses this meticulous analysis of his own state of health to attack the medical field. It is difficult to understand why a patient who is so preoccupied with a systematic approach so similar to the medical scientific method (Montaigne always keeps track of his cures and their results), feels so strongly against it. Perhaps the reason is to be found once again in Montaigne's avowed philosophy of introspection of himself. His method is valid because it is an individualistic approach, self-applied just as the writing of the *Essays*. The medical method, on the contrary, is focused on the study of others, the patients, and its approach is generalizing instead of individualizing. Montaigne is his own subject as he famously puts it in his "Avis au lecteur": "je suis moy-mesmes la matiere de mon livre", "I am myself the matter of my book." (2) This quasi-scientific method of self-study is reflected in the detailed records of Montaigne's daily progress while following treatments at the baths. In appendix D you can find an abbreviated sample of such records taken from his first stay at the baiths of La Villa.

Although so devoted to registering his treatments on paper, Montaigne always had

time to mention between his cures his resentment toward doctors and their science:

> Era cosa piacevole di veder le diverse ordinazioni dei medici di diverse parti d'Italia, tanto contrari e particolarmente sul fatto di queste bagni e doccie: che, di venti consulte, non ci erano due d'accordo, anzi accusavano e dannavano l'una l'altra quasi tutte d'omicidio. (*JV*, 174)
>
> It was an amusing thing to see the various prescriptions of the doctors from various parts of Italy, so contradictory, and particularly on the matter of these baths and showers, that out of twenty consulted there were not two in agreement; on the contrary, they almost all condemned one another and accused one another of homicide. (132)

Upon his return to France, while revising his next edition of the *Essays*, he made a point to incorporate some of these thermal experiences of his trip. Having probably in mind the final comment of the second censor that reproached him for his overall disrespectful and dismissive view on medicine, Montaigne engaged in a long and descriptive discourse of the uses and usefulness of water therapy. These pages provide indisputable proof for the readers (and perhaps the censors) that the author knew this subject very well, and that his allegations against medicine were based on repeated personal experience. All these textual additions are inserted in the final essay of the1580 version of II. 37, ("De la resemblance des enfans aux peres"):

> [1582]Il y a infinies autres differences de coustumes en chasque contrée; ou, pour mieux dire, il n'y a quasi aucune ressemblance des unes aux autres. Voilà comment cette partie de medecine à laquelle seule je me suis laissé aller, quoy qu'elle soit la moins artificielle, si a elle sa bonne part de la confusion et incertitude qui se voit par tout ailleurs en cet art. (V-S, 777)
>
> [1582]There are infinite other differences of customs between countries, or, to put it better, there is almost no ressemblance between one country's customs and another's. Thus you see how this part of medicine to which alone I have abandoned myself, although it is the least artificial, still has its good share of the

> confusion and uncertainty that is seen everywhere else in this part. (716-7)

However, Montaigne makes sure to mention the reassuring aspect of water spa treatments, and recognizes the positive side of these cures, which necessitates pleasurable company and the picturesque aspect of their locations. The effectiveness of the treatment is in direct connection with a state of mind free of worries and other negative distractions, allowing the body to relax in harmony with the soul:

> [1582] Qui n'y apporte assez d'allegresse pour pouvoir jouir le plaisir des compagnies qui s'y trouvent, et des promenades et exercices à quoy nous convie la beauté des lieux où sont communément assises ces eaux, il perd sans doubte la meilleure piece et plus asseurée de leur effect. (V-S, 777)
>
> [1582] Anyone who does not bring to them enough cheerfulness to be able to enjoy the pleasure of the company that is found there, and the walks and exercises to which the beauty of the places where these baths are usually located invites us, will doubtless lose the best and surest part of their effect. (716)

2. Textual Additions Reinforcing Montaigne's Faith in the Catholic Church

So far in this chapter we have looked at the paragraphs inserted in the 1582 edition of the *Essays* which speak directly of Montaigne's traveling experience, reconnecting them with several passages in his *Journal* that mark the point of their occurrence within the order of this private text. We will now take a look at some of the remaining passages added in this second edition of the text, passages that are not directly connected to an actual experience during the trip, but rather reinforce Montaigne's position before the Catholic Church, as an institution which exercised its censorial power on the text during the author's visit to Rome. These passages, mainly in the form of short paragraphs are scattered throughout the *Essays* without any direct connection to the

passages marked by the censors, but their content suggests Montaigne's intentions to reformulate and better articulate some of the more ambiguous aspects of his discourse.

Among new paragraphs added in 1582 and aimed at better communicate Montaigne's position on religious matters, we find that a great number were added in chapter II.12 "Apologie de Raimond Sebond". The accumulation of textual additions from 1582 in this chapter is hardly surprising. As I mentioned in the previous chapter, this essay is not only the longest, but also one of the most discussed and puzzeling chapter of the *Essays*.[269] As the title indicates it, this chapter is conceived as a defense of the Spanish theologian's *Theologia Naturalis*, a work which Montaigne had translated into French at the request of his father in 1569. Sebond basically stated in this text that men are able to discover and understand Christian revelations through nature, not only through the Bible, an approch that the Catholic Church found questionable. At the time when Montaigne visited Rome Sebond was already on the *Index*. This was due to the preface of his book. However, as the second censor mentioned in Objection 12, the rest of his book was not officially condemned, and in 1581 a second edition of Montaigne's translation was published, thus making this particular chapter II.12 of the *Essays*, a dangerous point of reference. The section of this essay that contains all of the 1582 references is the part of Montaigne's argument that destroys any shade of reliability we might grant to our human reason. He opens this series of textual additions with the paragraph mentioned above regarding Tasso's case thus establishing the incapacity of the

[269] See *supra* p. 220. For more on Montaigne's "Apologie" see Blum, Claude, *Montaigne. Apologie de Raimond Sebond. De la Theologia à la Théologie* éd. Paris, Honoré Champion, 1990; Jean Céard "Montaigne, traducteur de Raymond Sebond: Positions et propositions", *Montaigne Studies* : 1993 Dec pp. 11-26, ; Michel Bideaux "De Sebond à Montaigne: D'une apologie l'autre", *Nouvelle Revue du XVIe Siecle*12. 2 (1994): 165-187; Mary McKinley "L'Accomplissement de l''Apologie de Raimond Sebond': Esthétique et théologie" *Bulletin de la Societe des Amis de Montaigne*13-16 (1988 July-Dec-1989 Jan-June): 55-65.

human mind to operate beyond certain restrained limits. Following the passage regarding the Italian poet and his misfortune cited above[270], we find a series of five distinct paragraphs that reinforce Montaigne's view on the vanity of our human knowledge.

The first passage in this series elaborates on the power and nature of our judgment:

> [1582] On le [notre esprit] bride et garrote de religions, de loix, de coustumes, de science, de preceptes, de peines et recompenses mortelles et immortelles; encores voit-on que, par sa volubilité et dissolution, il eschappe à toutes ces liaisons. C'est un corps vain, qui n'a par où estre saisi et assené; un corps divers et difforme, auquel on ne peut asseoir neud ny prise. (V-S, 559)
>
> [1582] They bridle and bind it with religions, laws, customes, science, precepts, mortal and immortal punishments and rewards; and still we see that by its whirling and its incohesiveness it escaepes all these bonds. It is an empty body with noting by which it can be seized an directed; a varying and formless body, which can be neither tied nor grasped. (509)

Montaigne provides a visual description of the human mind that has the dangerous ability of running wild and losing its path (i.e. insanity), unless it is conscientiously controlled and directed by the rules imposed by social institutions. This passage is a contextual continuation of another paragraph inserted in 1582 which contains what Montaigne refers to as a Tuscan proverb "Chi troppo s'assotiglia si scavezza", but which in reality is a line from Petrarch's *Cazoniere* .

> Tenez vous dans la route commune, il ne faict mie bon estre si subtil et si fin. Souvienne vous de ce que dit le proverbe Thoscan: *Chi troppo s'assottiglia si scavezza*.[271] (V-S, 558)

[270] See Montaigne's alleged meeting with Tasso, *supra* pp. 216-220.
[271] See commentary on this line *supra* pp. 200-204.

This Italian line sets the framework for the paragraph in question by restating Montaigne's position, which posits that men should follow the common path between extremes, and to control any urge to go beyond these limits.[272]

The second passage added in this section in 1582 is a personal account of the author documenting to the great degrees of variation and inconstancy produced by the human mind in response to neutral external factors. It corroborates the preceding argument that human reason cannot achieve any reliable result on its own, serving exclusively as a vain representation of its capriciousness.

> [1582] Il se faict mille agitations indiscretes et casuelles chez moy. Ou l'humeur melancholique me tient, ou la cholerique; et de son authorité privée, à cet'heure le chagrin predomine en moy, à cet'heure l'alegresse. (V-S, 566)
>
> [1582] A thousand unconsidered and accidental impulses arise in me. Either the melancholic humor grips me, or the choleric; and at this moment sadness predominates in me by its own private authority, at that moment, good cheer. (517)

In the 1588 edition Montaigne elaborated on this position outlined in 1582 on the constant state of inconstancy experienced in making his own book. The the act of writing offers him a singular context in which he can literally follow or lose his trains of his thoughts:

> [B] En mes escris mesmes je ne retrouve pas tousjours l'air de ma premiere imagination: je ne sçay ce que j'ay voulu dire, et m'eschaude souvent à corriger et y mettre un nouveau sens, pour avoir perdu le premier, qui valloit mieux. Je ne fay qu'aller et venir: mon jugement ne tire pas tousjours en avant; il flotte, il vague. (V-S, 566)
>
> Even in my own writings I do not always find again the sense of my first thought; I do not know what I meant to say, and often I get burned by correcting and putting a new meaning, because I have lost the first one which was better. (517)

[272] See *supra* p. 93 regarding Montaigne's approach to Aristotle's "golden mean" theory.

This additional development becomes the metatext of the process of writing within the suggested limited space between two extremes. Montaigne's judgment does not attempt at spectacular advancements as in the case of Tasso, whose extraordinary abilities pushed him over the edge it deliberately wanders and drifts aimlessly within its own human boundaries. This later addition proves that Montaigne's writing is an external instrument of his own judgment, and that all the addendums to the original 1580 body of the *Essays* mark different personal junctures occasioned by external, often unpredictible elements.

A few pages later, Montaigne concludes his argument regarding the inconstancy of human judgment with another short passage added in 1582, which directly credits the unreliability of his judgment for his unquestioned loyalty to the Catholic Church.

> [1580] Or de la cognoissance de cette mienne volubilité j'ay par accident engendré en moy quelque constance d'opinions, et n'ay guiere alteré les miennes premieres et naturelles. Car, quelque apparence qu'il y ayt en la nouvelleté, je ne change pas aisément, de peur que j'ay de perdre au change. Et, puis que je ne suis pas capable de choisir, je pren le chois d'autruy et me tien en l'assiette où Dieu m'a mis. Autrement, je ne me sçauroy garder de rouler sans cesse. [1582] Ainsi me suis-je, par la grace de Dieu, conservé entier, sans agitation et trouble de conscience, aux anciennes creances de nostre religion, au travers de tant de sectes et de divisions que nostre siecle a produittes. (V-S, 569)
>
> Now from the knowledge of his mobility of mine I have accidentally engendered in myself a certain constancy of opinions, and have scarcely altered my original and natural ones. For whatever appearance of truth there may be in novelty, I do not change easily, for fear of losing in the change. And since I am not capable of choosing, I accept other people's choice and stay in the position where God put me. Otherwise I could not keep myself from rolling incessantly. [1582] Thus I have, by the grace of God, kept myself intact, without agitation or disturbance of conscience, in the ancient beliefs of our religion, in the midst of so many sects and divisions that our century has produced. (521)

Paradoxically, the 1582 addition is meant to explain why, unlike many of his friends (and even his wn brother) he has not embraced the new "protestant" ideas floating around him. His mental wonderings are bringing him closer to the great Catholic tradition ("anciennes creances"), rather than distancing him from the strict dogmas of the church. This self-controlled freedom of the mind allows him to remain unyielding in his faith within the precarious religious context of his times.

The next 1582 addition in this essay is a short phrase in the form of a piece of advice. "[1582] Il ne faut pas croire à chacun, dict le precepte, par ce que chacun peut dire toutes choses." (V-S, 571) "We must not believe every man says the maxim, because any man may say anything" (522) Just as one's own judgment is not a trustworthy tool, noboby else's judgment should be trusted. This concluding statement based on the ineffectiveness of one's judgment becomes another piece of supporting evidence in the author's argument against human knowledge. In the later edition of 1588 and on the Bordeaux copy, Montaigne continues discrediting human understanding by listing a variety of explanations given by humans in different times or places, and noting the continuous change of what was understood as undeniable facts. This argument concludes with another paragraph added 1582 that makes the transition from the inconsistency of human mind to the infinite merit of Christianity:

> [1582] Si nature enserre dans les termes de son progrez ordinaire, comme toutes autres choses, aussi les creances, les jugemens et opinions des hommes; si elles ont leur revolution, leur saison, leur naissance, leur mort, comme les chous; si le ciel les agite et les roule à sa poste, quelle magistrale authorité et permanante leur allons nous attribuant? (V-S, 575)

> [1582] If nature enfolds within the bounds of her ordinary progress, like all other things, also the beliefs, judgments, and opinions of men; if they have their rotation, their season, their birth, their detah, like cabbages; if heaven moves and rolls at its will , what magisterial and permanent authority are we attributing t them? (526)

This is the last paragraph inserted in 1582 within this section of chapter II.12, in which Montaigne praises the conservative values offered by the Roman Catholic tradition . All the passages added in 1582 reinforce the author's original position clarifying any ambiguity entailed by his "defense" of Sebond's "natural theory".

The next two additions that we will discuss, appended in the 1582 edition, regard the situation of women and their portrayal in the *Essays*. Montaigne was reproached by the censors for his loose moral attitude regarding the physical pleasures experienced by women.[273] The first passage is part of a longer addition to essay II.15 ("Que nostre desir s'accroit par la malaissance"), which we discussed partially above, regarding Montaigne's interest in women especially during his trip to Italy. The first addition can be understood as a clarification of a comment made by Montaigne in II. 3 ("Coustume de l'isle de Cea") and criticized by the second censor as a risky approach due to the author's irony:

> …aussi, Dieu mercy, nostre air s'en voit infiniment purgé depuis ce bon advertissement: suffit qu'elles dient nenny en le faisant, suyvant la reigle du bon Marot. (V-S, 357a)
>
> and so thank God, our atmosphere has been throughly purged of them by that man's good advice. Enough for them to say No while doing it, following the rule of our good Marot. (312)

In 1582 Montaigne rearticulates his opinions, this time stating clearly what he had only implied in 1580 about virginal modesty. The physical expression of the human desire to

[273] See *supra*, pp. 101-105.

conquer or obtain something that is forbidden or hrad to get becomes the key example for an argument already set in place in 1580 and clearly stated in the title of the chapter ("Que nostre desir s'accroit par la malaissance"):

> [1580] Car il se sent evidemment, comme le feu se picque à l'assistance du froid, que nostre volonté s'esguise aussi par le contraste. […][1582] A quoy sert l'art de cette honte virginalle? cette froideur rassise, cette contenance severe, cette profession d'ignorance des choses qu'elles sçavent mieux que nous qui les en instruisons, qu'à nous accroistre le desir de vaincre, gourmander et fouler à nostre appetite toute cette ceremonie et ces obstacles? (V-S, 612-614)

> [1580] For we obviously sense that, just as the fire is stirred up by the presence of cold, so our will is whetted by opposition. […] [1582] What is the use of that art of virginal shame, that sedate coldness, that severe counetenace, that profession of ignorance of things that they know better than we who instruct them in them, but to increase in us the desire to conquer, to overwhelm and subdue to our appetite all this ceremony and these obstacles? (563-565)

In the same 1582 edition, following the example of faint virginal modesty employed by women, Montaigne developed the main idea of the chapter even further in an attempt to jusify the brutal reality of the Religious wars. The present troubles of the Catholic Church are thus revealed as part of the greater Providential plan to renew and strengthen the faith of it true followers.

> [1582] C'est un effect de la Providence divine de permettre sa saincte Eglise estre agitée, comme nous la voyons, de tant de troubles et d'orages, pour esveiller par ce contraste les ames pies, et les r'avoir de l'oisiveté et du sommeil où les avoit plongez une si longue tranquillité. Si nous contrepoisons la perte que nous avons faicte par le nombre de ceux qui se sont desvoyez, au gain qui nous vient pour nous estre remis en haleine, resuscité nostre zele et nos forces à l'occasion de ce combat, je ne sçay si l'utilité ne surmonte point le dommage. (V-S, 615)

> It is an act of divine Providence to allow its holy Church to be agitated, as we see it is, by so mant troubles and storms, in order to

> awaken pious souls by this opposition and bring them back from the idleness and sleepiness into which such long tranquility had plunged them. If we wigh our loss against our gain, the numbers of tose who have gone astray againstth erenewed vigor, zeal and strength that have come to us in this struggle, I do not know that the benefit does not outweigh the harm (566)

The next passage inserted in 1582 discussing the role and social implications of feminine modesty appears in the next essay II.16 ("De la gloire"). The close vicinity of two paragraphs developing the same theme, suggests that Montaigne revised his book in the consecutive order of the chapters. In the context established in 1580, the author states that there is a clear separation between what is honorable and what a woman really wants.

> [1580] je ne conseille non plus aux Dames d'appeller honneur leur devoir [[c]…] car je presuppose que leurs intentions, leur desir et leur volonté, qui sont pieces où l'honneur n'a que voir, d'autant qu'il n'en paroit rien au dehors, soyent encore plus reglées que les effects. (V-S, 631)

> [1580] neither do I advise the ladies to call their duty honor. [[c]…] For I assume that their intentions, their desire and their will, which are parts in which honor is not concerned, since nothing of them appears on the outside, are even better regulated than their acts. (580)

In 1582, Montaigne inserts a very brief sentence right in the middle of this phrase, after the words "leur devoir": "[1582] Ny ne leur conseille de nous donner cette excuse en payement de leur refus." "Nor do I advise them to give us this excuse for payment of their refusal." By adding this statement, Montaigne brings back into focus the pretended act of refusal (through language) that references Marot's huitain *D'Ouy et Nenny,* which was criticized by the Roman censors[274]. This instance is another attempt of Montaigne to clarify the use of irony reproached by the censors, inserting his comments in a better

[274] "Ung doulx Nenny, avec ung doulx soubzrire / Est tant honneste, il le vous fault apprendre: / Quant est d'Ouy, si veniez à le dire, / D'avoir trop dict je vouldroys vous reprendre: / Non que je soys ennuyé d'entreprendre / D'avoir le fruict, dont le desir me poingt: / Mais je vouldroys, qu'en me le laissant prendre, / Vous me disiez, non, vous ne l'aurez point." *Oeuvres Complètes* ed. François Rigolot, Garnier-Flammarion, Paris, 2007, vol I, p. 449. See *supra* p. 105-106

context without any religious examples that might send the wrong message to the Catholic reader.

The last series of 1582 additions appear in essay II.17, ("De la praesumption"). A collection of short sentences which do not give much weight to the overall argument, and one long paragraph which resonates with other 1582 additions he inserted in chapter I.21 ("De la force de l'imagination") a chapter which was the target of objection 22 on the censors' list, in which they criticized Montaigne's discourse on miracles. Consequently, following his return to France, Montaigne enriched that chapter (I.21) with a series of personal experiences and folk tales that supported his opinion that miracles are a product of human imagination. The main addition to II.17 continues in the same way Montaigne's discourse on the role and power of that key mental faculty:

> [1582] Cecy que je sens en la memoire, je le sens en plusieurs autres parties. Je fuis le commandement, l'obligation et la contrainte. Ce que je fais ayséement et naturellement, si je m'ordonne de le faire par une expresse et prescrite ordonnance, je ne le sçay plus faire. Au corps mesme, les membres qui ont quelque liberté et jurisdiction plus particuliere sur eux, me refusent par fois leur obeyssance, quand je les destine et attache à certain point et heure de service necessaire. Cette preordonnance contrainte et tyrannique les rebute; ils se croupissent d'effroy ou de despit, et se transissent. [[B]…] Cet effaict est plus apparent en ceux qui ont l'imagination plus vehemente et puissante; mais il est pourtant naturel, et n'est aucun qui ne s'en ressante aucunement. On offroit à un excellant archer condamné à la mort de luy sauver la vie, s'il vouloit faire voir quelque notable preuve de son art: il refusa de s'en essayer, craignant que la trop grande contention de sa volonté luy fit fourvoier la main, et qu'au lieu de sauver sa vie, il perdit encore la reputation qu'il avoit acquise au tirer de l'arc. Un homme qui pense ailleurs, ne faudra point, à un pousse pres, de refaire tousjours un mesme nombre et mesure de pas au lieu où il se promene; mais, s'il y est avec attention de les mesurer et conter, il trouvera que, ce qu'il faisoit par nature et par hazard, il ne le faira pas si exactement par dessein. (V-S, 650)

> [1582] This thing that I feel in my memory [memory serves him by chance not by pressure], I feel in several other parts. I flee command, obligation, and constraint. What I do easily and naturally, I can no longer do if I order myself to do it by strict and express command. Even as regards my body, the parts that have some particular freedom and jurisdiction over themselves sometimes refuse to obey me when I destine and bind them to a certain time and place for compulsory service. These forced and tyrannical advance orders repel them. They go limp from fear r spite and become paralyzed. [[b]…]This effect is more apparent in those who have a more ardent and powerful imagination; but for all that it is natural, and there is no one who does not feel it somewhat. An excellent archer condemned to death, was offered his life if he would show some notable proof of his skill. He refused to try it, fearing that the excessive tension of his will would make his hand go astray , and that instead of saving his life, he would lose the reputation he had acquired for shooting with his bow. A man whose thoughts are elsewhere will not fail, to the inch, to take always the same number and length of steps in the place where e walks. But if he goes at it attentively, measuring and counting them, he will find that what he did naturally and by chance, he will not as exactly by design. (599)

This paragraph about the power of the human imagination over one's actions, supported by the example of the excellent archer who was not able to perform under pressure. It reminds the reader of the personal anecdote also added in 1582, in essay I.21, in which Montaigne recommended mental diversion to those who suffered from sexual impotence.[275] As we noted in other instances, Montaigne's 1582 textual additions act as catalytic passages prompting further developments in the successive editions. This is also the case for the 1582 addition made to II.17, and cited above. In 1588, when reviewing this section of the text, Montaigne was inspired to add yet another personal anecdote to this argument, drawn from the trip to Italy. Thus, even years later, he is still reminiscing and incorporating the experience of his journey in the *Essays*. The paragraph was inserted in the preceding 1582, following the sentence "ils se croupissent d'effroy ou de despit, et

[275] See *infra* Appendix B.

se transissent", "they go limp from fear or spite and become paralyzed". It recalls an evening when visiting a place where it was very disrespectful to refuse drinks, Montaigne planned ahead to indulge himself one night in order to please his host and the ladies present, but he could not even have one drop of wine because of the high expectations he had imposed on himself. This paragraph is perhaps bringing up the experience of his trip, while in Germany, as his secretary recorded it at the beginning of the *Journal*.

> Ils [les Allemands] vont eux mesmes conviant les serviteurs à boire et leur font tenir table deux ou trois heures. Leur vin se sert dans des vaisseaux come grandes cruches, et est un crime de voir un gobelet vuide qu'ils ne remplissent soudain, et jamais de l'eau, non pas à ceux mesme qui en demandent, s'ils ne sont bien respectés. (*JV*, 33)
>
> They [the Germans] themselves invite the servants to drink with them and keep them at table for two or three hours. Their wine is served in vessels like big pitchers, and it is a crime to see an empty goblet and not fill it immediately; and never any water not even for those who ask for some, unless they are held in great respect. (28)

Returning to the additions to essay II.17 developed in the 1582 edition, we count 3 short sentences, and a brief apposition. The first one is a comparison regarding Montaigne's own style : "et si mon inclination me porte plus à l'imitation du parler de Seneque, je ne laisse pas d'estimer autant pour le moins, celuy de Plutarque" "And if my inclination leads me more to imitate Seneca's style, I nonetheless esteem Plutarch's more." (V-S, 638a) During his stay in Rome, Montaigne had a great opportunity to discuss the work of the latter in remarkable company, a conversation that might have influenced his preference of Plutarch's style over Seneca's mentioned in 1582: "Disnant un jour à Rome avecq nostre Ambassadeur, où estoit Muret & autres sçavans, je me mis sur le propos de la traduction Françoise de Plutarche." (*JV*, 113-4) "Dining one day in Rome with our ambassador, with Muret and other learned men present, I got on the subject of the French translation of Plutarch." (87) However, even before his trip to Italy,

the two classical authors were mentioned in chapter II.10 ("Des Livres"), as Montaigne's favorite educational readings.

> Quant à mon autre leçon, qui mesle un peu plus de fruit au plaisir, par où j'apprens à renger mes humeurs et mes conditions, les livres qui m'y servent, c'est Plutarque, dépuis qu'il est François, et Seneque. Ils ont tous deux cette notable commodité pour mon humeur, que la science que j'y cherche, y est traictée à pieces décousues, qui ne demandent pas l'obligation d'un long travail, dequoy je suis incapable, comme sont les Opuscules de Plutarque et les Epistres de Seneque, qui est la plus belle partie de ses escrits, et la plus profitable.[276] (V-S, 413a)
>
> As fro my other reading, which mingles a little more profit with the pleasure, and by which I learn to arrange my humors and my ways, the books that serve me for this are Plutarch, since he exists in French and Seneca. They both have this notable advantage for my humor, that the knowledge I seek is there treated in detached pieces that do not demand the obligation of long labor, of which I am incapable. Such are the Moral Essays of Plutarch and the Epistle of Seneca, which are the finest part of his writings, and the most profitable. (364)

Therefore, there is no surpise that during his trip to Rome, when he was granted entry to the Vatican library, the very first items Montaigne records are the manuscripts of Seneca (ca. 4BC- 65CE) and the works of Plutarch (46-120 CE): "Il y a un grand nombre de livres attachés sur plusieurs rangs de pupitres; il y en a aussi dans des coffres qui me furent tous ouverts; force livres escrtis à la main, et notament un Seneque et les *Opuscules* de Plutarche."[277] (*JV*, 1111) "There are a large number f books attached onto several rows of desks; there are also some in coffers, which were all opened to me; lots of books written by hand, and especially a Seneca and the *Moral Essays* of Plutrach." (85)

[276] This 1582 addition is not mentioned in V-S edition.

[277] For more on the items Montaigne saw in the Vatican Library see François Rigolot's article "Curiosity, Contingency and Cultural Diversity: Montaigne's Readings at the Vatican Library" in *Renaissance Quarterly*, 64, 2011, pp. 849-874.

The second addition in chapter II.17 is a paraphrase from Apollonius about the virtue of telling the truth. “Apollonius disoit que c'estoit aux serfs de mantir, et aux libres de dire verité.” (V-S, 647) “Apollonius daid that it was for slaves to lie, and for free men to sapeak the truth.” (596) This is the second reference to Apollonius among the 1582 additions. The first one was inserted in II.12: “[1582] Toutesfois aucuns se sont vantez de les [les animaux] entendre, comme Apollonius Thyaneus, [1588] Melampus, Tyresias, Thales [1582] et autres.” (V-S, 453ab) “However some have boasted of understanding them [animals], like Apollonius of Tyana [1588] Melampus, Tiresias, Thales, [1582] and others.” (402) Apollonius Thyaneus is not a very frequent reference in Montaigne’s *Essays*. We only note one more mention of this author in chapter III.10: “Je ne m'estonne plus de ceux que les singeries d'Apollonius et de Mehumet enbufflarent. Leur sens et entandement est entierement estouffé en leur passion.” (V-S, 1013c) “I am no longer amazed at those who are hoodwinked by the monkey tricks of Apolllonius and Mahomet. Their sense and understanding is smothered in their passion.” (1013) This addition appears on the Bordeaux copy. The only available Latin translation of the Apollonius’s *Epistolae* was an edition published in Bâle in 1554, and we know that Montaigne owned it.[278] He must have bought it during his trip when he stopped in the Swiss city, where the secretary mentions visiting a particularly nice bookstore. “Nous y vismes une très belle librairie publique sur la riviere et en très-belle assiette.” (JV, 16) “Here we saw a very handsome public library on the river and in a very beautiful site.” (15)

The next 1582 addition in essay II.17, is another short remark that pertains to Montaigne’s own faulty memory, expanded on the Bordeaux copy, not surprisingly, with a reference to his traveling experience:

[278] *Essais*, V-S, “Catalogue des livres de Montaigne” p. LIII.

> [1582] Il m'est advenu plus d'une fois d'oublier le mot [Bordeaux copy] du guet [1582] que j'avois [Bordeaux copy] trois heures auparavant [1582] donné ou receu d'un autre, [Bordeaux copy] et d'oublier où j'avoi caché ma bourse, quoy qu'en die Cicero. Je m'aide à perdre ce que je serre particulierement.[279] (V-S, 651ac)
>
> [1582] It has happened more than once that I have forgotten the watch-word that I had given [c] three hours before [1582] or received from another, [c] and forgotten where I had hidden my purse in spite of what Cicero says about that. I help myself to lose what I lock up most carefully. (600)

This is probably an allusion to the loss of his purse, while in Rome in 1581:

> il [Montaigne] perdit sa bourse et ce qui estoit dedans, et estima que ce fust que, en donnant l'aumosne à deux ou trois fois, le temps estant fort pluvieux et mal plaisant, au lieu de remettre sa bourse en sa pochette, il l'eust fourrée dans les découpures de sa chausse. (*JV*, 99)
>
> [Montaigne] lost his purse and what was in it; and he tought what had happened was that in giving alms two or three times, the weather being very rainy and unpleasant, instead of putting his purse back into his pocket he had slipped it through the slashings of his breeches. (78)

Judging by the addition in the *Essays*, it is possible that Montaigne found his purse somewhere at a later time, after the secretary had already entered this episode in the *Journal*.[280]

The final 1582 addition to the essay II.17 is "ou une en tel degré d'excellence" to a phrase that describes the author's best friend, Étienne de la Boétie, whom he cherished and admired like no one else.

---

[279] *Memoria certe non modo philosophiam, sed omnis vitae usum omnesque artes una maxime continet*. (Cicero, *Academica*, II, 7) "It is certain that memory is the only receptacle, not only for philosophy but of all that concerns the conduct of life, and of all the arts." This citation is also added on the Bordeaux copy a few lines before the above-cited paragraph.

[280] Montaigne fired his secretary at a very short time after this event. Following the dates recorded in the *Journal*, the secretary mentions Montaigne losing his purse on January 26th and he is fired about two weeks later between February 9th (last *Journal* entry in the secretary's hand), and February 16th (first entry by Montaigne himself).

> [1580] Je connoy des hommes assez, qui ont diverses parties belles: qui, l'esprit; qui, le coeur; qui, l'adresse; qui, la conscience; qui, le langage; qui, une science; qui un'autre. Mais de grand homme en general, et ayant tant de belles pieces ensemble, [1582] ou une en tel degré d'excellence, [1580] qu'on s'en doive estonner, ou le comparer à ceux que nous honorons du temps passé, ma fortune ne m'en a fait voir nul. (V-S, 659a)
>
> [a] I know enough men who have various fine qualities, one wit another courage, another skill, another conscience, another style, one one science, another another. But as for an all-round great man having all these fine parts together, [1582] or one part in such excellent degree [a] as to cause amazement or comparison with the men of the past whom we honor, I had not the good fortune to find any. (608)

In the 1580 edition this paragraph continues the argument that people are far from perfect, made up of good and bad qualities, and in this passge, Montaigne directs his remark at his contemporaries. The small addition from 1582 intensifies the critique, adding to the overall lack of the greatness, a lack of particular excellence.

CONCLUSION

In this dissertation I have identified and analyzed the major textual changes and additions that appeared in the *Essays* as a direct result of Montaigne's trip to Rome, and particularly as a result of his interaction with the Roman censors. My research focused on the material evidence pertaining to the process of censorship: both in the author's own account registered in his *Journal de voyage* (*Travel Journal*), published posthumously in 1774, and in the original list of objections compiled by the Roman censors, a document made public only in 2000. In the first part I discussed the main narrative passages modified as a result of Montaigne's interaction with the Roman censors: the way the Vatican objections found their place in the fabric of the text, providing references, context and future inspiration for further textual developments that continued to augment and vary in an ever-changing text. After a careful consideration of all the objections triggered by the censorship of the *Essays* in 1581, and of Montaigne's textual reaction to these remarks in the following editions of 1582, 1588 and the Bordeaux copy, we were able to witness the concrete realization of an unexpected, paradoxical, yet fruitful interaction. Although one may instinctually equate the process of censorship, operated in Rome in the name of the Congregation of the Index, with deprivation of textual freedom, in the case of the *Essays*, the voice of the author was encouraged and even invigorated at times by the censorial remarks. Instead of removing the material censured in Rome, Montaigne reworked and developed the amended concepts and paragraphs, turning the objections into material for reflection within the web of his text throughout the following editions. Some modifications were operated immediately in the 1582 edition, like the matters raised in objections 7, 9, 19 and 36, and further developed in the later additions

made for the 1588 edition, and even more so on the Bordeaux copy. Some objections were never textually addressed. This is mostly the case of the passages that were misread or misinterpreted by the censors, such as objections 1, 2, 4, 20, 25 and 30.

The analysis of Montaigne's response to his censors suggests the formation of distinct patterns corresponding to different strategies. As we mentioned in the beginning of this study, the author seems to consider the objections made by the second censor more often and more seriously. In his *Travel Journal* he only remembered six of the more than thirty-five objections made by the Maestro del Sacro Palazzo. Three of them only figured on the second censor's list: the use of the word fortune, his disapproval of cruelty, his praise for Julian the Apostate (although reconsidered on the Bordeaux copy). The other three objections recounted in the *Journal* were mentioned in the first censor's list, and they were vigorously reinforced by the comments made by the second reader (about the liberal education of children, the discourse on prayers and on heretic authors). In addition, there were other objections raised by the second censor, which although not mentioned in the *Journal*, were directly addressed in the text of the *Essays*, such as some remarks from objections 18, 22, 26 and 34.

Throughout this dissertation, we also noted a general reluctance on Montaigne's part to exclude the names of certain authors, professors or dignitaries on the sole basis of their religious preferences. All the occurrences of names of problematic figures in the *editio princeps* (1581) remained in the following editions. Sebond, Machiavelli, Marot, Beza, Buchanan and others did not disappear despite the disapproval of both censors. The merits of these famous people were considered on their own terms, not in connection with debatable theological issues.

The nature of the chronologically dispersed reactions as well as their volume and reappearance in the following editions of the *Essays*, demonstrate their importance in developing the composition of the final text we have today [whether the Bordeaux copy or the 1595 posthumous edition]. To be sure, there is a direct connection between the censors' objections and the form of the text in the 1582 edition; but the imprint of these objections made in 1581 is also palpable in the1588 additions and on the Bordeaux copy of the *Essays*. This continuous presence of the censors' discourse makes us consider the possibility that Montaigne had his own copy of the Vatican document and that he probably consulted it during the editing of the text. The inspiration drawn from the two meetings he had at the Sacro Palazzo (as Montaigne mentions in the *Journal*) had a long-term impact on the elaborate revisions and additions of the *Essays* from 1582 to 1595.

In the second part of this dissertation, I discussed in detail the 1582 edition of the *Essays*. I analyzed the textual changes Montaigne made in this second edition of his book, referencing many aspects of his trip to Rome, such as the books he read, the people he met, some personal observations regarding the culture and traditions of places he visited. The textual additions examined in the second part provide even further evidence that, when Montaigne prepared the 1582 edition, he favored certain chapters over others. Textual modifications always seemed to revolve around the same powerful issues of reaffirming his faith in the Catholic Church, without however compromising his original stand, and without neglecting the fundamental humanist character of his book. In general, added passages were meant to provide more context, or clarify issues already discussed without refuting the validity of the already published edition. We also noted that certain

chapters were modified more than others, such as I. 21, I.56, II.3, II.12 and II.17, and these same essays were more developed in subsequent editions as well.

The *Travel Journal* illuminates and enhances the value of the 1582 edition of the *Essays*, and both texts act as supplementary material for each other. Although they were not mutually necessary in the beginning, once their relationship was established, they became one single body of work, indispensable for understanding the development of the *Essays*. The newly found document in the Vatican Archives adds to this already established conjoined entity, and puts in perspective the importance of these two texts in Montaigne's creative process. Although one might disagree with some of the interpretations proposed in this study, there is overwhelming evidence that the textual additions found in the 1582 edition (in the form of Latin and Italian quotations, or of supplemental personal examples and clarifications) are a symptom of the ongoing debate Montaigne continued to have, years after his trip to Italy, with the Roman authorities, a debate enhanced by his own experience abroad. The complex, continuous reshaping process Montaigne undertook, from his return to his château (November 30, 1581) until his death (September 13, 1592), reveals the ongoing dialog he pursued with the Roman officials, a dialog that can be precisely reconstructed through an analysis of textual transformations in the 1582 edition, the 1588 Paris edition, the hand-written "allongeails" on the BordeauxCopy, and the 1595 posthumous edition prepared by Marie de Gournay. For a dozen years, the essayist carried on a discussion with his absent censors by gradually building new textual arguments in response to them. In a sense, the whole dialogical process started in Rome with the censors constitutes a new chapter to be added

to Pierre Villey's canonical study on the "sources and evolution" of Montaigne's essaying adventure.[281]

[281] Pierre Villey, *Les sources et l'évolution des* Essais *de Montaigne*, Paris: Hachette, 1908.

Appendix A

Vatican Documentum 32

Text reproduced by Peter Godman in *The Saint as Censor. Robert Bellarmine between Inquisition and Index*, Leyde, Boston, Cologne, Brill 2000, p. 339- 342, document n.32

32. *Indice, Protocolli* C, fols. 346r–347r.

In librum sermone Gallico impressum Abourdeaus 1580 auctore Michaele de Montaigne

(a)

1 Questo autore in molte cose parla assai profanamente all' usanza de gentili, come pag. 221 nella prima parte dice che bisogna avezzar li giovani ad accommodarsi in ogni cosa alli compagni etc. *etiam* nelli disordini et cose male come in imbriacarsi etc.

2 Et pag. 371: biasma quei che si privano delle commodità o per divocione o per philosophare, il che quanto alla divocione è pernicioso a dire.

3 Nel 20 libro pagina 17: par che senta bene dell' ammazzar se stesso et che dice che pàr che Dio ci dia licencia d' ammazzarci, quando ci pone in tal stato ch'il vivere ci è peggio.

4 Et pag. 30: dice che basta alle donne quando sono richieste dire di non et lasciarsi violare. Onde loda una che, essendo capitata in mano de soldati, ringraciava Dio che s'era saciata de atti carnali senza peccato.

5 Pag. 182: aguagla in tutto l'huomo all' altri animali poco christianamente et parla male del libero arbitrio.

6 Pag. 363: loda una che prova l'arte della pietra philosophica con cinque authorità della Sacra Scrittura.

7 Pag. 109: si burla di quel che si dice nel prefacio della messa *sursum corda.*

8 Pag. 167 et 168: dice che l'accioni nostre *etiam* della ragione et de virtù e vicii sono sottoposte al cielo et stelle.

9 Primo libro, pagina 482: dice che sempre bisognarebbe dire il *pater noster, quod male sapit* et che chi sta in peccato fa male a far oracione.

10 Nel lib. 2, pag. 99: loda alcuni libri male massime Rabolet, il quale nell'Indice è *prime classis.*

12 Et cap. 12: defende Raymondo Sebondo.

13 Et pag. 459: loda di *Discorsi* del Macchiavello.

14 Et pag. 470: loda Beza et Buccanano per boni poeti.

15 Et pag. 32: approva un detto del buon Marot et lo chiama buono, essendo egli heretico — questi autori o sono heretici o sono poco boni.

16 Et nel primo libro pag. 180: dice che la theologia non insegna ne a ben fare ne a ben pensare.

17 Et nel libro 2 pag. 13: dice che è ben qualche volta imbriacarsi. *Hec et his similia.*

18 Ha anchora alcune cose poco honeste nel primo libro, pag. 217 et nel cap. 28 mette molti sonetti amorosi etc.

(b)

Io truovo queste censure esser vere, ma non di meno ho a dire qualche cosa intorno ad alcune per maggiore dichiaratione —

1 Quanto a la prima: ancor che il autore non dice chiaramente nella pag. 221 che bisogna avezzar li giovani ad imbriacarsi, niente di meno si collige assai di ciò che soggionge nella pagina seguente.

2 Quanto a la 2ª, quello che dice è, che opinarsi delle commodità è attorno d'una virtù eccessiva, e poi lauda la mediocrità et ciò che, quanto a lui, a assai a fare senza andare innanzi — nel che acenna non so che contra l'austerità religiosa.

3 Quanto a la terza: non solo in quel luogo (pag. 21 et 22) pare laudare quei che s'ammazzano se stessi pag. 21 et 22 ma anco in altri luoghi pare fare il medesimo come a parte, pagina 166 et 2ª parte, 576.

4 Forse risponderà l'autore che quelle dice per ironia burlandosi di Parigini, ma ancor che fosse cosi, quel luogho è molto periculoso, per esser la cosa si brutta et la ironia si nascosta.

5 I luoghi dove parla similmente sono notati nella pag. 181 et 182.

7 Nella settima: se non si burla del *sursum corda*, al manco pare ch'il fa dicendo che simili parole le quali si eccita l[']attentione sono fuorché per esso lui.

9 Quello che dice è questo che bisognava dare al *Padre nostro* questo privilegio ch'il volgo l' havesse sempre nella bocca, quasi vero *hoc non faceret Ecclesia.* L'altro punto pare che se può colligere di doi luoghi notati nella pag. 483 et 484.

10 Et Bocaccio ancora.

12 È vero che defende Raymondo Seboni, ma in quel autore non v'è altro prohibito che la prefatione.

15 Già dissi che quel luogo si puo piglare per ironia, ma non tutti il pigleranno cosi forse.

17 Al manco, doppo aver allegato molti autori in favor dell'imbriachezza, soggionge ch'il suo gusto et complessione è qui nemica di quel vita che'l suo discorso.

18 Quei sonetti non trovo troppo dishonesti, ma par empio che nel secondo sonetto dice l'autore di esso che vede ch'a *quel grande dio* (cioè ad Amore) *bisogna ch'ancor ch'habbia torto la ragione lasciva*, et nel 70 chiama il nome dell'amica *santo*, et nel 17 dice: *per questo fatto io ti daria un altare*. Nella pag. 257 della prima parte non vi truovo niente dishonesto, ma in assai altri luoghi, si come nella parte 2 pagine 205 et 208 et 213 et 360.

Di qui parla come i profani et ethnici della fortuna *maxima parte paginis* 50 et 54, 142, 158 *et alibi passim* et anco del fato come nella pagina 420 prima parte et 2a, 505, et 517 et 605 et parla come Epicureo 103.

Per che si burla delle discipline che si suoleva fare il venerdi santo, dicendo ch'alcuni ne fanno per danari. Al manco non accadeva dire tal cosa in questi tempi, ancor che fusse vera, lib. 1, pag. 73.

79 Allega un fundamento dell'opinione di quei qui damnant punitione capitali ha <. . .>

122 *Tribuit potentie imaginationis praecipuum assensum, qui datur miraculis. Titulus capitis est: fortis imaginatio facit casum.*

133 *Ministrorum religionis proficisci ex nostra morte et vitiis.*

136 Il costume che cosa non può nelli nostri giudicii et fede. Ve' qualche opinione si fantastica (lasciando a parte la goffa importanza delle religioni).

144 Pone fra i piu monstruosi modi di vesti le berrette quadrate, et 168 *usurpat illud ridiculum. Magis magnos clericos non sunt magis magnos serpentes*, et 206 *ridicule narrat parochum suum tribuere irae divinae quod vites congelatas* et 488 *memorat exemplum ridiculum theologi, qui aequitabat foeminarum more.*

239 *Honorifice meminit Ganesii et Buchanani hereticorum* et 344 *Giraldi et Castilionis.*

423 *Laudat eos, qui malunt vocari Mathusalem, Ezechiel, Malachius quam Carolus, Ludowicus, Franciscus. Quod hereticis familiare est.*

333 *Non vult tribui vindicte divine infaustam mortem Arii heresiarche, aut saltem probat id non esse necessarium.* Parte 2ª pagina 1: Ch'el Papa Bonifacio 8° (secondo si dice) entrò nel carico come volpe, vi si comportò come lione, e morse come cane.

36 Che senza il Sebondo eravamo persi. Et per questo punto fu prohibita la sua prefazione, onde di forza fu ben notato questo.
139 Allega la regina di Navarra.
141 Tutti i castigi oltre la morte istima pura crudeltà.
157 Iddio debbe il suo aiuto extraordinario alla fede et alla religione, non alli huomini.
244 Il non havere male è la maggior felicita che l'huomo possa havere.
296 Il dio della scienza scolastica è Aristotele.
460 Loda o al manco iscusa il Macchiavello. *Idem* fece pagina 554.
479 *Mirifice laudat Julianum Apostatam* et 481 *negat eum sagitta ictum exclamasse: "Vicisti Nazarene!" aut miracolosum aliud quodquam in eius morte accedisse.*
486 *Facit dubium an debeat permitti libertas religionis illa, quam heretici tantopere requirunt, necne.*

L'ultimo capo è quasi tutto contra la medicina, et particolarmente nella pag. 639. Dice che se'gli havesse ad accettare alcuna sorte di medicina accettarebbe più presto che nessuna altra quella che danno le donnicelle con certe parole et scritti, perché al manco non v'è niun danno a temere.

Appendix B

Various Stages of Chapter I.21 " De la Force de L'Imagination"

I, 21 - 1580:

Car ie sçay, par experience, que tel*, en qui il ne pouuoit eschoir nul soupçon de foiblesse et aussi peu d'enchantement, ayant ouy faire vn conte a vn sien compaignon d'vne defaillance extraordinaire, en quoy il estoit tombé sur le point qu'il en auoit le moins de besoing, se trouuant en pareille occasion, l'horreur de ce conte luy vint si rudement frapper l'imagination qu'il en encourut vne fortune pareille*. Et notamment cela est a craindre ou les commoditez se rencontrent improueues et pressantes*. Aqui a assez de loisir pour se rauoir et remettre de ce trouble, mon conseil est qu'il diuertisse ailleurs son pensement, ou qu'on lui persuade qu'on luy fournira des contrenchantemens d'vn effect merueilleux et certain*. Mais il faut aussi que celles a qui legitimement on le peut demander ostent ces façons cerimonieuses et affectées de rigueur et de refus, et qu'elles se contraignent vn peu pour s'accommoder a la necessité de ce siecle mal'heureux. Car l'ame, troublée de plusieurs diuerses al'armes, elle se perd aisement:[282]

I.21 - 1582/1588 :

Car je sçay par experience que tel, de qui je puis respondre comme de moy mesme, en qui il ne pouvoit eschoir soupçon de foiblesse et aussi peu d'enchantement, ayant ouy faire un conte à un sien compagnon d'une defaillance extraordinaire en quoy il estoit tombé sur le point qu'il en avoit le moins de besoin, se trouvant en pareille occasion, l'horreur de ce conte luy vint si rudiment frapper l'imagination qu'il en encourut une fortune pareille. Cela n'est à craindre qu'aux entreprinses où nostre ame se trouve outre mesure tandue de desir et de respect, et notamment où les commoditez se rencontrent improveues et pressantes. A qui a assez de loisir pour se ravoir et remettre de ce trouble, mon conseil est qu'il divertisse ailleurs son pensement, s'il peut, car il est difficile, et qu'il se desrobe de cette ardeur et contention de son imagination. J'en sçay à qui il a servy d'y apporter le corps mesme, amolly et affoibly d'ailleurs. Et à celuy qui sera en alarme des liaisons, qu'on luy persuade hors de là qu'on luy fournira des contre-enchantemens d'un effect merveilleux et certain. Mais il faut aussi que celles à qui legitimement on le peut demander ostent ces façons ceremonieuses et affectées de rigueur et de refus, et qu'elles se contraignent un peu pour s'accommoder à la necessité de ce siecle malheureux: car l'ame de l'assaillant, troublée de plusieurs diverses allarmes, elle se perd aisement:[283]

I, 21 - Bordeaux Copy

[282] *Essais* (1580), ed. Martin, p.124
[283] *Essais (1582),* ed. Desan 1582, p.74

Car je sçay par experience, que tel, de qui je puis respondre, comme de moy mesme, en qui il ne pouvoit choir soupçon aucune de foiblesse, et aussi peu d'enchantement, ayant ouy faire le conte à un sien compagnon, d'une defaillance extraordinaire, en quoy il estoit tombé sur le point, qu'il en avoit le moins de besoin, se trouvant en pareille occasion, l'horreur de ce conte lui vint à coup si rudement frapper l'imagination, qu'il en encourut une fortune pareille; et de là en hors fut subjet à y rechoir: ce villain souvenir de son inconvenient le gourmandant et tyrannisant. Il trouva quelque remede à cette resverie par une autre resverie. C'est que, advouant luy mesmes et preschant avant la main cette sienne subjection, la contention de son ame se soulageoit sur ce, qu'apportant ce mal comme attendu, son obligation en amoindrissoit et luy en poisoit moins. Quand il a eu loy, à son chois, sa pensée desbrouillée et desbandée, son corps se trouvant en son deu de le faire lors premierement tenter, saisir et surprendre à la cognoissance d'autruy, il s'est guari tout net à l'endroit de ce subjet. A qui on a esté une fois capable, on n'est plus incapable, si non par juste faiblesse. Ce malheur n'est à craindre qu'aux entreprinses, où nostre ame se trouve outre mesure tandue de desir et de respect, et notamment si les commoditez se rencontrent improveues et pressantes: on n'a pas moyen de se ravoir de ce trouble. J'en sçay, à qui il a servy d'y apporter le corps mesme commencé à ressasier d'ailleurs, pour endormir l'ardeur de cette fureur, et qui par l'aage se trouve moins impuissant de ce qu'il est moins puissant. Et tel autre à qui il a servi aussi qu'un amy l'ayt asseuré d'estre fourni d'une contrebatterie d'enchantemens certains à le preserver. Il vaut mieux que je die comment ce fut. Un comte de tres bon lieu de qui j'estoye fort privé, se mariant avec une belle dame qui avoit esté poursuivie de tel qui assistoit à la feste, mettoit en grand peine ses amis et nommément une vieille dame, sa parente, qui presidoit à ces nopces et les faisoit chez elle, craintive de ces sorcelleries: ce qu'elle me fit entendre. Je la priay s'en reposer sur moy. J'avoye de fortune en mes coffres certaine petite pièce d'or platte, où estoient gravées quelques figures celestes, contre le coup de soleil et oster la douleur de teste: la logeant à point sur la cousture du test; et, pour l'y tenir, elle estoit cousue à un ruban propre à rattacher souz le menton. Resverie germaine à celle de quoy nous parlons. Jacques Peletier m'avoit faict ce present singulier. J'advisay d'en tirer quelque usage. Et dis au comte qu'il pourroit courre fortune comme les autres: y ayant là des hommes pour luy en vouloir prester d'une; mais que hardiment il s'allast coucher; que je luy feroy un tour d'amy; et n'espargneroys à son besoin un miracle, qui estoit en ma puissance, pourveu que, sur son honneur, il me promist de le tenir tres-fidelement secret; seulement, comme sur la nuit on iroit luy porter le resveillon, s'il luy estoit mal allé, il me fit un tel signe. Il avoit eu l'ame et les oreilles si battues, qu'il se trouva lié du trouble de son imagination, et me fit son signe. Je luy dis lors, qu'il se levast souz couleur de nous chasser, et prinst en se jouant la robbe de nuict que j'avoye sur moy (nous estions de taille fort voisine) et s'en vestist, tant qu'il auroit exécuté mon ordonnance, qui fut: quand nous serions sortis, qu'il se retirast à tomber de l'eau; dist trois fois telles oraisons, et fist tels mouvemens; qu'à chascune de ces trois fois, il ceignist le ruban que je luy mettoys en main, et couchast bien soigneusement la médaille qui y estoit attachée, sur ses roignons, la figure en telle posture; cela faict, ayant bien estreint ce ruban pour qu'il ne se peust ny desnouer, ny mouvoir de sa place, que en toute asseurance il s'en retournast à son prix faict, et n'oubliast de rejetter ma robbe sur son lict, en maniere qu'elle les abriast tous deux. Ces

singeries sont le principal de l'effect: nostre pensée ne se pouvant desmesler que moyens si estranges ne viennent de quelqu'abstruse science. Leur inanité leur donne poids et reverence. Somme, il fut certain que mes characteres se trouverent plus Veneriens que Solaires, plus en action qu'en prohibition. Ce fut une humeur prompte et curieuse qui me convia à tel effect, esloigné de ma nature. Je suis ennemy des actions subtiles et feintes et hay la finesse, en mes mains, non seulement recreative, mais aussi profitable. Si l'action n'est vicieuse, la routte l'est. Amasis, Roy d'Egypte, espousa Laodice tres-belle fille Grecque: et luy, qui se montroit gentil compagnon par tout ailleurs, se trouva court? à jouïr d'elle, et menaça de la tuer, estimant que ce fust quelque sorcerie. Comme és choses qui consistent en fantasie, elle le rejetta à la devotion, et, ayant faict ses voeus et promesses à Venus, il se trouva divinement remis des la premiere nuit d'empres ses oblations et sacrifices. Or elles ont tort de nous recueillir de ces contenances mineuses, querelleuses et fuyardes, qui nous esteignent en nous allumant. La bru de Pythagoras disoit que la femme qui se couche avec un homme, doit avec la cotte laisser aussy la honte, et la reprendre avec le cotillon. L'ame de l'assaillant, troublée de plusieurs diverses allarmes, se perd aisement:[284]

For I know by experience that one man, whom I can answer for as for myself, on whom there could fall no suspicion whatever of importance and just as little of being enchanted, having heard a friend of his tell the story of an extraordinary impotence into which he had fallen at the moment when he needed it least, and finding himself in a similar situation, was all at once so struck in his imagination by the horror of this story that he incurred the same fate. [c] And from then on he was subject to relapse, for the ugly memory of his mishap checked him tyrannized him. He found some remedy for this fancy by another fancy: which was that by admitting this weakness and speaking about it in advance he relieve the tension of his soul, for when the trouble had been presented as one to be expected, his sense of responsibility diminished and weighed upon him less. When he had a chance of his own choosing, with his mind unembroiled and relaxed and his body in good shape, to have his bodily powers first tested, then seized and taken by surprise, with the other party's full knowledge of his problem, he was completely cured in this respect. A man is never after incapable, unless from genuine impotence, with a woman with whom he has once been capable.

[a]This mishap is to be feared only in enterprises where our soul is immoderately tense with desire and respect, and especially if the opportunity is unexpected and pressing; there is no way of recovering from this trouble. I know one man who found it helpful to bring to it a body that had already begun to be sated elsewhere, [c] so as to lull his frenzied ardor, and who with age finds himself less impotent through less potent. And I know another who was helped when a friend assured him that he was supplied with a counterbattery of enchantments that were certain to save him. I had better tell how this happened.

Account, a member of a very distinguished family, with whom I was quite intimate, upon getting married to a beautiful lady who had been courted by a man who was present at the wedding feast, had his friends very worried and especially an old lady, a relative of his, who was presiding at the wedding and holding it at his house. She was fearful of these sorceries, and gave me to understand this. I asked her to rely on me. I had

[284] *Essais*, V-S, I.21, p. 99-101ac

by chance in my coffers a certain little flat piece of gold on which were engraved some celestial figures, to protect against sunstroke and take away a headache by placing it precisely on the suture of the scull; and, to keep it there, it was sewed to a ribbon intended to be tied under the chin: a kindred fancy to the one we are speaking of. Jacques Peletier had given me this singular present. I thought of making some use of it, and said to the count that he might incur the same fate as others, there being men present who would like to bring this about; but that he should boldly go to bed and I would do him a friendly turn and would not, if he needed it, spare a miracle which was in my power, provided that he promised me on his honor to keep it most faithfully secret; he was only to make a given signal to me, when the came to bring him the midnight meal, if things had gone badly with him. He had had his soul and his ears so battered that he did find himself fettered by the trouble of his imagination, and gave me his signal. I told him then that he should get up on the pretext of chasing us out, and playfully take the bathrobe that I had (we were very close in height) and put it on him until he had carried out my prescription, which was this: when we had left, he should withdraw to pass water, say certain prayers three times and go through certain motions; each of these three times he should tie the ribbon I was putting in his hand around him and very carefully lay the medal that was attached to it on his kidneys, with the figure in such and such a position; this done, having tied the ribbon firmly so that it could neither come untied no slip from its place, he should return to his business with complete assurance and not forget to spread my robe over his bed so that it should cover them both. These monkey tricks are the main part of the business, our mind being unable to get free of the idea that such strange means must come from some abstruse science. Their inanity gives them weight and reverence. All in all, it is certain that the characters on my medal proved themselves more venereal than solar, more useful for action than for prevention. It was a sudden and curious whim that led me to do such a thing, which was alien to my nature. I am an enemy of subtle and dissimulated acts and hate trickery in myself, not only for sport but also for someone's profit. If the action is not vicious, the road it is.

Amasis, king of Egypt, married Laodice, a very beautiful Greek girl; and he, who showed himself a gay companion everywhere else, fell short when it cam to enjoying her, and threatened to kill her, thinking it was some sort of sorcery. As is usual in matters of fancy, she referred him to religion; and having made his vows and promises to Venus, he found himself divinely restored from the first night after his oblations and sacrifices.

Now women are wrong to greet us with those threatening, quarrelsome, and coy countenances, which put out our fires even as the light them. The daughter-in-law of Pythagoras used to say that the woman who goes to bed with a man should put off her modesty with her skirt and put it on again with her petticoat. [a] The soul of the assailant, when troubled with many various alarms, is easily discouraged;

Appendix C

Petrarch's *Canzone CV*

Petrarch's *Canzoniere* – canzone CV

Proverbio "ama chi t'ama" è fatto antico.
I' so ben quel ch'io dico: or lass'andare,
ché conven ch'altri impare a le sue spese.
Un' humil donna grama un dolce amico.
Mal si conosce il fico. A me pur pare
senno a non cominciar tropp'alte imprese;
et per ogni paese è bona stanza.
L'infinita speranza occide altrui;
et anch'io fui alcuna volta in danza.
Quel poco che m'avanza
fia chi nol schifi, s'i' 'l vo' dare a lui.
I' mi fido in Colui che 'l mondo regge,
et che' seguaci Suoi nel boscho alberga,
che con pietosa verga
mi meni a passo omai tra le Sue gregge.

Forse ch'ogni uom che legge non s'intende;
et la rete tal tende che non piglia;
et chi troppo assotiglia si scavezza.
Non fia zoppa la legge ov'altri attende.
Per bene star si scende molte miglia.
Tal par gran meraviglia, et poi si sprezza.
Una chiusa bellezza è piú soave.
Benedetta la chiave che s'avvolse
al cor, et sciolse l'alma, et scossa l'ave
di catena sí grave,
e 'nfiniti sospir' del mio sen tolse!
Là dove piú mi dolse, altri si dole,
et dolendo adolcisse il mio dolore:
ond'io ringratio Amore
che piú nol sento, et è non men che suole.

The proverb "love him who loves you" is an ancient fact I know well what I ma saying; now let be; each must learn at his own expense.

A humble lady makes a sweet friend suffer; figs are hard to judge; it seems to me prudent not to begin undertakings that are too difficult;

And in every country there are pleasant dwellings. Infinite hope kills people, and I too have sometimes joined the dance. What little is left to me to please someone, if I wish to give it to him. I rely on him who rules the world and shelters His followers even in the wood to lead me now wth mercifulstaff among His flocks.

Perhaps not everyone who can read can understand, and he who sets up the netdoes not always catch, and he who is too subtle breaks his own neck.

When folk await, let not the law be lame. One goes many miles to be at ease; a thing seems a great marvel but then is despised;

Hidden beauty is sweetest. Blessed be the key that turned in my heart and let loose my soul and freed it from so heavy a chain and freed my breast from numberless sighs. Where I most sorrowed, another sorrows and by sorrowing makes swet my sorrow; wherefore I thank love, for I feel it no more, and it is no less than it was.

Petrarch's Lyric Poems. Rime Sparse *and Other Lyrics,* ed. Robert M. Durling, Harvard University Press, 1976, CV, v.31-60, pp. 210-211)

Appendix D

Journal de Voyage – Montaigne's Daily Schedule at the Wartespas of La Villa, Italy

p. 179

Lunedì la mattina stetti al bagno due ore non mi ci adocciai, perché presi tre libre d'acqua per capriccio la quale mi mosse del corpo. Bagnava gli occhi ogni mattina, tenendoli aperti nell'acqua. Non ne sentiva effetto né d'un verso né d'altro. Queste tre libre d'acqua credo che la smaltii al bagno, dove pisciai assai volte e poi sudai un poco più del solito e per il secesso. Sentendomi gli giorni passati il corpo stitico fuora dell'ordinario, usava delli sopradetti 3 grani di corriandro confetto, li quali mi scacciavano molte ventosità, donde era pienissimo; roba poco. Con questo che io mi purgassi mirabilmente i reni, non lasciava di sentirci qualche punture: e giudicava che fusseno più presto ventosità che altro. Martedì stetti due ore al bagno: m'adocciai mezza ora non bevvi. Mercordì stetti una ora e mezza al bagno, m'adocciai mezza circa. […]

Temendo anco che quest'acqua non m'indebolisse la testa, per questo il giovedì non volsi adocciarmi e mi bagnai un ora.

Il venerdì, il sabbato, la domenica facci pausa a tutta sorte di cura per rispetto di questo, e che mi trovava assai men allegro della vita, scacciando sempre arenella in fura. [...]

Il lunedì la mattina bevvi in 13 bicchieri, 6 libre e mezza d'acqua della fontana ordinaria. Ne smaltii circa 3 libre di bianca e cruda innanzi il pasto; il resto poco a poco.[…]

Il martedì al far del giorno andai alla fontana di Bernabò, e ci bevvi 6 libre in sei volte. Pioveva un poco. Sudai un poco. […] Mi mosse il corpo, e lavò gagliardamente le budella. Per questo non possi giudicare quanto ne avea reso. Orinai poco, ma in due ore avea pigliato colore.

Si tiene qui a dozzina sei scudi d'oro, poco più, per mese una alloggiato in camera particulare, comoda quanto volete; un servitore altrettanto. Chi no [ha] servitore, sarà ancor servito dall'oste. Di più cose a mangiare convenevolmente.

Innanzi che passasse il giorno naturale la smaltii tutta e più che non avea bevuto di tutta sorte di bevanda. Non bevvi ch'una voltetta per pasto mezza libra. Cenava poco.

Il mercordì, piovoso, presi 7 libre in 7 volte dell' ordinaria, e la smaltii, e quel ch'io avea bevuto di più.

Il giobbia ne presi 9 libre, cioè d'un tiro prima 7, e poi avendo cominciato di smaltirla, ne mandai a cercare altre due libre. La smaltii per ogni banda. Beveva pochissimo al pasto.

Venerdì e sabbato, fecci il medessiomo. Domenica mi stetti cheto.

Lunedì presi 7 bicchieri, 7 libre. Butavva sempre arenella ma un poco manco che del bagno del quale in questo effetto viddi ancora l'essempio in assai d'altri in un medesimo tempo. Questo dì sentii un dolore al pettignone, come del cascar di pietre, e ne fecci una picciola.

Il martedì, una altra. E posso dire quasi affermatamente essermi accorto che questa acqua ha forza di spezzarle, perché d'alcune al calare ne sentiva la grossezza, e poi le butava in pezzi più minuti. Questo martedì ne bevvi 8 libre in 8 volte. […]

Mercordì presi 8 libre 8 biccheri. La smaltiva quasi sempre, fino alla mezza parte, cruda e naturale in tre ore. Poi, qualche mezzza libra di rossa e tinta. Il resto di poi pasto e la notte. […]

Giovedì la mattina fui al bagno una ora senza bagnar la testa, e innanzi il giorno per aver il primo loco. Di questo, credo, e dell'aver poi dormito al letto, mi sentii male: la bocca asciutta e sitibonda, e caldo in modo che la sera andando al letto bevvi due grandi bicchieri di quest'acqua rinfrescata. Del che non ne sentii altra mutazione.
Il venerdì stetti cheto.

Travel Journal

-p. 135

Monday morning I stayed in the bath two hours. I did not give myself a shower because I took three pounds of water on a whim, which made my bowels move. I used to bathe my eyes every morning holding them pen in the water. I felt no effect from it, either good or bad. I believe that I got rid of those three ponds of water in the bath – where I urinated a good many times and then sweated a little more than usual – and in my stool. Having felt more constipated than usual for the last few days, I used the aforementioned three grains of candied coriander, which drove out a lot of wind, of which I was very full, but little matter. Although I purged my kidneys wonderfully, I did not stop feeling some pricking there; and I judged that it was due rather to wind than to anything else.

Tuesday I stayed two hours in the bath, shower myself for half an hour and did not drink. Wednesday I stayed in the bath an hour and a half and showered myself about half an hour. […]

Fearing also that this water might weaken my head, on Thursday I would not take a shower, but bathed for an hour. During Friday, Saturday, and Sunday I discontinued the cure in every form for that reason and because I felt a good deal less cheerful, since I was still discharging gravel furiously. […]

On Monday morning I drank, in thirteen glasses, six pounds and a half of water from the ordinary spring. I passed about three pounds of this, white and indigested, before dinner; the rest little by little.

On Tuesday at daybreak I went to the Bernabo spring and there drank six pounds, one at a time. It was raining a bit. I sweated a little. I gave me a movement and washed my bowels lustily. For that reason I could not judge how much I had given out. I did not urinate much, but in two hours my urine had taken on some color. […]

Before the natural day was over I had passed all the water, and more than I had drunk of all kinds of drink. I had only one little drink at dinner, half a pound. I ate little supper.

On Wednesday, a rainy day, I took seven pounds, one at a time, from the ordinary spring, and passed them, as well as what I had drunk besides.

On Thursday I took nine pounds: seven in a row at first, and then, when I had begun to discharge it, I sent for two more pounds. I discharged it in both ways. I drank very little at dinner. On Friday and Saturday I did the same. On Sunday I stayed quiet.

On Monday I took seven glasses, seven pounds. I was still voiding gravel, but a little less than after a bath; I saw examples of this effect of the baths in a good many other people at the same time. On this day I felt a pain in my groin as from the descent of stones, and I passed a small one.

On Tuesday, another. And I can say, and almost affirm, that I have observed that this water has the power to break them up, because I could feel the large size of some of them as they were coming down, and the I discharge them in smaller pieces. This Tuesday I drank eight pounds in eight times.[…]

Wednesday I took eight pounds, eight glasses. I almost always passed the first half of it, undigested and natural, in three hours; then about a half a pound, reddish and colored; the rest after dinner and at night. […]

Thursday morning I was in the bath for an hour without bathing my head, and before daybreak, in order to have the first place. For that reason, I believe, and because I slept afterward in bed, I felt bad: my mouth, dry and thirsty, and so hot that in the evening, on going to bed, I drank two beg glasses of that water, cooled; from which I felt no other change.

On Friday I stayed quiet.

Bibliography

Alighieri, Dante. *The Divine Comedy*. Translated by John D. Sinclair. New York: Oxford University Press, 1961.

Andrea del Col, Giovana Paolin. *L'Inquisizione romana: metolologia delle fonti e storia istituzionale*. Trieste: University of Trieste, 2000.

Aristotle. *Aristotle*. *The Nicomachean Ethics*. Paperback. Translated by David Ross and revised by J.L. Ackrill and J.O. Urmson. Oxford University Press, 1998.

Balmas, Enea. "Montaigne et l'inquisition." *Le parcours des essais: Montaigne 1588-1988. Colloque international Duke University 1988*. Paris: Aux Amateurs de Livres. 239-249.

Balsamo, Jean. "L'Arioste et le Tasse en France au XVIe siècle." *Cahiers V.L. Saulnier. L'Arioste et le Tasse en France au XVIe siècle* 20 (2003): 11-27.

Balsamo, Jean. "Montaigne et le "saut" de Tasse." *Rivista di Letterature moderne e comparate* LIV (2002): 389-409.

Beall, Chandler. *La Fortune du Tasse en France*. Eugene: University of Oregon Press, 1942.

Bennassar, Bartolome. *L'Inquisition espagnole, XVe-XIXe siecle*. Paris : Hachette , 1979.

Bethencourt, Francisco. *L'Inquisition a l'epoque moderne. Espagne, Portugal, Italie. XVe-XIXe siecle*. Paris: Fayard, 1995.

Beza, Theodore. *Juvenilia*. Edited by A. Machard. Translated by A Marchard. Paris: A. Marchard, 1879.

Bideaux, Michel. "De Sebond à Montaigne : d'une apologie l'autre." *Nouvelle Revue du Seizième Siècle*, no. 12 (1994): 165-187.

Black, Cristopher. *The Italian Inquisition*. New Haven and London : Yale University Press, 2009.

Blum, Claude. *Montaigne. Apologie de Raimond Sebond. De la Theologia à la Théologie*. Paris : H. Champion, 1990.

Bodel, Jehan. *Le jeu de saint Nicolas*. Edited by Albert Henry. Geneva: Droz, 1981.

Buchanan, George. *John the Baptist. A Drama Translated from the latin of George Buchanan by A. Gordon Mitchell*. Paisley, Scotland: Alexander Gardner, 1904.

Bujanda, Jesus Marinez de. *Index des livres interdits. T. VIII, Index de Rome : 1557, 1559, 1564. Les premiers index romains et l'index du Concile de Trente*. Edited by E. Stanek J.M. Bujanda with the help of R. Davognon. Vol. VIII. Geneva: Droz , 1991.

Butor, Michel. *Essais sur les Essais*. Paris: Gallimard, 1968.

Butterworth, Emily. "Censors and Censure: Robert Estienne and Michel de Montaigne ." In *Reading and Censorship in Early Modern Europe. Barcelona, 11-13 de diciembre de 2007*, by Julián Weiss, Cesc Esteve María José Vega Ramos, 161-179. Barcelona: Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Servei de Publicacions, 2010.

Calvin, Jean. *Institution de la religion chrétienne par Jean Calvin. Nouv. ed. soigneusement rev. et corr. sur l'éd. française de 1560 (1888)*. Geneva: E. Beroud, 1888.

Castiglione. *The Book of the Courtier*. Translated by Charles S. Singleton. New York: Anchor Books, 1959.

Catullus. *The Poems of Catullus: A Billingual Edition* . Translated by James Michie. New York: Vintage Books, 1971.

Cavalinni, Concetta. "Les Mosti: intermédiares entre Montaigne et Le Tasse." *Montaigne Studies* XV (2003): 147-159.

Cavallini, Concetta. *"Cette belle besogne": étude sur le Journal de voyage de Montaigne avec une bibliographie critique*. Fasano-Paris: Schena Editore Presses de l'Université de Paris-Sorbonne, 2005.

—. *L'Italianisme de Michel de Montaigne*. Fasano-Paris: Schena Editore-Presses de l'Université de Paris-Sorbonne, 2003.

Céard, Jean. "Montaigne, traducteur de Raymond Sebond: Positions et propositions." *Montaigne Studies*, Dec. 1993: 11-26.

Charpentier, Françoise. "L'écriture de l'errance." Edited by Zoe Samaras. *Montaigne. Espace, voyage, écriture. Actes du congrès international de Thessalonique (23-25 septembre 1992)*. Paris: H. Campion. 243-252.

Cotgrave, Randle. *A Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues*. London : Adam Islip, 1611.

Blum, Claude, and André Tournon, . "Dans l'atelier de Millanges. Les Conditions de fabrication des editions bordelaises des "Essais"." *Editer le Essais de Montaigne. Actes du colloque tenu à l'Université de Paris IV-Sorbonne (27-28 janvier 1995)*. Paris: H. Champion, 1997. 79-99.

Dédéyan, Charles. *Essai sur le "Journal de Voyage" de Montaigne*. Paris: Boivin, 1945.

Defaux, Gerard. *Montaigne et le travail de l'amitié*. Orléans: Editions Paradigme, 2001.

Desan, Philippe. "Apologie de Sebond ou justification de Montaigne?" In *Dieu à nostre commerce et société. Montaigne et la théologie*, edited by Phillipe Desan, 175-200. Geneva: Droz, 2008.

—. *Portraits à l'essai : iconographie de Montaigne*. Paris: H. Champion , 2007.

Erasmus, Desiderius. *Collected Works of Erasmus*. Translated by Clarence H. Miller. Vols. 76,77. Toronto: Toronto University Press, 2000.

Estienne, Robert. *Dictionarium, seu Latinae linguae thesaurus (2 vols.)*. Paris: Robert Estienne, 1531.

Flaccus, A. Persius. *The Satires of A. Persius Flaccus*. Ebook: http://www.gutenberg.org/files/22119/22119-h/22119-h.htm. Edited by Basil L. Gildersleeve. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1875.

Frame, Donald. *Montaigne. A Biography*. San Francisco: North Point Press, 1984.

Furetière, Antoine. *Dictionnaire universel, contenant généralement tous les mots françois tant vieux que modernes, et les termes de toutes les sciences et des arts*. Edited by A. et R. Leers. Rotterdam, 1690.

Garavini, Fausta. *Itinéraires à Montaigne. Jeux de texte*. Paris: H. Champion, 1995.

Garvini, Fausta. *Monstres et chimère. Montaigne, le texte et le fantasme*. Paris: Honoré Campion, 1994.

Godman, Peter. *The Saint as Censor. Robert Bellarmine between Inquisition and Index*. Brill: Leyde, 2000.

Grady, Hugh. *Shakespeare, Machiavelli, and Montaigne: Power and Subjectivity from Richard II to Hamlet*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Guazzo, Stefano. *La civil conversatione del signor Stefano Guazzo divisa in quattro libri*. Digitized edition 2012. Source: Lyon Public Library http://books.google.it. Edited by Apresso Domenico Imberti. Venezia, 1600.

Herdman, Emma. "Censured and Censored: Redactions that Help Define Obscenity." In *Obscénités renaissantes*, by Guillaume Peureux, Lise Wajeman Hugh Roberts, 368-378. Geneva: Droz, 2011.

Hillar, Marian. "Sebastian Castellio and the Struggle for Freedom of Conscience." Edited by Robert D. Finch and Marian Hillar. *Essays in the Philosophy of Humanism* 10 (2002): 32-59.

Horace. *Horace's Satires and Epistles* . Translated by Jacob Fuchs. New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 1977.

Kirkham, Everard de. *Distiques de Caton, en vers latins, grecs et français; suivis des Quatrains de Pibrac, traduits en prose grecque par Dumoulin*. Edited by Dumoulin. Paris: Fuchs, 1802.

La Boëtie, Étienne de. *Oeuvres complètes d'Estienne de La Boëtie, publiées, avec notice biographique, variantes, notes et index, par Paul Bonnefon*. Bordeaux/Paris: G. Gounouilhou and J. Rouam, 1892.

Leake, Roy. *Concordance des Essais de Montaigne*. 2 vols. Geneva: Droz, 1981.

Legros, Alain. " Montaigne face à ses censeurs romains de 1581 (mise à jour) ." *BHR*, no. LXXI (2009): 7-33.

Legros, Alain. "Edition de 1582." In *Dictionnaire de Michel de Montaigne*, edited by Philippe Desan, 301-303. Paris: H. Champion, 2003.

Legros, Alain. "Montaigne between Fortune and Providence." In *Chance Literature and Culture in Early Modern France*, edited by Kathleen Wine John D. Lyons, 17-31. Farnhan: Ashgate Publishing, 2009.

—. *Montaigne. Essais, I, 56 'Des prières'. Edition annotée des sept premiers états du texte avec étude de genèse et commentaire*. Geneva: Droz, 2003.

Llorente, Juan Antonio. *Histoire critique de l'Inquisition d'Espagne: dupuis l'époque de son établissement par Fedinand VII*. Paris: Treuttel et Würz , 1817.

Lucretius. *De rerum natura*. Translated by W.H.D. Rouse. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975.

Machiavelli, Nicolo. *The Prince*. Translated by Harvey Mansfield. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.

MacPhail, Eric. "Praising the Past: Novelty and Nostalgia in Machiavelli, Castiglione and Montaigne." *Romanic Review*, no. 4 (2010): 639-654.

Macphail, Eric. *The Voyage to Rome in French Renaissance Literature*. Edited by Stanford French and Italian Studies. Anma Libri, 1990.

Marcellinus, Ammianus. *Ammianus Marcellinus, with an English translation*. Translated by C. Rolfe. 3 vols. London/Cambridge: Loeb Classical Library, 1935-1939.

Marot, Clement. *Oeuvres complètes*. Edited by François Rigolot. 2 vols. Paris: Garnier-Flammarion , 2007.

Martin, Daniel. *Montaigne et la fortune*. Geneva-Paris: Slatkine-Champion, 1977.

Mathieu-Castellani, Giselle. *Montaigne. L'écriture de l'essai*. Paris: PUF, 1988.

—. *Montaigne. L'écriture de l'essai*. Paris: PUF, 1988.

McKinley, Mary. "L'accomplissement de l'Apologie de Raimond Sebond Esthétique et Théologie." *Bulletin de la Société Internationale des Amis de Montaigne*, 1988-1999: 55-66.

McKinnley, Mary. *Words in a Corner. Studies in Montaigne's Latin Quotations*. Lexington: French Forum Publishers, 1981.

Miller, Clarence H., ed. *Erasmus and Luther: the battle over free will*. Translated by Peter Macardle Clarence H. Miller. Indianapolis: Hackett, 2012.

Montaigne, Dictionnaire de Michel de, ed. *Dictionnaire de Michel de Montaigne*. Paris: H. Champion, 2007.

Montaigne, Michel de. "*Essais de Michel de Montaigne. Texte original de 1580 avec les variantes des éditions de 1582 et 1587 publié par R. Dezeimeris & H. Barckhausen*. Bordeaux: Féret et Fils, 1870.

—. *Essais Reproduction Photogtaphique de la deuxieme édition (Bordeaux 1582)*. Edited by Philippe Desan. Paris: Société des Textes Français Modernes, 2005.

—. *Journal de Voyage*. Edited by François Rigolot. Paris: PUF, 1992.

—. *Journal de voyage. Publié avec une introd., des notes, une table des noms propres, et la traduction du texte italien de Montaigne*. Edited by Louis Lautrey. Paris: Librairie Hachette, 1909.

—. *Les Essais*. Edited by Catherine Magnien-Simonin, Michel Magnien Jean Balsamo. Paris: Gallimard Bibliothèque de la Pléiade, 2007.

—. *Les Essais*. Edited by Catherine Mangnien-Simonin, Michel Magnien Jean Balsamo. Paris: Gallimard Bibliothèque de la Pléiade, 2007.

—. *Les Essais*. Edited by Pierre Villey and V.L. Saulnier. Paris: PUF, 2004.

—. *Les Essais. Reproduction photographique de l'édition Originale de 1580 avec une introduction et des notes sur les modifications apportées ultérieurement au texte en 1582 , 1587, 1588 et sur l'exemplaire de Bordeaux . Publié par Daniel Martin*. 2 vols. Geneva: Slatkine, 1976.

—. *Montaigne's Travel Journal*. Translated by Donald Frame. San Francisco, 1983.

—. *Reproduction photographique de la deuxieme edition (Bordeaux 1582)* . Edited by Marcel Françon. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969.

—. *The Complete Works*. Edited by Stanford University Press. Translated by Donald Frame. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2003.

Neveau, Bruno. *L'Erreur et son juge. Remarques sur les censures doctrinales a l'epoque moderne*. Naples: Bobliopolis, 1993.

Nicot, Jean. *Thresor de la langue françoyse, tant ancienne que moderne*. Dictionnaires d"Autrefois. ARTFL Project University of Chicago, 1606.

Petrarca, Francesco. *Petrarch's Lyric Poems: The Rime Sparse and Other Lyrics*. Edited by Robert M. Durling. Translated by Robert M. Durling. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Pfeiffer, Helmut. "Das Ich als Haushalt: Montaignes okunomische Politik." In *Historische Anthropologie und Literatur: Romanistiche Betrage zu einem neuen Paradigma der Literaturwissenschaft*, by Roland Gale Rudolph Brehrens, 69-90. Wurzburg: Konigshausen und Neumann, 1995.

Rabelais, François. *Gargantua*. Barcelona: Gallimard "Folio Classique", 2004.

Reardon, Wendy. *The Deaths of the Popes: Comprehensive Accounts, Including Funerals, Burial Places and Epitaphs*. McFarland & Company Incorporated, 2010.

Regosin, Richard L. "Montaigne and His Readers ." In *A New History of French Literature*, by Howard Bloch Denis Hollier, 248-252. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994.

Rigolot, François. "Curiosity, Contingency and Cultural Duversity: Montaigne's Readings at the Vatican Library." *Renaissance Quarterly*, 2011: 847-872.

—. *Les Métamorphoses de Montaigne*. Paris: PUF, 1988.

—. *L'erreur de la Renaissance. Perspectives littéraires*. Paris: H. Champion, 2002.

Rigolot, François. "Montaigne et Aristote: La conversion à l'"Ethique à Nicomaque"." In *Au-delà de la "Poétique" : Aristote et la littérature de la Renaissance*, edited by Ullrich Langer, 47-63. Geneva: Droz, 2002.

Rigolot, François. "Montaigne et Veronica Franco: de la courtisane à la femme de lettres." *Montaigne Studies* XIV (2003): 117-131.

Rigolot, François. "Montaigne in Italy." In *The Renaissance World*, 225-241. New York and London : Routelage, 2008.

Rigolot, François. "Montaigne's Anti-mannerist Mannerism." In *Le visage changeant de Montaigne. The changing face of Montaigne*, edited by Keith Cameron Laura Wilett, 207-231. Paris: H. Champion, 2003.

Schneikert, Elisabeth. *Montaigne dans le labyrinthe. De l'imaginaire du Journal de voyage à l'écriture des Essais*. Paris: H. Champion , 2006.

Screech, Michael. *Montaigne's Annotated Copy of Lucretius*. Geneva: Droz, 1998.

Sebond, Raymond. *La theologie naturelle de Raymond Sebon*. Translated by Michel de Montaigne. Paris: Chez Gilles Gorbin, 1581.

Smith, Malcolm. *Montaigne and Religious Freedom. The Dawn of Pluralism, .* Geneva: Droz, 1991.

—. *Montaigne and the Roman Censors*. Geneva: Droz, 1981.

Solerti, Angelo. *Vita di Torquato Tasso*. 3 vols. Torino Roma: Ermanno Loescher, 1895.

Tasso, Torquato. *Aminta: A Pastoral Play*. Edited by Irene Marchegiani Jones Charles Jernigan. Translated by Irene Marchegiani Jones Charles Jernigan. new York: Italica Press. Dual-Language Poetry Series, 2000.

—. *Gerusalemme Liberata*. Brescia: Editrice la Scuola, 1978.

—. *Jerusalem Delivered*. Edited by Ralph Nash. Translated by Ralph Nash. Wayne State University Press, 1987.

Tétel, Marcel. *Présences italiennes dans les Essais de Montaigne*. Paris : H. Champion, 1992.

Varchi, Benedetto. *L'ercolano, dialogo di messer Benedetto Varchi nel quale si ragiona delle lingue, ed in particolare della toscana e della fiorentina*. Milan: Società tipografica de' classici italiani, 1804.

Villey, Pierre. *Les Sources & l'évolution des Essais de Montaigne*. Paris: Hachette, 1908 (1933).

Virgil. *The Eclogues: The Georgics* . Translated by C. Day Lewis. New York: Oxford University Press, 1983.

Vittorini, Edwina. "Montaigne, Ferrara and Tasso,." In *Renaissance in Ferrara and Its European Horizons*, edited by June Salmons and Walter Moretti, 145-167. Swansea: University of Wales Press, 1984.