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Abstract

Literary criticism of French Renaissance literature widely considers how prominent Greek, Roman, and Italian intertexts and allusions are present in, shaped, and contributed to the development of works of French Renaissance prose and poetry. The influence of Spain and Spanish literature, however, has been the focus of relatively little research. This dissertation proposes that the political rivalry between France and Spain under the reigns of Francis I and Charles V spurred literary productivity and thus must also be considered an important factor in the development and study of some major texts printed in the French language, particularly after 1519 when Charles V was elected Holy Roman Emperor. This election incited the French, among other major kingdoms, to balance Charles’ growing empire and influence not only through warfare but also through literary representations that challenged his legitimacy, actions, authority, and supremacy.

Chapter One is a rereading of François Rabelais’ prose novel Gargantua (1534, 1535) with its adversarial character Pichrocole as a French parody of Emperor Charles V. Chapter Two analyzes the French prologue to Herberay Des Essarts’ French translation/adaptation Amadis de Gaule (1540) after the Spanish version Amadís de Gaula (1496?) by Garci Rodríguez de Montalvo. The French prologue is analyzed as a liminal text, an opening signal, for its direct discourse rivaling the Spanish text, and the work in itself is an example of emulation. Chapter Three studies the symbols representing Charles V and Francis I in the court poetry of Clément Marot’s Oeuvres (1538, 1543) and in Maurice Scève’s Délie: Objet de plus haute vertu (1544). These works of poetry are analyzed together to suggest a reading that considers how lyric poetry
can be read as a political tool. Finally, Chapter Four is a reading of Joachim Du Bellay’s *Songe* (1558) as a backward glance and criticism of Charles V’s imperialism and heightened rivalry with France under Francis I.
Acknowledgements

Thank you to my adviser Professor François Rigolot for his guidance and support from the earliest stages of this project. I am especially grateful for his recent, two-volume edition of Clément Marot’s *Œuvres Complètes* without which much of my writing and research would not have been possible with depth and clarity of context. The erudition of his notes at the end of each volume, as well as the individual footnotes and bibliography, were of immense help to me. I am also indebted to his vast scholarship on François Rabelais, which has been an essential part of my research. It is also thanks to him that I discovered the French *Amadis de Gaule* by Herberay Des Essarts, and the Spanish *Amadís de Gaula* by Garci Rodriguez de Montalvo; which he recommended that I read since I am bilingual and have a deep appreciation of both languages. I have also been fortunate enough to learn from him in his class seminars, in which I explored the poetry of Joachim Du Bellay and the prose of Rabelais, and attended inspiring lectures given by him on a wide array of Renaissance topics since my arrival at Princeton in September 2006. I am thankful for the time he has spent with me discussing my ideas, for the many letters of support and recommendation that he has written for me and for generously commenting on each chapter draft along the way.

I thank Professor Chenoweth for discussing my dissertation project with me, for her generosity, availability, and time. I thank her for reading my chapter drafts and offering suggestions based on her expertise and knowledge of literature of the French Renaissance.

I would also like to thank Professor Schröder who has also supported me with guidance, encouragement, and recommendations during my time in the department. For teaching me how to teach, for their guidance, and for help with teaching materials while I have been in the dissertation writing process, I’d like to also thank Professor Christine Sagnier, and the Heads of Course that I have worked with in the Department of French and Italian: Murielle Perrier, Anne Ambrogelly, Anne-Catherine Aubert, and Rachel Hart. I am also grateful for the administrative support of RuthAnne Lavis, Kathleen Allen, Ronnie Pardo, and Crystal Arrington.

For perspective on the Spanish-side of my project, I would like to thank Professor Ronald Surtz with whom I took a graduate seminar in Spanish on Golden Age Poetry, and Professor Yolanda Martinez-San Miguel with whom I studied Colonial Spanish American Literature in Spanish while she was a visiting professor in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese at Princeton in 2009. Thank you also to Professor Marina Brownlee for leading the Renaissance Studies Colloquium series which I have greatly benefited and learned from during my time at Princeton. Special thanks to Bety, Laura, Dean, Phil, and Scott for their unconditional support and friendship. I thank Louis and
JoAnn for their teaching and mentorship at the University of Notre Dame during my undergraduate years there.
I dedicate this work with gratitude to my parents,
Alondra and Ignacio,
to my brother, Chris,
and to my grandmothers, Thaís and Catalina.

And as unconventional as it might be, I also thank God.
### Table of contents

**Abstract** ............................................................................................................................................................................. iii-iv

**Acknowledgements** .......................................................................................................................................................... v-vii

**Introduction** ...................................................................................................................................................................... 1

**Chapter 1.** “Representations of Political Rivalry in Rabelais’ *Gargantua* (1535)” ............................................................ 17

**Chapter 2.** “Linguistic and cultural rivalry in literary discourse: the French *Amadis de Gaule* (1540).” .............................................. 43

**Chapter 3.** “Lyric poetry as Political Tool: Clément Marot’s *Œuvres* (1538-1543) and Maurice Scève’s *Délie* (1544)” ................................................................. 85

**Chapter 4.** “Oracular Visions and Patriotic Commitment in Joachim Du Bellay’s *Songe* (1558)” ................................................................. 123

**Conclusion** ......................................................................................................................................................................... 150

**Bibliography** .................................................................................................................................................................... 157
Introduction

This project is a study of how French and Spanish rivalry was represented during the early sixteenth century in a few important texts of French Renaissance literature. The chapter progression aims to be both chronological and varied in genre. Chapter One is a rereading of François Rabelais’ prose novel *Gargantua* (1534, 1535) with its adversarial character Pichrocole as a French parody of Emperor Charles V. Chapter Two analyzes the French prologue to Herberay Des Essarts’ French translation/adaptation *Amadís de Gaul* (1540) after the Spanish version *Amadís de Gaula* (1496?) by Garci Rodriguez de Montalvo. The French prologue is analyzed as a liminal text, an opening signal, for its direct discourse rivaling the Spanish text, and the work in itself is an example in emulation. Chapter Three studies the symbols representing Charles V and Francis I in the court poetry of Clément Marot’s *Œuvres* (1538, 1543) and in Maurice Scève’s *Délie: Objet de plus haute vertu* (1544). These works of poetry are analyzed together to suggest a reading that considers how lyric poetry can be read as a political tool. Finally, Chapter Four is a reading of Joachim Du Bellay’s *Songe* (1558) as a backward glance and criticism of Charles V’s imperialism and heightened rivalry with France under Francis I.

The scope of this dissertation includes only some of the most prolific and well-known French Renaissance authors who were writing their work and having it printed between the years 1530 and 1560. The driving question behind the research in this dissertation is: how was French and Spanish rivalry, particularly the one dramatically played out between Francis I and Charles V, represented in the literature of Renaissance France? Francis I reigned as king of France during the years 1515-1547 and Charles V
was king of Spain from 1516-1556, as well as Holy Roman Emperor from 1519-1556. The study of important works printed in the thirty years between 1530 and 1560 will permit a focused and in-depth study of the historical context and forms of literary representation of these monarchs’ rivalry. The works of literature that will be studied are François Rabelais’s *Gargantua*, Herberay des Essarts’ *Amadis de Gaule* Book I, Clément Marot’s *Œuvres*, Maurice Scève’s *Délie: Objet de plus haute vertu*, and Joachim Du Bellay’s *Songe*.

First, it will be useful to give a brief overview of some of the major historical events that shaped Europe, and in a focused way for the purpose of this study, France and Spain in the early sixteenth century. In 1519, Emperor Maximilian died and his lands were inherited by his grandson Charles who had been the sovereign in Spain since the 1516 death of his maternal grandfather Ferdinand II of Aragon. The death of Maximilian and the consequent enlargement of the territories under the rule of Charles, that is, the House of Austria and the House of Bourgogne which included the Low Countries and Franche Comté, evoked fear in other major European leaders such as Francis I of France, Pope Leo X, and Henri VIII of England who sought to balance Charles’ growing power.

The scales continued to tip in Charles’ favor because of his success in offensive battles in Italy to gain even more territory. February 24th, 1525 stands out in history as the date on which French troops were defeated by Charles V’s army at Pavia and King Francis I himself was taken prisoner to a tower in Madrid. This was a humiliating blow to France and an episode that would mark the rivalry between the monarchs. Francis I refused the demands and remained captive until the following year 1526, when he reluctantly signed the Treaty of Madrid, drafted by French Ambassadors with little
cooperation from him. Francis I was to marry Eleonora who was Charles’ sister, and this too was supposed to mark a reconciliation between the monarchs. As yet another condition to his release, Francis had to hand over his two eldest sons, who were only seven and eight years old, as hostages. Upon his release Francis I did not keep the terms agreed upon in the Treaty of Madrid, which entailed that Francis relinquish lands in Italy, Flanders, Artois, Tournai and parts of France. Francis I signed but shortly refused to ratify the treaty; he led the League of Cognac (France, the papacy, Milan, Venice, and Florence) against Charles V upon returning to French territory, and his children were kept captive by Charles for four years.

The fighting between Charles V and Francis I after Francis’ release from captivity in Madrid continued fiercely. In 1527 Charles’ forces sacked Rome. Francis declared war and proceeded to invade Naples and Milan. Fighting escalated again until the Treaty of Cambrai (also known as the Paix des Dames) was negotiated by Francis’ mother Louise of Savoy and Charles’ aunt Margaret of Austria on August 3, 1529. This treaty temporarily established Spanish dominance in Italy and entailed Francis’ renunciation of his claims in Flanders and Artois. The concessions on the Spanish (Habsburg) side included to cease claims on Burgundy and to release the two French princes in exchange of money. France would later make three additional attempts to invade Italy and regain dominance there against Charles. The battles were won in Charles’ favor and in 1559 France would abandon this endeavor with the signing of the Treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis on April 3, 1559.

Several treaties were negotiated between Charles V and Francis I, mostly with the help of third parties such as Pope Adrian VI (Adrian of Utrecht), Pope Paul III, and
influential women such as Louise de Savoie, Marguerite de Navarre, and Margaret of Austria, but small ceasefires were short-lived. The 1529 Peace of Cambrai, the 1538 Truce of Nice, which was achieved with Pope Paul III’s intercession after Charles’ tried to invade Provence unsuccessfully, and the 1544 Peace of Crépy, which resulted after both camps retreated from fighting, are examples of brief hiatuses in the battles between the imperial armies of Charles V and armies in the service of Francis I.

Secondly, this study considers that the authors of the texts analyzed in Chapters One through Four were in one way or another involved in the court and political life of France under Francis I’s rule. The rivalry between Charles V and Francis I marked history, as well as literary texts written at the time. This study seeks to analyze how French Renaissance literature represented the rival Spanish king who then became Holy Roman Emperor, and how the battle for the Holy Roman Empire was played out in literature as well as in battlefields through rhetorical devices used to question the legitimacy, authority, and image of Charles V.

It will also be useful at this time to discuss the background and extent of association with the court of each of the authors studied here. It is worthwhile and pertinent information to include in the study, because it reveals the extent to which these authors had access to first-hand, courtly, political, humanist, and literary information that informed them and that appears in their literary production. The authors’ close association with court and political life also reveals the extent to which they were each educated and privileged to come into contact with other cultures. In their literary works, they mediate through language the impact of other ways to represent, to think, and to live. Their encounters with the culture of other kingdoms and other languages, through
literature and politics, resulted in that they were each able to incorporate, twist, gloss, and play with other forms of representation in their own literary work in the French language.

François Rabelais (c.1494-1553) acquired a deep humanist education, which coupled with his predilection for satire, linguistic inventiveness, and scatological humor, made his writing both highly visible to the restricted educated circles of society and highly targeted by the commanding groups that made up the court and the clergy. His satirical and scatological point of view was applied to untouchable subjects such as marriage, the monarchy, the church, the nature of absolute power, and authority (to name just a few prominent subjects). This approach made such figures nervous because Rabelais’ parodies resembled their reality too closely; consequently, they were quick to censor and condemn his work.

However, Rabelais also earned the respect and protection of powerful patrons who protected him from persecution, helped lift censorship from his writing, and advocated for him on all fronts. In the court, Guillaume Du Bellay and Marguerite de Navarre were among his staunchest allies; in the church, he was supported by Cardinal Jean Du Bellay, Bishop Geoffrey d’Estissac, and Cardinal Odet de Châtillon. He also managed to obtain a dispensation from Pope Clement VII to leave the Franciscan order.

François Rabelais often traveled with politicians as a personal physician and thus gained a perspective in politics and diplomacy that went beyond the territory of the French monarchy under which he lived. In the years preceding Gargantua, he lived in several bustling cities in France and in Italy (Rome), which kept his mind open and aware of political happenings and social currents.
In 1520, while he was a monk at Fontenay-le-Comte, he met and began a lasting friendship with Guillaume Budé (1467-1540), who was King Louis XII’s ambassador to Rome and secretary until 1515. Budé remained active in Francis I’s court and served as royal librarian. In 1531 Rabelais was living in Montpellier and in 1532 he moved to the lively trade city of Lyons, where many of the brightest minds and an active printing trade were located. There, he was in frequent contact with the humanist Dolet, the poet Mellin de Saint-Gelais, and the commander of the order of the Hospitaliers de Saint-Antoine-du-Bourg, Antonie du Saix, to name a few prominent figures.

The 1533 condemnation of his *Pantagruel* by the Sorbonne that October perhaps pushed him even closer to politics, because in January of 1534 he left France for Rome accompanying cardinal Jean du Bellay, then an advisor to Francis I, as his doctor and secretary. It seems (it is not certain because the title page of the only known copy of the first edition is missing) that it was in May of that same year when he returned to Lyons that his *Gargantua* may have been first printed. In 1535 Rabelais left Lyons, only four months after the Affair of the Placards, perhaps because of the particularly tumultuous time, to be closer to his protector in the church, bishop Geoffroy d’Estissac in Poitou who was appointed abbot and bishop by Francis I.

It was in the spring of 1535 that Charles V and his forces prepared at Cagliari to attack Tunisia in the summer. It is evident from his writing that Rabelais was among the humanists who were increasingly worried about Charles V’s ambition for territorial and ideological domination. By May of that year, Rabelais was back from Italy in Lyons and this is another possible date for the first printing of *Gargantua*. Guy Demerson recounts these chronological details and points out in the “Preface” to a modern edition of

---

1 Original publication date: 1532
*Gargantua* that although some chapters must have been written as early as 1533, the allusions to Charles V’s imperial policies could confirm the date of 1535.²

Herberay des Essarts and his French *Amadis de Gaule* represent another underlying theme that frames the tumultuous political and literary life of France during the Renaissance, as it is analyzed in this study: war and diplomacy are two of the major ways in which cultures clash with each other, but also get a sense of each other, and exchange between them happens. The history and traces of each party, namely the armies and courtiers of Francis I and those of Charles V, are forever marked in the other and these marks are visible in literature. In his “PROLOGUE DU TRANSLATEUR DU LIVRE D’AMADIS, D’ESPAGNOL EN FRANÇOYS” to the French *Amadis*, Des Essarts claims to have read the Spanish *Amadís* during a respite from his active involvement under Francis I in war against the forces of Charles V:

> Depuis deux ou trois ans en ça, que Mars s’est eslongné d’entre les princes Chrestiens, contraint laiser enrouiller ses armes et instrumens belliqueux à l’occasion de la treufve, qui est de present, entre le treschrestien et magnanime Roy vostre père, et Charles cinquiesme Empereur, estant par ce moyen reduict de l’impetueuse vie des armes, au bien du repos et loisir, me suis mis (pour eviter la trop pernitieuse oysiveté) à lire plusieurs sortes de livres, tant vulgaires qu’estranges. Entre lesquelz, m’estant tumbé es mains celluy d’Amadis de Gaule en langue Castillane […]³

Michel Bideaux writes, on the matter of Des Essarts’ and Francis I’s contact with the Spanish *Amadís de Gaule* by Garci Rodriguez de Montalvo:

---
Herberay aura peut-être voulu ainsi souligner sa présence en Espagne (parmi les prisonniers de Pavie) lorsque le futur connétable s’y rendit pour négocier la libération de François Ier.4

Further in the text, Michel Bideaux recalls a very interesting and plausible hypothesis, even if there is unfortunately no documented way to prove its occurrence:

King Francis I no doubt made the acquaintance of Amadís while a prisoner of war in Madrid, 1525-26.5

While this study will focus on the Prologue of the Amadis de Gaule Livre I, it should be noted that Herberay des Essarts was the translator-writer of the first eight Amadis volumes, which were translated between the years of 1540 and 1548. The numerous Amadis volumes that were produced by des Essarts and the printing presses within that span of time are due to des Essarts’ perseverance, the favorable reception of the Amadis as a chivalric romance in France, and the support of Francis I. In his 1545 dedication of Amadis de Gaule Livre V to Francis I, Herberay des Essarts writes: “Poursuyvant la cronicque d’Amadis, comme il vous a pleu me commander.”6

Not much background information is known about Herberay des Essarts, but Michel Bideaux’s “Introduction Générale” to his recent critical edition of Amadis de Gaule Livre I (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2006) provides useful historical, literary, and biographical information about him.7 We learn that des Essarts was originally from the Picardy region. He was by title a “commissaire ordinaire en artillerie” although he was not “d’œpée par ses origines”8. We also know from an undated document that he was

4 Ibid., note 3, p. 165.
5 Ibid., the statement that M. Bideaux recalls is by H. Thomas.
6 Ibid., p. 58.
7 Ibid., p. 56-65. The biographical, literary, and historical information regarding Des Essarts in this “Introduction” is from Bideaux’s Amadis “Introduction Générale”. Bideaux cites the work of L. Guillerm and M. Simonin as well, which has greatly contributed to our knowledge of Des Essarts and his texts.
8 Ibid., p. 56.
secretary to the duc d’Orléans, the youngest son of Francis I. Before his Amadis from Spanish into French appeared in publication in the year 1540, he was already a seasoned translator of Spanish having previously translated into French and published: Electra, tragedie de Sophocle in 1530 and Diego de San Pedro’s L’amant mal traicté de s’amye published in Paris by Sertenas in 1539.

A posthumous inventory of Herberay des Essarts’s library offers a glimpse of his literary preferences and his specific book possessions. He owned fifteen Spanish books and the main chivalric romances in French that appeared between the years 1540 and 1550. Bideaux provides some examples from the Spanish side, which are: “un chansonnier, compilation poétique manuscrite effectuée vers 1463, les Amadis IV-VII, le Primaleon, et ‘ung amadis de gresse espaignol couvert de papier’.”

Furthermore, we know that des Essarts had a literary connection to Michel Le Clerc, Mellin de Saint-Gelais, and Antoine Macault, because the three opening poems that precede his “Prologue” to Amadis Book I, are written by each of them respectively: “MICHEL LE CLERC, SEIGNEUR DE MAISONS, AUX LECTEURS.”, “MELLIN DE SAINCT GELAYS AU SEIGNEUR DES ESSARS, N. DE HERBERAY TRADUCTEUR DU PREMIER LIVRE D’AMADIS DE GAULE.”, and “ANTOINE MACAULT Secrétaire et vallet de chambre du roy, aux lecteurs.” Each poem praises des Essarts’ efforts and his superior achievement in relation to the Spanish language. While Michel Le Clerc was the least known out of the three mentioned, Mellin de Saint-Gelais was at the time official court poet and Antoine

9 Ibid.
Macault was valet de chambre of Francis I, poet, translator, and friend of Clément Marot.¹⁰

Clément Marot (1496-1544) was close to the French court because his father, Jean Marot, was court poet for Anne de Bretagne and also for King Francis I. Clément Marot began his own ascension at court as page to Nicolas de Neufville who was the King’s secretary. He then served King Francis I’s sister Marguerite d’Angoulême, who later became queen of Navarre. After the death of his father Jean Marot, Clément Marot became valet de chambre of Francis I. He held this privileged position in relation to Francis I until 1542, almost to the end of his life.

In his article “Poets of the Renaissance: Clément Marot”, Hilaire Belloc describes the historical context into which Marot was born:

> The discovery of America [sic] had preceded his birth for three or perhaps four years. His early manhood was filled with all that ferment, all that enormous branching out of human life, which was connected with the expansion of Spain; he was in the midst of the scarlet and the gold. A man just of age when Luther was first condemned, living his active manhood through the experience of the great battlefields in Italy, wounded (a valet rather than a soldier) at Pavia, the perpetual chorus of Francis I [...]¹¹

Like his father, Clément Marot was recognized as court poet, and because of his title, his erudition, his education, and his central position in the court, Marot was particularly aware of the unfolding of political events affecting France. Marot was one of the most privileged authors able to observe, analyze, interpret, and poetically represent in literature the workings of sixteenth-century French politics.

Maurice Scève (c. 1501-1560/64?) in the hub city of Lyons was in touch with the wide-array of political and social pressing issues affecting France and its surrounding geographical neighbors. As Françoise Charpentier writes in the “Preface” to her critical edition of Scève’s *Délie*, “Lyon dans les années 1530-1540 est un carrefour culturel où se fondent et se réactivent un ensemble d’influences complexes. Seconde ville de France pour l’imprimerie, foyer intellectuel intense où se croisent et se retrouvent poètes, savants, philologues, archéologues…”

We know from historical records that in January 1515 Maurice Scève père, who was a prominent doctor of laws, juge-mage, and échevin (county magistrate), was one of the few representatives who were sent by the échevins of Lyons to the court of the newly crowned François I to give an oath of loyalty to him on behalf of the city. It is also documented that one of Maurice Scève’s uncles, Michel Scève, was a royal tax collector (475) and his cousin Pierre Scève was an échevin of Lyons and Treasurer of the Aulmosne générale (474). Jean Scève, uncle of the poet, was seigneur de Montelier and was also elected échevin of Lyons (474). Furthermore, it is known that in 1539 Maurice Scève and Guillaume Mellier, a prominent and wealthy lawyer, were ordered (presumably by the court) to “faire un gect et form des ystoires qu’il conviendra faire” for the newly appointed Archbishop of Lyons, Hyppolyte d’Este, to enter Lyons on February 26th, 1539 (472). From this historical documentation highlighted by John Erig we can deduce that Maurice Scève and his family were connected to the royal court in a way that was privileged. Maurice Scève also famously claimed the discovery of Petrarch’s

---

Laura’s tomb in an Avignon church where Francis I will travel to, kneel, and write a poem to Laura’s glory.

We also know that he had knowledge of the Spanish language because his first printed book was a translation: La Deplourable fin de Flamete, elegante invention de Jehan de Flores espaignol, traducite en langue françoys, in 1535 by François Juste.\(^{14}\) The Sevillian author, Juan de Flores, was in France and in Italy “le plus populaire […] des auteurs espagnols qui dissertaient sur l’amour avec la subtilité d’un docteur en théologie. Son Tratado á su amiga de los amores de Grisel y Mirabella fut publié la première fois en France en 1527 sous le titre de Jugement d’Amour.”\(^{15}\) The scholar Albert Baur asserts however that La Deplourable fin de Flamete is a book that is not mentioned by sixteenth-century authors or brought up by Scève or others, which could perhaps mean that it was not well received in France. (36)

While literary criticism widely considers the prominent intertexts and ideological confluences in Scève’s Délie to be: Petrarch (the Délie is referred to as the first French canzoniere), the Italian trattati d’amore, the Dialogui d’Amore by Leone Ebreo, the Dialogi by Sperone Speroni, the Greek Anthology, the tradition of courtly love, the tradition of “dolce stil nuovo”, Propertius, Tibullus, Ovid, André le Chapelain’s De Amori libri tres, Plato, the Commentaires by Marsilio Ficino, neoplatonism, and Guy le Fèvre de La Boderi’s Discours de l’honneste amour\(^{16}\), not much critical attention has been given to how Scève might have incorporated the Spanish literary tradition in his

---

work, or Spanish themes and subjects, considering that he knew Spanish well enough to translate it and was familiar with Spanish discourses on love.

Finally, Joachim Du Bellay (c. 1522-1560) came from a noble family who lived in the rich Loire River Valley. He had a privileged education in law and the humanities, as well as a penchant and gift for poetic production. These elements colored the lens through which he observed and represented political power as he traveled with his influential cousin Jean Du Bellay, a diplomat and cardinal, on a journey to Rome. From the church and court political events that surrounded him on this mission, he drew many themes for his collections of poetry, namely the *Regrets*, the *Antiquités de Rome*, and the *Songe*. He was separated from France for four years, and reflected intensely upon French living and life in the poetry that he produced while away from his homeland. Yet, he remained politically connected to it through diplomatic networks. As one of the leaders of the *Pléiade* literary group, his writing was highly visible and it circulated among the erudite and most politically-active circles of the church and court.

Guillaume Du Bellay (1491-1543) was a writer, diplomat, and soldier under King Francis I. He held the title of “Seigneur de Langey”. On the military side, it is significant to mention that he fought in battles in Flanders and Italy and was imprisoned with Francis I after the loss of the battle at Pavia against the armies of Charles V in 1525. After their release, Guillaume Du Bellay played a very important diplomatic role in negotiations between Charles V and Francis I. He was in charge of drafting the 1529 Treaty of Cambrai between the two sovereigns. He was also active in negotiating among German princes to oppose Charles V. With regard to his authorship of texts, it is known that he had a privileged education at the Sorbonne, and that he wrote the *Ogdoades*, a historical
account of the rivalry between Charles V and Francis I. His *Ogdoades* survives only in fragments. The first half of this text was written in Latin and focuses on the years of 1515-1521, and the second half was written in French.

The privileged, multi-lingual, and highly politically-conscious milieux of these important authors of the French Renaissance make possible that their texts offer the symbols, images, allusions, and language that evoke and decode a particular political past and present for their contemporary readers. In the aforementioned texts, we also see the results of a cross-cultural contact that was spurred by the rivalry between France and Spain, and consequently the crossing of borders in Francis I’s struggle with Charles V’s growing empire. The struggle for power led to destructive battles, but it also led to the exchange of words and languages through diplomacy, intercultural literary curiosity and emulation, and in general a desire to be greater than the other. In the process of seeking superiority, however, the arch-rivals had to know each other well and it is the contact with another culture, other traditions, and other world views that in part drove and can be read in the these particular texts.

Finally, one of the contributions of this dissertation is an analysis of a slice of some of the major Renaissance texts written in French in relation to the culture of Charles V. A look into how French literature in part of the first half of the sixteenth century represented an “other” that was a political and cultural rival is of value for several reasons. It takes into consideration the power of literary representation when it pertains to history and it analyzes how artistic representation can morph historical events, people, memory, and perception.
In a wider sense, another contribution of this dissertation to the field of French Renaissance studies is the rapprochement of the French and the Spanish language and culture of the sixteenth century as a lens through which literature of this period could be read. Considering that the battles for territory and the expanding Holy Roman Empire threatened the sovereignty and specificity of otherwise independent kingdoms, it is worthwhile to analyze how literature responded to these changes in boundaries, the threat of a growing empire, and the confrontation of languages and literary traditions.

While literary criticism of French Renaissance literature considers the Italian Francesco Petrarca, Leone Ebreo, Sperone Speroni, the petrarquistes, Marsilio Ficino; the Roman Propertius, Tibullus, and Ovid; the Greek tradition, Plato, neoplatonism; and the medieval courtly love tradition in France as major points of reference and intertexts, this study considers how a few important texts of the French Renaissance allude to, include, translate, or parody their contemporary political Spanish rivals. Beyond the Italian, French, and Greco-Roman traditions scholars must keep looking to other relevant literary, linguistic, political, traditions to keep asking themselves how it is that French literature of the Renaissance responded to “la contamination et la transgression des textes [qui] correspondent à la mentalité exploratoire et expansionniste de cette époque.”

Francis I as king of France and Charles I of Spain (before he became Emperor Charles V) were in many ways political “equals” who were even both Catholic princes. However, this balance of power shifted when Charles I became Charles V and inherited such vast territories and eventually the seat of the Holy Roman Empire. This imbalance

---

caused a response in literature, and literature has memorialized this rivalry through rhetorical devices embedded within some of its most widely recognized texts.
Chapter 1. Representations of Political Rivalry between Francis I and Charles V in Rabelais’ *Gargantua* (1535)

« Dans le *Gargantua* de Rabelais va disparaître le monde arthurien et émergera le troisième personnage du théâtre de l’histoire contemporaine, le prétendant heureux à la couronne impériale, Charles Quint, ridiculisé sous les traits de Picrochole. »

Rabelais’ cornucopian explosion of lexical creativity, his inclination for phonic plays on words, and his knowledge and alchemy of diverse linguistic roots give his *Gargantua* a marked distinction regarding inventiveness and illustriousness in the realm of the French language. The 1530s and 1540s were particularly marked by linguistic awareness as it is signaled by the Villers-Cotterêts ordinance signed by Francis I in 1539, and Joachim Du Bellay’s *Deffence et Illustration de la langue françoys* published in 1549.

Rabelais’ texts display salient stylistic and lexical characteristics that made important contributions to the development of the French language. François Rigolot closely examines the different language registers in which Rabelais’ French weaves a story together. Considering the different editions of *Gargantua*, Rigolot proposes that,

Si le profil “définitif” du texte ne révèle pas ses avatars, il garde cependant la trace, les cicatrices parfois, du dialogue historique engagé entre l’écrivain et son public : corrections, « alongeails », remaniements divers.

In a similar, yet, non-diachronic sense, this chapter explores how not only does Rabelais’ language contain the scars of a historical dialogue between the writer and his reading

---

public, but also any one given edition of *Gargantua* bears the scars of the political and cultural rivalry between the French and Spaniards.

Also aware of the linguistic choices of Rabelais, Mireille Huchon points out that,

Rabelais a été attentif à tout ce qui se passait en Italie: il a choisi l’expérimentation de la langue littéraire comme langue artificielle, faite de toutes les variétés. Toutefois, sa tentative qu’il dut placer sous le patronage du roi n’est pas celle qui prévalut. Dans les années 1540, c’est une autre voie qui a les faveurs du public : celle du langage d’*Amadis de Gaule*, adaptée par Herberay des Essarts, puis des traductions de Jacques Amyot. Dans *Amadis* se retrouve l’esthétique de la langue prônée par le *Courtisan*: disposition en bon ordre, recours à des paroles propres, choisies, élégantes, bien composées et surtout accoutumées par l’usage du vulgaire, «une parfaicte Idée de nostre langue françoise». 20

Thus, language in the French *Amadis* of 1540 is used with awareness of it as a carrier not only of courtly but also monarchical and cultural prestige and superiority vis-à-vis other languages, and here, particularly in relation to the Spanish language. While the role of language in the French *Amadis* will be discussed in further detail in the following chapter, it is important to see that Rabelais’ *Gargantua* (1535) and Des Essarts’ *Amadis de Gaule* (1540) are published in a time of increased focus on French as a legitimate and strong enough vehicle for creative prowess and worthy literary expression.

Mireille Huchon’s quote, cited under the title of this chapter, points to the driving question of our analysis: are there enough rhetorical devices or signals in the text that could have facilitated certain political readings, parodies, and interpretations by readers contemporary to Rabelais? This study explores possible and even likely interpretations in light of widely known political events at the forefront of the minds of Rabelais’ readers, based on Hans Robert Jauss’ theory of interpretation, which proposes that readers

interpret meaning based on a “horizon of expectations” created by their preoccupations of the moment, or of their knowledge of the recent past.\textsuperscript{21} I align myself with reader-reception literary critics such as the German theorist Jauss who propose it is the writer and the reader that co-write the text according to each historical moment.

Just as language is by its very essence problematic and opaque, and we can consider that authors strategically distort lived experience and real knowledge coupled with their imagination, so too the reader comes to a literary work with lived experience and a memory of events as an interpretive tool that allows her or him to construct sense, even if that quest becomes frustrated or if it culminates in a \textit{noli me legere}\textsuperscript{22} disjunction between the work and the reader.

The theme of politics and princes, ubiquitous in \textit{Gargantua}, whether one is reading a serious genre or the notoriously frivolous genre of fiction, necessarily evokes the readers’ horizons of expectation through its lexical, symbolic, and thematic fields. Recent and current political memory is summoned by means of association, and it inevitably function as an interpretive tool. It would be difficult to argue the contrary: that a lexical field of war, princes, battles, politics, and monarchical rivalry coupled with evocative parodies would not stir up memories of the recent political situation in France and the rivalry with Charles V’s forces.

Historical, as opposed to strictly literary, sources are helpful in order to understand the context and the political climate in which \textit{Gargantua} was read. The year 1534 was turbulent in both France and Spain. In France, October 1534 unleashed a strong


\textsuperscript{22} As explained by Maurice Blanchot in “The Essential Solitude”, \textit{L’espace littéraire}. Paris: Gallimard, 1955.
wave of religious strife due to the Affair of the Placards. The posting of Protestant placards throughout Paris attacked the principal tenets of the orthodox Catholic Mass, thereby challenging the religion of the majority and the authority of the Catholic King. The radical dissenters made an attack on the religious and political front simultaneously. Panic and hysteria began in Paris and spread throughout provincial regions; arrests, accusations, and xenophobia crept out of the capital. Burnings of alleged heretics were approved by the King and both censorship and general repression by governing bodies such as the royal court, the university, and religious orders reached their highest levels.

The hybrid religious and political identity and perception of Francis I, urged him to take a strong stance against the upheaval caused by the Affair of the Placards. As R. J. Knecht notes, “His [Francis’ I] credibility as the Most Christian King would have suffered irreparable damage. He therefore chose the only sensible course of action: that of identifying himself with the persecution and giving it his full encouragement.”\(^{23}\) However, it is interesting to note that although he was forced to make this self-identification, “He did not watch the burnings, but left Paris as soon as the victims had done public penance.” (251).

One of the rhetorical devices that predominate in Rabelais’ lexical field is hyperbole, which functions to intentionally break the possibility of verisimilitude, thus giving the author freedom to challenge ideas in a volatile society. For example, choosing the theme of giants is already an exaggeration of human form; since however not all of the characters are giants, Rabelais’ gargantuan world straddles that of the fantastical genre of tall tales and the familiar everyday world that readers knew, a world rendered

very familiar through regional descriptions of actual French surroundings, villages, cities and customs.

The setting and characters of *Gargantua* are uncanny, because they are both familiar and strange. *Gargantua*’s world is a world that the reader can imagine because it contains a very concrete and sensory, regional French color brought to life by Rabelais’ literary realism:

[Gargantua] allait voir les bateleurs, trejectaires & theriacleurs, & considérait leurs gestes, leurs ruses, leurs soubressauts et beau parler, singulièremment de ceux de Chauny en Picardie, car ils sont de nature grands jaseurs & beaux bailleurs de balivernes.  

En cestui temps, qui fut la saison de vendanges, on commencement de Automne, les bergers de la contrée étaient à garder les vignes, et empêcher que les étourneaux ne mangassent les raisins. En quel temps les fouaciers de Lerné passaient le grand quarroi, menant dix ou douze charges de fouaces à la ville. (129)

Yet, its parameters also and equally comfortably cross outside the bounds of verisimilitude because of the exaggeration, rib-tickling repetition, and hyperbole that Rabelais relies on for comic effect and shock value. Rabelais’ realism, however, is not limited to the setting of his work or a depiction of local customs, regional speech patterns and behavior. It is a realism that extends to historical characters that become recognizable even if still slightly and artistically distorted into a fictional mold.

In “La réalité dans le roman de Rabelais et spécialement dans le *Gargantua*”, Abel Lefranc’s archival sixteenth-century research examined in tandem with Rabelais’ literary works demonstrates that Rabelais’ writing strategy included keen observations of sixteenth-century society and political events. Furthermore, due to his multiple talents

---

and skills, Rabelais was in contact with an intricate web of varied relations within the royal court, practitioners of medicine, the nobility, politicians, and the general population at large. When reading his prose, it is textually evident that:

Rabelais s’est associé avec une curiosité et une ferveur ininterrompues à toutes les préoccupations de son époque : aux entreprises du gouvernement royal, aux problèmes politiques posés, aux visées géographiques et coloniales, aux querelles morales, religieuses et même savantes, aux controverses sociales et mondaines.25

Lefranc gives the example of Rabelais’ *Tiers Livre* as particularly steeped in, and reactive to, its historical context, because it is here that the text is pulled into the whirlpool of “l’une des plus grandes batailles du siècle, à la fois morale et intellectuelle, que l’on ne saurait mieux désigner qu’en l’appelant « la Querelle des Femmes et du Mariage », vaste controverse qui remplit près de quinze années du milieu du XVIe siècle, a la veille des guerres de religion.” (72).

Lefranc gives the *Quart Livre* and the *Cinquième Livre* as yet additional examples that show Rabelais’ literary texts as particularly in tune with political and social currents, because they present Pantagruel’s voyages and adventures,

racontées avec une exactitude surprenante, d’une grande navigation et d’un voyage de découverte, et cela dans le moment où les explorateurs qui venaient de révolutionner la connaissance du monde excitaient décidément l’émulation jalouse des nations européennes, désireuses de coloniser les terres nouvelles. Durant cet ample récit, les données géographiques, maritimes, ou même ethnographiques fournissent la trame légère sur laquelle brode l’incomparable imagination de Rabelais. (72-3)

This chapter, in turn, examines Rabelais’ realism in *Gargantua*, specifically as it pertains to the historical rivalry between Charles V and Francis I.

---

As early as in the Prologue of Gargantua, the reader can perceive representations of French-Spanish rivalry. The narrator alludes to the Spanish cap as a symbol of bravery, and challenges it using a French proverb which serves to pin point it as an outward symbol empty of real value:

Car vous mêmes dites que l’habit ne fait point le moine ; et tel est vêtu d’habit monachal, qui au dedans n’est rien moins que moine ; et tel vêtu de cappe Hispanole, qui en son courage nullement affiert à Hispane.\(^\text{26}\)

In his critical edition, Guy Demerson translates this part of the “Prologue” into modern French as:

Car vous dites vous-mêmes que l’habit ne fait point le moine : et tel a revêtu un habit monacal, qui n’est en dedans rien moins que moine, et tel a revêtu une cape espagnole, qui, au fond du cœur, ne doit rien à l’Espagne.\(^\text{27}\)

Also, this section in the “Prologue” is translated into English by Sir Thomas Urquhart and Peter Le Motteux in their Gargantua and Pantagruel as:

Seeing yourselves avouch that it is not the habit that makes the monk, many being monasterially accoutred, who inwardly are nothing less than monachal; and that there are of those that wear Spanish caps who have but little of the valour of Spaniards in them.\(^\text{28}\)

The example is essentially trying to communicate a certain degree of disjunction between the apparent sense and the hidden sense in Gargantua. At the same time, it makes a cultural reference specific to Spanish dress that warns viewers not to take outward appearance as a symbol for bravery instead of courageous actions. This reference to the Spanish cap, which follows the French proverb “l’habit ne fait point le moine”, provides

---


an example of how neither the French nor Spaniards are immune to the vices of false appearance and the viewer (and reader) must always take a closer look.

The first line of Chapter I reads: “Je vous remets à la grande chronique Pantagrueline reconnaître la genealogie & antiquité dont nous est venu Gargantua” (15) This opening signal evokes the genre of the grande chronique, the genre that traces and documents the lineage of French Kings in a tongue-in-cheek way, given that the subjects of the lineage of this text are fictional, scatological giants. In this opening chapter, the narrator sets the tone of Gargantua as irreverent, ironic, and comic by poking fun at royal attempts, through the grandes chroniques, to establish direct bloodlines to the Trojans and up to the Biblical Noah, which is a strategy used to establish supremacy and legitimacy among rival royal families:

Plût à dieu qu'un chacun sût aussi certainement sa généalogie, depuis l’arche de Noë jusques à cet âge.

This important opening signal situates the reader in the world of Princes and Kings because it opens with, and plays upon, the typical elements that describe the special birth of a royal son and the education that royalty received.

As the opening quotation by Mireille Huchon points to, critics claim that the character Picrochole (Bitter Bile) in Gargantua is a figure that unfavorably represents the historical Charles V, the King and Emperor, with whom Francis I would engage in continuous competition and conflict. A previous reading by Lefranc proposed that the antagonistic Picrochole was a figure of Gaucher de Sainte-Marthe, who quarrelled with Rabelais’ father Antoine Rabelais; however, this reading has been dismissed by some critics on the basis that there are insufficient grounds from which to draw this interpretation:
Lefranc affirme que Picrochole ne saurait être que Gaucher de Sainte-Marthe, médecin personnel de l’abbesse; et que l’origine de cette “grande querelle héroï-comique” entre Gaucher et Antoine Rabelais vient d’un procès intenté par les riverains de la Vienne et de la Loire au sujet d’une affaire de pêcheries. Aujourd’hui, cette lecture est tombée en discrédit. Il reste que le Gargantua est notre premier roman régionaliste, et qu’il faudra bien un jour rendre compte des raisons qui ont pu pousser Rabelais à donner à son livre une telle couleur locale. (Defaux, note 1, p. 134.)

However, literary critics such as Gérard Defaux and Mireille Huchon have proposed ample evidence to put forth as a convincing idea that Charles V is parodied through the caricature of Picrochole. This is further maintained by the opening “Prologue de l’auteur” of Gargantua in which the grounding metaphor emphasizes critical thought and stresses a curious and meditative approach toward interpreting not only texts, but also “l’état politique”:

A l’exemple d’icelui [Galen], vous convient être sages, pour fleurer, sentir & estimer ces beaux livres de haute gresse, legiers ou prochas, & hardis à la rencontre. Puis, par curieuse leçon, & meditation frequente, rompre l’os, & sucer la substantifique mouelle- c’est-à-dire ce que j’entends par ces symboles Pythagoriques-, avec espoir certain d’être fait escors et preux à la dite lecture. Car en icelle bien autre goût trouverez, & doctrine plus absconce, que vous revelera de tresaults sacrements & mysteres horrificques, tant en ce que concerne notre religion, que aussi l’état politique & vie oeconomique.  

Rabelais’ proximity to and awareness of the most salient political events in his circles of society as well as his native France in the international sphere were very significant in his life and thought. Particularly influential was his close relationship with Jean Du Bellay, Bishop of Paris and then archbishop and cardinal, who was his patron, his patient, and his

most important protector in a volatile political environment that had little tolerance for criticism, due to increasingly violent religious conflicts that threatened church authority and royal authority in tandem.

In his chapter “Emperor Charles V in the French Historical Tradition”, David Potter asserts that:

The role of the du Bellays in formulating a coherent French propaganda attack on the emperor was central. By 1536, a standard narrative of the conflict had emerged in the speeches and writings of French diplomats. In May 1536, Cardinal Jean de Lorraine presented the Pope with ‘la veritable histoire abregée’ of the wars. At the same time, Guillaume du Bellay drew up a long riposte along the same lines which refuted the emperor’s Rome declaration point by point, the main aim of which was to denounce the emperor as the cause of the wars within Christendom. What was more, the emperor had shown himself to be cruel in his treatment first of Francis and then of his children in captivity. Part of the du Bellay ‘campaign’ against the emperor, if so it can be called, was to rally the support of the German princes and link their fears of Charles’s intentions to French interests.

---

30 Donald M. Frame writes: “It was probably that summer of 1533, when the King was in Lyons with his court for the marriage of his eldest son, the future Henry II, to Catherine de Medici, that Rabelais met one of his greatest protectors, Jean du Bellay. Then in his forties, Du Bellay was Bishop of Paris, and in time would become an archbishop and cardinal: an able highly cultivated diplomat sympathetic to peaceful Church reform and highly esteemed by the King [...] Suffering so badly from sciatica that he could hardly endure the trip even by litter, he [Du Bellay] invited Rabelais to come with him as his doctor, and Rabelais accepted.” Rabelais: A study. New York and London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, p. 13.


33 « L’empereur a esté prouocateur, tant en la precedente guerre, qu’en celle cy [...] S’il a grand desir, comme il dit, & veult que nous croyons, de mettre la Christienté en bonne paix & repos, pourquoi n’en fait il foy ? pourquoi ne monstre il que c’est la vray fin ou il tend ? pourquoi ne souffre il, puis qu’il veult d’attribuer l’honneur & gloire d’un si grand bien, que le profit en redonde à autruy ? » / « The emperor, both in the previous and this war, provoked it [...]. If he really wishes, as he says and wants us to believe, to bring peace to Christendom, why does he not give us proof? Why does he not show us that this is his true objective? Why does he permit, since he wants the honour and glory to redound to his own credit, that they go to another?” Ibid., fol. 82r, 92r. Potter, note 10, p. 136.

Guillaume du Bellay formulated numerous letters to the princes of the Empire to this end.\textsuperscript{35}

Furthermore, Rabelais’ allusions to real historical events in his fiction, such as: the rebellion of the \textit{Ducs de Bretagne} against France at the end of the XV century, the battle of Saint-Aubin-du-Cormier in which Charles VIII defeats their armies, of “Isabella”, the city founded in 1493 by Christopher Columbus in Haiti, and Charles V’s expedition against Tunis and Barberousse in June 1535\textsuperscript{36}, show that history was a subject at the forefront of his mind.

Sixteenth-century readers of \textit{Gargantua} would recognize a parody of Charles V in the character Picrochole. The characters of Rabelais, if considered “images” crafted by him, are complex and ample to the point of straddling two positions simultaneously: the position of universality that, as Mikhail Bakhtin argues, makes them resist being pinned down to a stable and precise meaning because they are,

\begin{quote}
empreintes d’une sorte de “caractère non officiel” indestructible, catégorique, de sorte qu’aucun dogmatisme, aucune autorité, aucun sérieux unilatéral ne peuvent s’harmoniser avec les images rabelaisiennes, résolument hostiles à tout achèvement définitif, à toute stabilité, à tout sérieux limité, à tous terme et décision arrêtés dans le domaine de la pensée et de la conception du monde.\textsuperscript{37}
\end{quote}

Yet, he admits that to a certain extent precise readings are possible, that the work with certain flexibility may be “déchiffrée”:

\begin{quote}
Oui, Rabelais est difficile. En revanche, son œuvre, si elle est convenablement déchiffrée, permet de faire la lumière sur la culture comique populaire vieille de plusieurs
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{36} See Defaux, notes 5 and 6, p. 156 and note 9, p. 166.
\textsuperscript{37} Mikhail Bakhtine in \textit{L’oeuvre de François Rabelais et la culture populaire au Moyen Age et sous la Renaissance}. Paris : Gallimard, 1982, p. 10.
milliers d’années, et dont il a été l’éminent porte-parole dans la littérature. (10)

Here, Bakhtine allows for the existence of the other side of the coin, which is the possibility of multiple yet concrete interpretations and readings in Rabelais. While he argues that “la culture comique populaire” can be read in his works, we can also see that political culture and political figures can be read in Gargantua.

In “La réalité dans le roman de Rabelais et spécialement dans le Gargantua”, Abel Lefranc argues similarly that Rabelais can be considered in a way “un miroir du temps” because of his interest, capacity, and involvement with the affairs of the royal government, with important political figures, and due to his engaged awareness of societal problems; this would have certainly informed, and is recognizable in, his creative work. After all, there would be no laughter if the recognition of something concrete and within the horizons of the reader were permanently and inflexibly elusive. Underneath the laughter that accompanies that of Rabelais, the reader laughs because a twisted image is only barely twisted and still recognizable as something that rings true to the reader. The figures in Rabelais are uncanny, because they can both seem familiar and strange, except that instead of causing fear, they evoke laughter, which is what situates them in the realm of parody.

The familiarity or truth element in Rabelais’ images, that which Lefranc characterizes as the “méthode et scrupule de vérité” in Rabelais’ work, is at the root of his comic strategy; it is the tightrope upon which he dances from one end of the book to

---

38 See Abel Lefranc in « La réalité dans le roman de Rabelais et spécialement dans le « Gargantua », Rabelais : Études sur Gargantua, Pantagruel et le Tiers Livre. Paris : A. Michel, 1953, p. 69-70 : Rabelais « s’est associé avec une curiosité et une ferveur ininterrompues à toutes les préoccupations de son époque : aux entreprises du gouvernement royal, aux problèmes politiques posés, aux visées géographiques et coloniales, aux querelles morales, religieuses et même savantes, aux controverses sociales et mondaines, etc. ». 
the other with different degrees of exuberance. As Lefranc puts it, “D’un bout à l’autre de son œuvre, jusque dans les épisodes qui semblent inspirés par la fantaisie la plus étourdissante, il n’a jamais perdu de vue la trame réelle qu’il avait une fois choisie et annoncée, fut ce en raillant.” (74)

In the notes of his critical edition, Gérard Defaux draws several parallels between Picrochole and Charles V to provide evidence that this character could have been recognized as a representation of the ambitious and quarrelsome King. This chapter provides further reasons to validate this reading in view of the historical context in which *Gargantua* was read, highlighting French-Spanish rivalry, and considering French historical memory. First, it is worthwhile to define the distinction between the literary tropes of satire, caricature, and parody in order to succinctly identify the strategy that Rabelais works with as a rhetorical device in this text.

In his book, *Rabelais: A Study*, Donald Frame offers the following distinction: Satire is “a comic representation – usually exaggerated – of some human vice or folly with the aim of exposing, discrediting, and perhaps amending it”. Caricature is “when comic deformation is prominent and ridicule is a major aim”. Parody, then, is perceived “when the factor of imitation stands out”. Thus, we can consider that while parody can contain elements of satire and caricature, its distinguishing feature is that it is primarily imitative. 39

One way in which Charles V is parodied as the character of Picrochole is as the antithesis of the protagonist *Gargantua*. It is historically known through documentation, and portrait paintings made by Titian 40, that Charles V had a protruding jaw. According

---

39 p. 119.
to the historian James Murray, based on the accounts contained in the relations of the
Venetian ambassadors,

*In 1525*, while Charles was still in the prime of youth, Gaspari informs us, ‘that the emperor was of middling stature, neither tall nor short; of fair complexion, pale, rather than ruddy. His body was well formed, his legs very handsome, and his arms good. His nose was a little aquiline, his eyes keen; his aspect was grave, but without any indications of cruelty or severity. *The only faults which could be found with his person were his chin and lower jaw, which were larger and longer than suited the general appearance. The result of this defect was that Charles could not join the teeth together, so as to shut the mouth completely.*’

The defect that would not allow Charles V to eat properly aligns him with the reserved Pichrochole and puts him in direct opposition to the food and wine-loving protagonist Gargantua. In Chapter XXXVI: “Comment Gargantua mangea en salade six pelerins”, this key scene demonstrates the comic effect of exploiting consumption in epic proportions:

Et comme ils délibéraient ainsi, Gargantua les mit avecques ses laitues dedans un plat de la maison, grand comme la tonne de Cisteaux, et avecques huile, et vinaigre, et sel, les mangeait pour soi refraîchir devant souper, et avait jà engoullé cinq des pelerins.

No subject is spared and dimensions are magnified:

Je m’en vais doncques (dit-il) pisser mon malheur. Lors pissa si copieusement que l’urine trancha le chemin aux pelerins, et furent contraints passer la grande boire. Passant de là par l’orée de la Touche, en plein chemin tombèrent tous, excepté Fournillier, en une trappe qu’on avait fait pour prendre les loups à la trainée.

---

41 See Murray 341, my italics.
42 See Desrosiers-Bení for this particular food-based characterization.
43 pg. 189.
44 pg. 191.
Reportedly, Charles V, “drank seldom” and as a practicing catholic was advised by his confessors to be moderate and reserved with food and drink.\(^{45}\) As Diane Desrosiers-Bonin, points out in *Rabelais et l’humanisme civil* with regard to the characterization of Picrochole, there is a direct correlation of food/wine consumption with virtue. The protagonists love food and wine, and the antagonists deprive themselves or are deprived of it:

> Au bon Gargantua qui boit et offre à boire répondent le tyrannique Picrochole et ses hommes qui, assoiffés, ne boivent pas. L’antagonisme des personnages est donc accentué par la relation contradictoire qu’ils entretiennent par rapport au vin [...] A l’issue de cette prise de bec [la guerre picrocholine dans *Gargantua*], les gens de Grandgousier se régalent de fouaces et de beaux raisins alors que les fouaciers se rendent chez Picrochole, « davant boire ny manger », précise le narrateur (*G*, 26, 122).\(^{46}\)

The all-consuming mouths of Grangousier and Gargantua are in a sense representative of virtue and a healthy appetite, whereas Picrochole and his people are unable to freely partake in the consumption of food and wine. Charles V’s defective jaw, which later became known as the “Habsburg jaw”\(^{47}\) is, like the character Picrochole, the antithesis of Gargantua’s virtue and his perfectly able mouth.

Of historical and political significance is that after January 23, 1516, as R.J. Knecht states in his chapter “The Uneasy Peace (1515-1520)”,

> The death of Ferdinand [of Aragon] seriously altered the balance of power in Europe. The Archduke Charles, who already ruled the Netherlands and Franche-Comté, suddenly acquired the kingdoms of Castile, Aragon, and Naples. He became overnight France’s most powerful

\(^{45}\) Murray, 341-48.
\(^{46}\) See Desrosiers-Bonin, p. 64.
\(^{47}\) See De Armas Wilson, p. 390.
Francis I and Charles V’s mounting conflicts of interest and differences culminated in a conference held at Montpellier on May 1, 1519, with the hope of discussing the sources of discord. However, the conference failed due to unfriendly accusations and interrupted debates over rightful and legitimate ownership of Navarre. Alain d’Albret argued that Navarre had been held by his ancestors for four centuries and the Spaniards argued that it had been annexed by Ferdinand of Aragon after Jean d’Albret’s excommunication, and therefore belonged to Charles. (66)

This May conference made it clear that the deaths of Ferdinand of Aragon (1516) and later that of Emperor Maximilian (1519) were events that intensified the rivalry between Francis I and Charles V. These events were political earthquakes that shook and shifted the balance of power; they brought about the expansion of territories for Charles after Ferdinand’s death, and later, a race for the throne to the Holy Roman Empire which ensued after the death of Emperor Maximilian.

The imperial throne was bestowed upon an individual by the vote of seven electors: the archbishop of Mainz, of Cologne, of Trier, the King of Bohemia, the elector-palatine, the Duke of Saxony, and the margrave of Brandenburg. Even though the Habsburgs had been in control of the Empire, there was no stipulation that excluded other Kings to come forth as candidates for the imperial throne; this set off a competitive, shrewd, and expensive race between Charles V and Francis I as they each sought to buy votes and curry favor with the elite and greedy electorate who benefited from this rivalry.

---

49 I am indebted to R.J. Knecht’s explanation of imperial elections, how they function, and what led up to the final election of Charles V as Emperor. See the chapter “The uneasy peace” in Francis I, pp. 71-82.
Francis I was slyly led to believe that he could win the favor of the majority and of key German politicians because: both the Archbishop of Trier’s chancellor and a humanist in service of the Archbishop of Mainz promised their superior’s votes for Francis I, the margrave of Brandenburg promised his vote in exchange of Princess Renée’s marriage to the margrave’s son and 75,000 écus, and a similar arrangement was concerted with the elector-palatine. In addition, the Dukes of Lorraine, Guelders, Brunswick-Lüneburg and Holstein, key German princes, all accepted pensions from Francis I. (71)

Francis I was Charles V’s most longstanding contender. Francis I had to fight on several grounds to challenge the insider Habsburg candidate: he sought to balance the power that Charles V already held over the Netherlands, Franche-Comté, Spain and Naples and to keep him from acquiring more territories, he worked to raise, allocate, and spend large sums of money to impress and acquire voting alliances, and he needed to win German public opinion which was against him. Antagonism for everything French was bred and publicized through sermons and broadsheets by Habsburg supporters and German banks were not allowing French money in. (75)

Even despite Francis I’s efforts to win the election by matching the large sums of money being sent to the electorate (laboriously and through dangerous routes as clandestine cash, due to bank interference), and despite his arguments that France was more like Germany than Spain, and that he was better able to defend Christendom against the Turks than his young and geographically distant rival, Francis I was not elected. (76) The June 8th 1519 imperial election was dubious at best, and took place in the city of Frankfurt which was strategically surrounded by the Swabian league army. As Knecht
writes, “The electors were told that this was for their protection, but were also made to understand that their safety depended on them choosing the right man.” (76) The electoral procedure was also carried out under the pressure of a stifling summer heat and a situation in which plague was running rampant. In addition, no foreigner was allowed into the city. (76)

Shortly after the election, there was a very brief period of peace and alliance-building on both sides. It was not until the spring of 1521 that military confrontations took place in the contested regions of Navarre and the Netherlands.\textsuperscript{50} Both confrontations proved disadvantageous for French forces. In Navarre, Francis I’s army of men is chased out by Spanish forces. In the Netherlands, there was no French victory either. By winter of the same year, a treaty aimed to solidify a three-way alliance between Charles V, Leo X and Henri VIII.

Imperial and pontifical troops seized power over Milan and proclaimed Francesco II Sforza as duke. Three French attempts to win back Milan failed. The final offensive by French troops, which took place in 1524-1525 ended badly with the notorious defeat at Pavia on February 25, 1525. François I was held captive in Madrid and on January 13, 1526 he is cornered to sign an over-ambitious treaty designed by Charles V in which he must resign to losing Milan, renounce Flanders and Artois, he must surrender to Bourbon, commander of the imperial army, and abandon Bourgogne. This overwrought treaty was nevertheless nullified after Francis I’s release, and many European powers supported Francis I thereafter. The \textit{Ligue de Cognac} of May 22, 1526, unified Clement VII, the

Venetians, and several Italian princes for the French cause.\textsuperscript{51} In a sense, Charles V’s ambition backfired, and it only served to frighten other European influential figures into recognizing the need to check and balance Charles V’s growing power. Balance of power politics shifted in favor of the French king, even though he had not received the backing he needed at the time of the imperial elections.\textsuperscript{52}

Despite the eventual truce signed between Clement VII (Francis I’s ally) and Charles V, the Imperial Army marched into Rome in May 1527, the event historically known as the sack of Rome. This event opened up hostilities between Francis I and Charles V, yet again, this time the French king declared war and the territory of Naples was highly contested. It was not until 1529 that battles cooled and the conflict reached calm again with the Treaty of Barcelona signed in May of the same year between the Pope and the Emperor.

Relations between the Emperor and Francis I, slightly improved with the Treaty of August 3, 1529 which reconfigured the conditions set forth in the Treaty of Madrid and stipulated that Francis I would in fact keep Bourgogne; finally, a ransom of 2 million écus was proposed for the liberation of the French king’s sons (held captive in their father’s place). What followed is known as the peace of Cambrai, which brought close to seven years of relative tranquility on this front, and came about after Spanish hegemony was officially instituted in Italy, and French-Spanish relations were somewhat repaired after Pavia through a renegotiated treaty.\textsuperscript{53}

\textsuperscript{51} Lapeyre, p. 145.
\textsuperscript{52} I am indebted to Henri Lapeyre’s historical account of what led up to Francis I’s capture and defeat at Pavia and what occurred shortly thereafter. See p. 144.
\textsuperscript{53} For a more detailed explanation of these historical events, please see Lapeyre, p. 146.
This is the historical context in which *Gargantua* was read, and the years that led up to the Peace of Cambrai in 1529, were fresh in the readers’ minds in 1535. That Charles V held the French king, and his sons, captive in Madrid after the battle at Pavia was an unforgivable event. M.A. Screech writes,

> Ever since his release from captivity after the defeat of Pavia, Francis I’s rivalry with Charles V took on a new dimension: Charles was convinced of French treachery; Francis was embittered by the crippling ransom imposed upon the kingdom and the obligation to send his two oldest children as hostages to the imperial court.⁵⁴

Furthermore, precisely the year 1535 marked a re-eruption of conflict between Francis I and Charles V after the death of the Duke of Milan, Francesco Sforza, in October 1535, over territory. Charles V invaded Provence and Picardie but was held off. It took the intervention of Paul III, and moderated negotiations between the two sovereigns in Nice, to establish what is known as the Ten Year Truce on June 18, 1538.⁵⁵

While some critics point out that Picrochole can be read as a comic parody of numerous historical figures blinded by the ambition of world domination as well as erratic and hyperbolic behavior and an inherent irrationality; the text closely aligns the contemporary Charles V to the territory-seeking character of Picrochole. We must note the fact that the quarrel in *Gargantua* takes place between contemporary neighbors and one of them seeks to take over all the territory of the world. A study of Chapter XXIII “Comment les habitants de Lerné par le commandement de Picrochole, leur roi, assaillirent au dépourvu les bergers de Gargantua”, Chapter XXXI “Comment certains gouverneurs de Picrochole, par conseil précipité, le mirent on dernier péril”, and Chapter

---

⁵⁵ Lapeyre, p. 147-8.
XLIII entitled “Comment Grandgousier traita humainement Toucquedillon prisonnier” offer examples that support this reading.

Chapter XXIII opens with the introduction to the main antagonist who is: Picrochole, “tiers de ce nom”. This precision is a playful wink from the narrator, all other evidence considered as pointing to Charles V, alluding to the numerical slippage that occurred in reference to the Emperor’s name as occupying two numerical spots as both Charles I and Charles V. Since Picrochole is also introduced in the setting of the “Capitole”, Guy Demerson suggests that it is an imitation of the “Capitole de Rome”, the center of parliamentary life, thus “Picrochole se prend pour le successeur des Empereurs de Rome.” In this way, Picrochole is also closely aligned with Charles V.

Furthermore, in this chapter, the phrase “plus outre” appears for the first time, which is of significance because as Défaux notes, it draws a parallel between Picrochole and Charles V through an imitative adoption of the motto of Charles V which is “PLVS OULTRE”, an utterance that is found throughout the book thereafter, and that returns, as he notes, as a sort of “refrain”.

Lequel incontinent entra en courroux furieux, et sans plus outre se interroger quoi ne comment, fit crier par son pays ban et arrière ban, et que un chacun sur peine de la hart, convint en armes en la grand place, devant le château, à heure de midi. (135)

This imitative quality tying the Emperor’s speech to that of Picrochole closely aligns them on linguistic grounds, creating a phonic yet distorted echo between the two figures because of the clash in context in which the phrase appears.

Chapter XXIX “La teneur des lettres que Grandgousier escripvoit à Gargantua” is made up of a letter written that characterizes Picrochole as an agressor who seeks lands that do not belong to him. This is another point in Gargantua where it would not be difficult for the reader to think of Picrochole as Charles V and Grandgousier as Francis I. The situation is very similar to the situation that Francis I found himself in when Charles V invaded France, and was bent on conquering lands in Italy, well beyond the vast territories that he had already inherited:

… Ma deliberation n’est de provocquer, ains de apaiser; d’assaillir, mais defendre; de conquerter, mais de garder mes feaulx subjectz et terres hereditaires, ès quelles est hostillement entré Picrochole, sans cause ny occasion, et de jour en jour pourusuit sa fureuse entreprinse avecques exces non tolerables à personnes libres.

Je me suis en devoir mis pour moderer sa cholere tyranicque, luy offrent tout ce que je pensois luy povoir estre en contentement, et par plusieurs foys ay envoyé amiablement devers luy pour entendent en quoy, par qui et comment il se sentoit oultragé, mais de luy n’ay eu responce que de voluntaire deffiance et que, en mes terres, pretendoit seulement droict de bien seance. Dont j’ay cogneu que Dieu eternel l’a laissé au gouvernail de son franc arbitre et propre sens, que ne peult estre que meschant sy par grace divine n’est continuellement guidé, et pour le contenir en office et reduire à cogoignoncse me l’a icy envoyé à molestes enseignes. […]\(^58\)

The negative and affirmative structure of the first sentence above is a way for Grandgousier to draw a portrait of himself in contrast to Picrochole. Here, he is portraying himself as peaceful, only acting in defense of his kingdom and his subjects, and concerned with defending the lands that he has inherited by birthright. The first paragraph is a statement about political sovereignty and an accusation of infringement on

---

\(^{58}\) p. 236.
the rights of free people, or sovereign kingdoms. This is a grave offense that was carried out by Charles V’s armies in an effort to enlarge his Holy Roman Empire. Picrochole is depicted as someone who has lost his reason and who needs the help of someone who is enlightened in order to be again aligned with the will of God and reasonable, just action. Since both Francis I and Charles V were “Christian princes”, the discourse about the necessity of divine enlightenment would have been fitting.

The phrase:

Passerez par l’étroit de Sybille, & là érigerez deux colonnes plus magnifiques que celles de Hercule, à perpétuelle mémoire de votre nom (167)

found in Chapter XXXI, “Comment certains gouverneurs de Picrochole, par conseil précipité, le mirent on dernier péril”, appears during a scene in which Picrochole’s followers speak to him. M.A. Screech reads this allusion as Rabelais mocking the unbridled ambitions of Charles V, considering that the Emperor’s emblem was precisely composed of two herculean columns supporting his famed motto “PLVS OULTRE”.59 The words “deux colonnes plus magnifiques que celles de Hercule” are powerfully evocative of Charles V’s famous emblem, and the comparative structure “plus magnifiques que” underline the unbridled ambitious nature of the speaker who boldly seeks to rival and surpass the mythical Hercules.

The main theme of Chapter XXXI is that of Picrochole’s fantastically ambitious plans of world domination. It is in this chapter that critics have been able to conclude that Picrochole’s political ambition and plans of imperial expansion as a distorted but recognizable mirror image of Charles V. This comic and hyperbolic comparison was relevant to readers contemporary to Rabelais especially because Picrochole is adamant

59 See Defaux, note 6, p. 166.
about conquering Constantinople and overcoming “Turcs et Mahumetistes”, in the same way that Charles V was adamant about dissolving the political alliance between Francis I and the Ottoman Empire. Picrochole’s caricature is depicted by Rabelais under an avalanche of lands the covetous Emperor seeks to rule over with little discrimination and expresses a particular and prominent disdain for Ottoman Turks:

Allons nous, dit Picrochole, rendre à eux le plus tôt, car je veux être aussi empereur de Thebizonde. Ne tuerons-nous pas tous ces chiens Turcs et Mahumetistes?

The “aussi” in this passage is the word that this caricature turns upon, the hyperbolic effect created by Picrochole’s expressed desire of all of the lands that his opponents have already taken back, and the addition that he “also” wants an additional empire. Since he does not single out any other group in a particularly pejorative manner, it evokes to the contemporary reader the salient political tensions that existed on the international sphere as Francis I tried to balance Charles V’s power by securing for himself Turkish allies.

Furthermore, as Defaux notes, in this chapter Picrochole uses the same excuse as Charles V to explain his expansive and invasive military decisions: a fight for the Holy Land and a battle against the infidel for the sake of Christianity.

De là prendrons Candie, Cypre, Rhodes & les îles Cyclades, & donnerons sus la Morée. Nous la tenons ! Saint Treignan, dieu garde Hierusalem ! car le Soubdan n’est pas comparable à votre puissance ! Je (dit-il) ferai doncques bâtir le temple de Solomon.

Chapter XLIII entitled “Comment Grandgousier traïta humainement Toucquedillon prisonnier” marks a pointed emphasis on Grandgousier, who is the foil of
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60 Ibid, note 28, p. 166.
Picrochole, and his behavior as an exemplary King in his humane treatment of prisoners. The focus on this particular virtue, stands in sharp contrast to Charles V’s humiliating and merciless imprisonment of Francis I as well as of his sons. The title of this chapter would have certainly evoked this memory well within the horizons of Renaissance readers in France. This episode highlights that the chivalrous code of conduct applies even in dealings with the enemy, and it places as a more grievous breach of this code to highlight Grandgousier’s example in the Chapter heading, he who treated Toucquedillon, Picrochole’s military chief, with compassion, in sharp contrast with Charles V who did not respect this code with another King. Toucquedillon is an important character because he is the captain in charge of artillery on behalf of Picrochole’s army; he represents the strong arm of war. However, unlike the historical Charles V and his imprisonment of Francis I in Madrid as well as his request of an exorbitant ransom, Grandgousier acts magnanimously and generously toward his prisoner. Unlike Charles V who asked for a ransom for Francis I’s sons, this king does not seek ransom:

> Allez-vous-en au nom de dieu suivez bonne entreprise; remontrez à votre roi les erreurs que connaîtres, & jamais ne le conseillez ayant égard à votre profit particulier : car avecques le commun est aussi le propre perdu. Quand est de votre ranczon, je vous la donne entièrement, & veux que vous soient rendues armes & cheval. Ainsi faut-il faire entre voisins et anciens amis, vu que cette notre différence, n’est point guerre proprement, comme Platon lib. 5. de rep. voulait être non guerre nommée, ains sédition, quand les Grecs mouvaient armes les uns contre les autres.

Grandgousier proposes in the sentence “Ainsi faut-il faire...” what the code of honor should be. It is particularly striking that he mentions the words “voisins et anciens amis” because this is even more evocative of France’s Spanish neighbors and historical ties.
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64 Ibid, note 5, p. 226.
65 p. 227.
That Pichrochole can be recognized and read as a parody of Charles V is significant, because it makes of Rabelais’ *Gargantua a lieu de mémoire* \(^{66}\), an artistic space in which French-Spanish rivalry is memorialized. *Gargantua*, as a work of literature, incorporates history within its playful imaginary, its abundant lexical fields, and its characterizations. This is what distinguishes it from a *lieu d’histoire*. According to Pierre Nora, the difference is as follows:

*Lieux de mémoire* are created by a play of memory and history, an interaction of two factors that results in their reciprocal overdetermination. To begin with, there must be a will to remember. If we were to abandon this criterion we would quickly drift into admitting virtually everything as worthy of remembrance. One is reminded of the prudent rules of old-fashioned historical criticism, which distinguish between ‘direct sources’, intentionally produced by society with a view to their future reproduction— a law or a work of art, for example—and the indiscriminate mass of “indirect sources”, comprising all the testimony an epoch inadvertently leaves to historians. Without the intention to remember *lieux de mémoire* would be indistinguishable from *lieux d’histoire*. \(^{67}\)

Thus, *Gargantua*, can be considered a comic French will to remember, and a response to political events, chronicles, and works of literature that glorified Charles V as an uncontested, impeccable, chivalric hero.

\(^{66}\) I am borrowing this term from the historian Pierre Nora, particularly as he defines it in “Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire” [1984]. *Representations* 26, Spring 1989, 7-25.

\(^{67}\) p. 19.
Chapter 2. Linguistic and cultural rivalry in liminary discourse: the French *Amadis de Gaule* (1540)

A cross-cultural study of the prologues of the *Amadís de Gaula* in Spain and its French translation *Amadis de Gaule* in France necessitates the consideration of the content and structure of the thresholds through which readers of one or both of these versions would have to pass; namely their respective paratexts. The *paratexte*, according to Genette, is made up of two subcategories that together constitute it, one being the *pérétexte*, which would include the text published about and within the volume either preceding or following the work, the other being the *építexte* or external commentary made elsewhere (*paratexte* = *pérétexte* + *építexte*). This section will focus on the *pérétexts* published within Book I of both versions, in order to evaluate their effect in ushering the *Amadis* romance into the hispanophone and francophone cultures of Spain and France.

The Spanish *Amadís* came out of Spanish presses almost at the same time as Christopher Columbus first reached the Americas in 1492 and his ensuing return to Spain. New volumes continued to be written and printed as expeditions and colonization in the Americas were taking place. The case of this romance’s readership in France is unique because Herberay des Essarts was the first in a long list of subsequent translators who brought (and in Des Essarts’ case, claimed to re-appropriate the text) it into his own court, language, and culture. In 1540, France was similarly implicated in expeditions to
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70 See Emilio José Sales Dasi, “Introduccion”, *Antología del ciclo de Amadís de Gaula*. Madrid: Centro de Estudios Cervantinos, 2006, p. xix: “...Nicolas de Herberay des Essarts (1540), primero de una serie de
the Americas at that time. The reception of this text in (and in light of) the colonization of
the Americas is relevant because the sixteenth century, as well as its readers and writers,
were marked culturally, politically, socially and aesthetically by the transatlantic
expeditions and the colonization of the “New World,” spurred by Christopher Columbus,
and the early expeditions to the Americas originating in rivaling France. Although the
scope of this study will not focus on the reception of the Amadís in the Americas, it is
worth mentioning what was going on politically at the time. Some scholars, such as
Leonard, have dedicated studies to the Spanish Amadís in “New Spain” (Mexico), and
more work could be done in this field of inquiry.

French voyages to the Americas were commissioned by Francis I as early as
1524, and they continued after his reign. French commissions include: Giovanni da
Verrazano’s voyage on La Dauphine to the New World, Jacques Cartier’s expeditions
beginning in 1534, Jean-François de la Rocque de Roberval’s explorations and attempts
at colonization in 1541, and Samuel de Champlain’s voyages to the West Indies and
Mexico during 1599-1602. At a time during which there was rivalry among the Spanish
and French regarding the Amadis, politically the Spanish and the French were also rivals
at staking claims in the New World and in representing it as they incorporated new
knowledge into their existing episteme. The Amadís de Gaula/e was read and favored by
the monarchs that were commissioning expeditions and attempts at colonization in the
Americas, both Charles V and François I and, later, Louis XIV.

traductores cuyo trabajo serviría para trasplantar los textos castellanos como modelo de urbanidad y buenas
maneras en Francia, y servir de trampolín hacia su difusión entre otros países...” [“...Nicolas de Herberay
des Essarts (1540), first in a series of translators whose work would serve to transplant the Castilian texts as
a model of courtliness and good manners in France, and whose work would serve as a spring board for the
spread of the work in other countries...” my translation.]
It will also be useful for this particular study, to mention the historical significance of Francis I’s law that made “Françoys”, or the French language known in the court, the official language of the French kingdom: the Edict of Villers-Cotterêts.

This edict was pronounced in the hallmark year of 1539, which is weighty in this analysis because the first book of the French Amadís de Gaula was printed shortly after, in 1540.

In “The Force of Law: Derrida, Montaigne, and the Edict of Villers-Cotterêts (1539)”, Katie Chenoweth highlights articles 110 and 111 of the Edict, which specifically address language use in France from that day forward.

These two articles state:

110. And so that there should be no cause to doubt whether the aforementioned legal decisions have been understood, we wish and order that they should be made and written so clearly that there neither is nor could be any room for ambiguity or uncertainty, nor cause to ask for interpretation [interpretation: interpretation or translation].

111. And because such things have often occurred regarding the understanding of Latin words contained in legal decisions, we wish that, henceforth, all decision and other procedures, pertaining to our sovereign courts or other lower or inferior courts, whether they be registers, inquiries, contracts, commissions, sentences, wills, or any other acts and writs of justice…should be pronounced, recorded, and delivered to parties in the French mother tongue [en langage maternel français], and not otherwise. (“Ordonnance”)†

In her study, Chenoweth stresses the words “en langage maternel français”, which are problematic because they constitute an ambiguous statement. Considering the overall language of the Edict, the courtly French, or Français identifies itself in a primarily negative fashion, that is, in opposition to some other language or languages. But is it

possible to say whether this “other” designates only the explicitly banned “Latin words” (Article 111) or also all other “maternal languages” not named François—the other native tongues of France?  

This is a very interesting question, and it is relevant for our analysis of the French *Amadís de Gaule* (1540) because Des Essarts claimed in a myth that he wove for his audience in the space of his “Prologue” that he found the original French *Amadís* in Picard language, from which the Spanish author must have been truly working (not acknowledging the source). It is Des Essarts who plays the role of rescuer of this text and claims to bring it back to its original “Français”. But in saying this, it seems that he is including Picard in this domain and is not really differentiating linguistically between Picard and the courtly François. The courtly French that Des Essarts translated/adapted his French *Amadís* into would have been very different from this alleged Picard *Amadís*. Thus, the only way one could make sense of his claim that Des Essarts is bringing the *Amadís* back to its original “Français” would be that the original Amadis (in Picard) would still be considered “Français” if only by virtue of its “Frenchness”, as opposed to “Spanishness”.

We also have to note that Latin was not the only language abolished by the 1539 Edict of Villers-Cotterêts. Spanish would figure into the list of languages absorbed by this law, in the sense that it too was a language that had to be “translated” (like Latin) for people, and thus was undesireable. It was an “other” that leaked in through the Spanish-French border and had to pass by a translator in order to be intelligible to the people who would be the target audience, interested readers, and buyers of a printed book. Spanish books, such as the Spanish *Amadís*, were in the hands of a privileged few (like Des Essarts) who would then have to make creative linguistic, stylistic, content-based,
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72 *Ibid*, p. 70.
culture-based and thus hugely transformative decisions about what to do with the story as he translated and adapted the work from Spanish into French. In this process, the Amadís became something else-- another text--yet related and indebted to an extent. Yet, we could consider that linguistically the French Amadís is one of the first “gifts” brought to the royal family (the Amadís book 1 was dedicated to Francis I’s second son, the Duc d’Orléans, and not to him directly) that was both an exercise in the prowess of the courtly Français to test its capabilities and limits, as well as the result of Spanish-French relations and border-crossings. It was also an exercise in rivalry, an attempt to find out and prove if a story could be told better in Français than in any “other” language.

It is in this delicate time of proving linguistic and political/cultural superiority that the French Amadís emerges. As Chenoweth notes:

The year 1539 marks a veritable shift in the symbolic terrain occupied by languages in France; even though the dominant vernacular Français was gaining in cultural authority over both Latin and competing vernaculars, it was not yet a clearly delimited metalinguistic or discursive object. The strange remainder at the end of Article 111, “and not otherwise,” lingers as a kind of reminder of what this law desires—and desires to impose sovereignty—and yet cannot quite articulate. We could say that if Villers-Cotterêts designates anything at all, it is the performative weakness of an “official language” not yet sure of its authority to speak and know what it wants to say.73

The year of the first Amadís de Gaule (1540), then, would mark a presence in a very significant time for literary production in the courtly Français at a time of heightened scrutiny and judgment given the preceding Edict, and the linguistic-political program freshly announced by Francis I.

73 Ibid, p. 72.
The details of Des Essarts’ myth will be discussed in further detail in the upcoming section on textual analysis of the peritexts of the French *Amadís*. This myth regarding the *Amadís* origin, constructed by Des Essarts in his “Prologue”, plays a significant part in reader reception, and for this we must analyze how structure plays an important part in imparting meaning to a text that is part of a literary tradition.

First, this study turns to an examination of the role of the earliest Spanish and French prologues in programming reader reception, because a “Prologue” is, as Lejeune defines it, a “frange” or fringe—an outer limit, a “zone de transaction”.

It is in this textual outskirt, which is the first contact zone, that Des Essarts must contend with the previous existence of Montalvo’s Spanish version, and it is here that he attempts to define the center, the translated text, from a marginal position and location. The Prologue is rightly a zone of transaction because on the one hand, it is where the author and translator account for, or reframe, the limits and possibilities in producing a narrative considering differences in language, culture, and literary history. On the other hand, the prologue is a zone that most intensely involves action in two directions: the direct, even if mythical, discourse of the author/translator aiming to program reader reception, and the reader’s own interpretive faculties considering a point of view from which the text can be read.

*Spain, a brief history preceding Montalvo’s* *Amadís* “Prólogo” *and its role in reader reception*

The text published within the volume, preceding Book I, of the Spanish *Amadís de Gaula* includes a prólogo written by the author, Garci Rodriguez de Montalvo. This prologue ushered the *Amadis* into the hands of its earliest readership as a printed text, one
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that was predominantly Spanish. This study considers that in Golden Age Spain, a prologue had a weight and a value in the horizon of expectations\textsuperscript{75} of contemporary readers; it contained characteristics that could classify it in a genre of its own.\textsuperscript{76} Scholars trace the origin of prologues to oral traditions that go as far back as Greek tragedy; printed prologues also find a precursor in the \textit{exordium} of the Roman oratorical tradition. (21-43) Thus, the prologue is a threshold that, because of its link to orality, is meant to invite, entice, and capture the attention and good will (\textit{captatio benevolentiae}) (70) of a wide and therefore more popular readership that goes beyond the smallest circles of the literate elite. To read, and to hear, the \textit{Amadis} from the margins of its first Spanish prologue is to be invited in through a gate that is much wider than other printed texts lacking such an apparatus.

Porqueras Mayo points to the Golden Age in Spain as not only a particularly resplendent time for Spanish literature, but also as the apogee of prologues, which were so developed and elaborate that their weight is such as that of a genre within a genre. He traces their earliest and informal beginnings back to the thirteenth century with Spain’s “most primitive literary work”, the \textit{Cantar del Mio Cid}, which though lacking in a formal introductory section due to its primarily oral transmission, would nevertheless leave up to the \textit{juglar} the task of formally presenting and explaining the work to an audience of listeners. (77) The prologue appears definitively in written form in Spain as early as the thirteenth century in the work of Alfonso X, such as the \textit{General Estoria} and the \textit{Primera
Cronica General, for example, and in other texts such as El Caballero Cifar and la Gran Conquista de Ultramar. (82)

Rhetorical recurrences in prologues are worth mentioning here because they appear in the Spanish prologue of the Amadis. The most common, and all of which appear in the Spanish Amadis’ Book I Prologue, include: a protest and a defense against possible and future attacks on the book, a fending off of erroneous interpretation that could turn such powers as the Crown or the Church against the work, and displays of (false) modesty that submit the author to the aforementioned higher powers. (85)

Historical books and romances of chivalry also share the characteristic of collapsing within the prologue a dedication. (87) Montalvo’s Book I Prólogo does not explicitly dedicate his work to anyone, however. He pays only indirect homage to King Ferdinand by recalling that Greek writers were responsible for preserving the memory and promoting the fame of great battles, Kings, and warriors:

> Therefore, if the generation of those discoursers [Athenians] who exercised their wits and wearied their minds on matters of fame rather than on subjects of material interest had been able to witness and bear testimony of the saintly conquest that our most valiant King recently made of the Kingdom of Granada, how many flowers, how many roses would have been strewn on it by them—as much with regard to the courage of the knights, to the uprisings, skirmishes and dangerous combats, and to everything else regarding the perilous confrontations and hardships of said war, as concerning the courageous speeches of the great King to his nobles gathered in the royal tent, and the obedient replies made by them; and, above all, the great praise, the heightened encomiums that the King deserves for having undertaken and finished that most Catholic struggle.\(^{77}\)
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Amadis, being a work of fiction and at a first attempt at publication, appears somewhat tentatively and cautiously. Montalvo is careful to outline all of the reasons why it is a worthy work of literature. Perhaps Montalvo’s versions of the Amadis, as a new publication, were not yet deemed worthy of a direct dedication to the King. The romance genre was not considered a genre for the erudite few; it paled in comparison to history, philosophy, and theology. Montalvo writes:

[...] not daring to set my feeble talents at that with which the wisest learned men have been concerned, have sought to join the latest ones to write about the most trivial and insubstantial matters on account of their being in keeping with the weakness of my talents; namely, by correcting these three Books of Amadis [...] and by translating and emending the fourth Book, together with the Exploits of Esplandián.\(^78\)

Though there is a degree of false modesty involved, one must note that Herberay des Essarts also did not dedicate his French Amadis Book I to Francis I. It was not until Book IV, once Amadis’ favorable reputation was established by the earlier volumes, that he dedicated this work directly to the King. Furthermore, Montalvo must have been aware to some degree of the elements in the Amadis story, such as illicit love encounters and magic, that could potentially be read as corruptive of its readers because of their transgression of civil and Church law; hence, further implicating any direct dedicatee.

Prólogos precede the Al Lector in literary tradition as an introductory structure. The Al Lector that acknowledges and addresses the reader directly will emerge in the sixteenth century; the earliest prologues do not emphasize the reader specifically, but they do address listeners or oyentes.\(^79\)

---

\(^{78}\) Ibid., p. 19.

\(^{79}\) Ibid, 83-86.
A recurrence in early modern Spanish and French prologues is the use of an overarching metaphor to characterize the work which, due to its prominent appearance in the text, directly affects the work’s reception. Montalvo’s prologue crafts two main liminal metaphors to present the *Amadís*; it is a newly-polished treasure lost and found, and a gold- and silver-lined, cork saltshaker:

for very fortunately it came to light in a stone tomb discovered under ground below a hermitage near Constantinople and was brought to this part of Spain by a Hungarian merchant, being inscribed on parchment so old that only with great difficulty were those who knew the language able to read it. The said five books, although up to now they have been considered fictions rather than chronicles, by virtue of the said emendations are augmented with moralizations and teachings of such a kind that they properly can be compared with cheap, coarse, cork saltshakers encased and adorned with bands of silver and gold—thus augmented in order that gentlemen, both old and young, may find in them what pertains to each.

The *topos* of a treasure lost and found, discovered near or in an ancient tomb, is not new to readers. However, what is more interesting is the gold- and silver-lined, cork saltshaker metaphor. Montalvo resorts to this metaphor to illustrate how the work is both useful and beautiful. Through this particular metaphor, Montalvo concisely explains that in saving and re-crafting the *Amadís* from its tattered and “found” manuscript form, he has not simply poured new wine into old wineskins, but rather he has fortified the feeble, old

---


81 Garci Rodríguez de Montalvo. *Amadís of Gaul*. Books I and II. Trans. Edwin Place and Herbert Behm. Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 2003, pp. 19-20. Garci Rodríguez de Montalvo. *Amadís de Gaula*. Ed. Juan Manuel Cacho Blecua. Madrid: Catedra, 1987, p. 219. “...por gran dicha paresció en una tumba de piedra, que debaxo de la tierra en una hermita, cerca de Constantinopla fue hallada, y traído por un úngaro mercadero a estas partes de España, en letra y pargamino tan antiguo, que con mucho trabajo se pudo leer por aquellos que la lengua sabían; en los cuales cinco libros como quiera que hasta aquí más por patrañas eran tenidos, son con las tales enmiendas acompañados de tales enxemplos y doctrinas, que con justa causa se podrán comparar a los livianos y febles saleros de corcho, que con tiras de oro y de plata son encarcelados y guarnecidos, porque así los cavalleros mancebos como los más ancianos hallen en ellos lo que a cada uno conviene.”
saltshakers (old wineskins) with strips of silver and gold, thereby conserving them for their ancient value, but also strengthening them and adorning them with precious metals.

Conserving the old materials with the new additions, Montalvo states, also serves the purpose of providing within the Amadis something fitting for old and young readers alike. The special property of salt to preserve matter from corruption is also a significant message suggested by the saltshaker. Montalvo’s awareness of his diverse reading public and concerns about reader reception are made clear through the rhetorical choices made in his introductory discourse. The rhetorical strategies particular to Montalvo’s Prologue will be discussed more in depth further on.

France, a brief history of the “Prologue” and its role in reader reception of the French Amadis

Scholarship on fiction of the French Renaissance, such as Deborah Losse’s book Sampling the Book: Renaissance Prologues and the French Conteurs, also emphasizes the oral origin of prologues, and traces it back to the Greek and Latin theater (parodos or parodus) as well as classical oratory (the exordium). The popular appeal to the aural and visual senses is an important strategy in inviting the listener to delve into a story until its end. The Amadis was performed publicly and theatrically in France, and many of its original listeners would be able to continue to follow (and recommend) the adventures of the hero in subsequent printed volumes. For example, Le Premier livre d’Amadis de Gaule (1550), Rés Y2 136 at the BNF, Ch. XXXIV, has a handmade annotation at the end of the chapter that reads “sonne tambours”, which indicates that Amadis was likely read in a performative context, given that it is annotated with stage directions. Similarly,

82 Ibid, p. 12.
the paratextual space, which was at one point the oral/auditory introduction to a work, is thus linked to promoting the modern practice of the literary serial. Virginia Krause points out that,

In the course of Herberay’s first eight books, something unimaginable in the world of twelfth-century romance took place: the literary serial (modern practice) replaced the romance cycle (medieval practice). *Amadis* was manufactured and marketed as a literary serial—a succession of books whose meaning is derived in part through their position within the series: first book, second book, third book, and so on [...] we tend to forget that the literary serial was an invention of the Renaissance, for the formula was perfected in the French *Amadis*. Traces of this new serial vocation appear almost immediately in paratextual signposts, which encourage the reader to situate the present volume within a sequence.

Through their prologues, romances of chivalry as well as other genres of Renaissance fiction printed in the earliest presses, sought to appeal to a market: the aristocracy and nobility, by following conventions emerging from Greek and Roman traditions in their horizon of expectations, and a wider public through an approximation with the oral tradition of communal storytelling. Both of these modes were tapped in Spain and France to enhance the dissemination and the reception of the *Amadis*; this is one major contributing factor to its initial and popular success.

The horizon of expectations of readers of French Renaissance fiction would be likely to include the prologues of Rabelais. *Gargantua* is an example of a widely-read

---


84 Ibid.
Renaissance text with a prologue that likely shaped reader’s horizons of expectation, and clearly illustrates the function of liminal metaphor in shaping reception.\(^{85}\)

Rabelais’ silenus box metaphor in his prologue to *Gargantua* is an attempt at showing the value of reading for a deeper meaning, thereby facilitating a favorable reception by erudite and philosophical readers; Montaigne’s self-portrait metaphor in his prologue to the *Essais* similarly functions to provide grounds for a sympathetic and benevolent reception by even the harshest critics.\(^{86}\) The reception of the French *Amadis* also pivots upon codes that appear in the liminal text to blur the lines between playfulness and serious claims:

\[\ldots\] ay prins plaisir à le communiquer par translation (soubz vostre auctorité) à ceulx qui n’entenderont le langaige Espagnol, pour faire revivre la renommée d’Amadis (laquelle par l’injure et antiquité du temps, estoit estaincée en ceste nostre France). Et aussi pource qu’il est tout certain qu’il fut premier mis en nostre langue Françoyse, estant Amadis Gaulois, & non Espaignol. Et qu’ainsi soit j’en ai trouvé encore quelque reste d’ung vieil livre escript à la main en langue Picard, sur lequel j’estime que les Espagnolz ont fait leur traduction, non pas du tout suyvant le vray original \[\ldots\]\(^{87}\)

Des Essarts presents his work as a treasure lost, found, and given back to France (but first, to the Dauphin); as booty that was rescued from the Spanish and brought back to its most probable origin, France. Like Montalvo, Des Essarts stresses the service he has done in pulling the *Amadis* out of an antiquated and almost illegible state into a language and style that is more fitting for the time and place. **

\(^{85}\) Losse, p. 46-47.
\(^{86}\) Ibid. Losse points to these two well-known Renaissance prologues as illustrative of how “Liminal metaphor informs our reception of the text it introduces”, p. 47.
While reader reception is often difficult to gauge due to the lack of written evidence remaining in the books of early readers of Renaissance fiction (in the form of annotations or glosses, for example) the prologues written by Montalvo and Des Essarts can be studied considering both writers as also readers of a previous Amadis version before their intervention as translators and adaptors. Montalvo was the reader of what scholars refer to as a “primitive” Amadis, which was a tattered manuscript version that originally circulated in the Middle Ages. It is through Montalvo’s intervention that the Amadis were “reborn” in the printing press in an adapted and “updated” form in Spain.

The primitive Amadis is incomplete, hence in need of serious work. Montalvo is a critical and harsh reader of this primitive version. He does not claim to be recopying it, but rather “correcting” it. He claims that he is contributing constructively to this literary work by

\[\ldots\text{correcting these three Books of Amadis, which through the fault of poor scribes or revisers were read in corrupt and defective versions; and by translating and emending the fourth Book, together with the Exploits of Esplandián its offspring, which up to now within no one’s memory has been seen, for very fortunately it came to light in a stone tomb discovered ground below a hermitage near Constantinople \[\ldots\text{by virtue of the said emendations are augmented with moralizations and teachings} \[\ldots\]\]

Thus, Montalvo characterizes himself as an erudite, critical, and actively engaged reader of the Amadis who considers his intervention to be necessary and highly desirable. He emphasizes the value of his work by couching it in terms of a correction, by putting forth his competency as a bilingual translator capable of making textual emendations, by

\[88\text{ Amadis of Gaul, pp. 19-20.}\]
achieving a reunion of the collection with its never-seen, “found” volume (Esplandián) and finally, by aptly boosting the whole ensemble with moral teachings.

Herberay des Essarts is also a critical reader of a previous Amadis version. Although he claims to be working from a Picard manuscript, the “true” Amadis that the Spaniards must have been working from (a counter-myth that he creates in his prologue to rival Montalvo89) it is well-established in scholarship that his French Amadis are based on Montalvo’s Spanish Amadis.

Although prologues appear first in a book, they are often written last. As not only writers, but also readers of the Amadis, what can be determined from their prologues? I argue that as not merely readers, but readers with a vested interest in the reception of their work, the rhetorical strategies employed in their liminal discourse argue alluring, yet proscriptive, ways in which the book can be read, thereby both inviting a readership but also limiting a diversity of readings. While the prologue is often cited for its advertising and enticing functions, it is important to also consider the other side of this effect, which is not only attraction, but also a hindrance to the freedom of new readers to imagine alternative interpretations and approaches to the text, due to the authoritative quality of auctorial discourse at a prominent place in the volume. Thus, the threshold is not an empty doorway; it has a standing guard, a previous and authoritative reader who simultaneously plays the role of broadcaster and gatekeeper.

Both Montalvo and Des Essarts characterize their versions of the Amadis text in a context of rivalry, an approach that aims to lure readers through its relevance and attention to political and historical moments. However, while Montalvo directly evokes his Greek, and to a larger extent Roman, literary predecessors, Herberay des Essarts

89 This will be discussed in further detail in the coming paragraphs.
rivals his more contemporary Spanish political and literary counterpart (Montalvo) at a
time in which there is a military truce between Spain and France. Both reader-translators
represent their work as a text in re-birth because it was rescued from a decaying
manuscript, improved from a previously defective and deficient state. It is through the
allegedly necessary intervention of each reader-translator, who moves and corrects the
text from one space to another while cultivating language, style, and courtly manners--
through their unique contribution to a primitive Amadis—that they each emerge as
subjects that are distinguishable\(^{90}\) and memorable within their respective literary and
political milieus. Thus, reader-reception is necessarily oriented by a subject at the
threshold, an authoritative reader who prescribes and proscribes interpretations of the
text.

In the case of Des Essarts’ Amadis version, it is particularly interesting to note
that his editions include Montalvo’s prologue (curiously and not totally accurately
translated into French\(^{91}\)), thereby providing for the reader of the French version, not the
traditional threshold of a single prologue, but two prologues through which to pass, two
points of view (separated by around forty years) to consider, two distinct subjectivities
ushering the Amadis story into the reader’s imaginary.

Montalvo praises and situates the recent conquest of Granada by the Spanish King
Ferdinand as an event occurring at an age in which, unfortunately, wise and skillful
writers and historians are lacking. He claims that because of this deficiency, King

\(^{90}\) Regarding paratextes as a privileged place for the emergence of subjectivity see François Rigolot, “Le
Paratexte et l’émergence de la subjectivité littéraire” Paratextes : Études aux bords du texte. Paris :
L’Harmattan, 2000, p. 36 : « En revendiquant leur individualité dans les pièces d’encadrement de leurs
œuvres, les écrivains de la Renaissance ont visé, avec plus ou moins d’arrogance et de modestie, à se forger
une persona qui leur permettrait de faire surgir leur moi littéraire tout en acceptant les contraintes d’une
tradition qui les empêchait de manifester plus ouvertement les secrets de leur propre subjectivité ».

Ferdinand’s glories in battle against the Moors and the brilliant speeches to his troops, all of which are most deserving of commemoration because they are in the name of the Catholic faith (unlike those of the pagan Greeks and Romans), have not been properly memorialized.

Montalvo takes a reverent, yet also critical, stance in relation to literary and political history as he carries out his project, while maintaining exemplary Greek epic poets, such as Homer, and Roman Historians, such as Sallust and Livy, in mind. Des Essarts also opens his Prologue by pointing to a recent and significant political event involving the French monarchy: the truce, if only temporary, between the French and the Spaniards. He explains that his translation arose within this particular hiatus in war, the relative peace, he claims, has been conducive to reading “plusieurs sortes de livres, tant vulgaires qu’estrangers” in order to avoid a dangerous peacetime vice: “la trop pernitieuse oysiveté”.

Both, Montalvo and Des Essarts relate their work to the current political events in their particular monarchies; Montalvo discusses Granada to highlight a literary deficiency in Spain and to stress the importance of historians and writers in monumentalizing such worthy deeds as victory in conquest. Des Essarts justifies his reading and translation of the Spanish Amadis by representing a particular political context as being conducive and favorable to his work. Des Essarts’ defense of his literary activity (which he seems to have to justify in opposition to training for taking up arms or another occupation) may also be read as one of the earliest defenses of the humanities, aimed at critics who might

92 See footnote 2 in Bideaux’ critical edition of Amadis Book I: « En 1538, la “trêve générale de dix ans » conclue à Nice le 18 juin et l’entrevue d’Aigues-Mortes (14 août) marquent un répit dans le conflit franco-espagnol. En 1540, Charles-Quint traverse la France pour réprimer une révolte des bourgeois de Gand ; il est reçu triomphalement par François I. »
otherwise prioritize military service (or military preparation) for the Crown. One can also see how the French reading public that Des Essarts is writing for, that is “ceulx qui n’entendront le langaige Espagnol,” would be curious at that precise point in time to read the knight combat-themed text so well known by their contemporary, neighboring rivals.

Although it is not within the scope of this chapter to delve into the implications of the particular claim set forth in “From Round Table to Revolt: Amadís de Gaula and the Comuneros,” it is relevant to mention that several scholars have made cases for the idea that, among a multiplicity of possible meanings, romances of chivalry could be read for an underlying political message pertinent to their time. Considering the political situation under which Garci Rodríguez de Montalvo was adapting a primitive Amadís, Wendell P. Smith sees an anomaly in that:

[Garci Rodríguez de Montalvo’s] son Juan Vaca, and his nephews, García de Montalvo and Gutierrez de Montalvo, were leaders in the Revolt of the Comuneros in Medina del Campo (Álvarez 1: 502, 519, 526). Given that Rodríguez de Montalvo was responsible for a book that set a fashion for noble behavior (see Place), it comes as a surprise that his progeny were in the vanguard of creating what José Antonio Maravall considered one of the first modern revolutions (Las Comunidades: Una primera revolución moderna). A link between the refundidor of the Amadíś and the revolt of Castilian cities against Charles I (1520-1522) runs so contrary to what is commonly supposed that it begs an explanation.93

Smith is among literary critics and cultural historians who disagree with the approach that views romances of chivalry as a genre purely in the realm of fantasy and closed off as a text independent of history and actual events:

This approach assumed that a lack of realism within the world of the fictional work meant that the work itself had nothing to do with the reality of its day. Since all fantasy must be, by definition, escapist, critics took for granted that it must also be irrelevant to events in the world. More recently, cultural historians have posed that quite often the concerns—and therefore the reality—of the audience is best re-created in escapist fantasy. In their mythologizing, in their shaping of the fictional construct’s social universe, books of chivalry such as Amadís announce the underlying political and social concerns shared by authors and their audiences.\(^\text{94}\)

The main argument put forth in Smith’s article is that “the political program envisioned by Rodríguez de Montalvo in Amadís and Sergas prefigures what was to happen in the early stages of the 1520 Comunero Revolt”.\(^\text{95}\) This study considers and supports Smith’s theory in terms of the Amadís and its political relevance.

The Comunero revolt was a rebel movement that shook the legitimacy of the Spanish monarchy. It was a movement in which town councils questioned the authority of the crown, and which was spurred by the displeasure of the Castilian Cortes when they were asked to supply more funds to the Crown after Charles V was elected Holy Roman Emperor (June 28, 1519). Charles left for Germany on May 20\(^\text{th}\), 1520 while the revolution in Castile was already underway. A comunero league, led by Juan de Padilla, assembled a revolutionary government claiming to be the kingdom with the right to decide their future and their welfare. The disapproval by the nobility at Charles’ appointment of foreign councillors in the court, his granting to the Burgundian Guillaume de Croy the highly influential post of Archbishop of Toledo, his absence at such a critical

\(^{94}\) *Ibid.*, p. 164. Smith provides a footnote at the end of this passage that states: “The idea that books of chivalry enact a political program tied to the politics of the Reyes Católicos is not new. See, for instance, María Carmen Marín Pina and more recently Cristina González. I extend the analysis to include the depiction of social relations and issues of class formation.”

time, and his leaving his former tutor Adrian of Utrecht as regent of Castille (the admiral Fadrique Enríquez and the constable of Castile, Íñigo de Velasco were co-regents) led them to leave the revolt unrestrained at the outset. The nobles did not get involved in stopping the Comunero Revolt until they were themselves threatened by it when the movement reached their personal estates; it was then that they assembled an army to defeat the rebels at Villalar on April 23rd, 1521.96

Smith’s article is particularly relevant in this study, because he discusses Montalvo’s prologue and reads it as having “a political program that, at its core, is expressed in his definition of chivalry”97.

The political context evoked by Des Essarts, that is, the truce between the armies of Francis I and Charles V, is significant because it situates this translation as emerging from what Mary Louise Pratt calls a type of contact zone, which is made up of “social spaces where cultures meet, clash, and grapple with each other, often in contexts of highly asymmetrical relations of power, such as colonialism, slavery, or their aftermaths...”98 However, although a type of contact zone, the military conflict between the Spanish and French, was notably not between a colonizer and a colonized, but between two imperial powers whose relations were rather symmetrical, hence the need to continually rival and test the other’s supremacy not only on the battlefield, but also in the realm of cultural production.

97 Smith, p. 170.
In the case of Des Essarts, it is at the threshold (the Prologue) that he grapples with the pre-existing version of his translated text and sheds a different light on his translation by creating a rival counter-myth regarding the origins of the *Amadis*; he claims that his source text did not stem from a manuscript found in Constantinople, but in one found by Des Essarts himself in Picard language:

> [...] il est tout certain qu’il fut premier mis en nostre langue Françoys, estant Amadis Gaulois, & non Espaignol. Et qu’ainsi soit j’en ay torué encore quelque reste d’ung vieil livre escript à la main en langaige Picard, sur lequel j’estime que les Espagnolz ont fait leur traduction, non pas du tout suyvant le vray original [...]^{99}

While mentioning the discovery of a long-forgotten, ancient text is a literary *topos*, their detailed, individual stories of discovery are revelatory: Montalvo recounts that the manuscript he uses “appeared” in a tomb of stone under a hermitage close to Constantinople, and was found by a Hungarian merchant. The mention of Constantinople, once known as New Rome, is yet another way through which Montalvo links his text to a Roman literary tradition, which he rivals in his new version. Constantinople was, in historical memory, the capital of the Byzantine Empire, which links the origins of the alleged manuscript to what was at one point a flourishing Catholic, and imperial society much like the image that Spain had fashioned for itself at the time.

Des Essarts, however, recounts that he personally found an ancient manuscript in “langaige picard, sur lequel j’estime que les Espagnolz ont fait leur traduction, non pas du tout suyvant le vray original”, thus arguing that the primitive *Amadis* manuscript was written in Picard, a language closely related to French, that he judges Montalvo was

---

^{99} *Amadis de Gaule*. Ed Michel Bideaux. p. 166. See also Bideaux’s footnote #2 regarding this very passage of Des Essart’s prologue : « Flatteuse pour l’amour-propre national, et reprise par certains liminaires, la fiction de l’origine française des *Amadis* ne résiste pas à l’examen. »
working from inadequately. It becomes clear that while Montalvo spends half of his Prologue discussing ancient Greek and Roman historians and his self-consciousness as an inheritor of their histories and legends, Herberay des Essarts spends as much time discussing only his Spanish rivals.

Montalvo expresses, in terms borrowed from moral as well as linguistic discourse, the inadequate variety of writers whose writing was corrupt, and burdened by an old, poor, and superfluous style:

\begin{quote}
corregióle de los antiguos originales que estavan corruptos y mal compuestos en antiguo estilo, por falta de los diferentes y malos escritores, quitando muchas palabras superfluas y poniendo otras de más polido y elegante estilo tocantes a la cavallería y actos della\(^{100}\).
\end{quote}

Des Essarts, in turn, criticizes the Spanish for deforming and poorly translating the true, original Picard manuscript:

\begin{quote}
Et qu’ainsi soit j’en ay trouvé encore quelque reste d’ung vieil livre escript à la main en langue picard, sur lequel j’estime que les Espagnolz ont fait leur traduction, non pas du tout suyvant le vray original comme l’on pourra veoir par cestuy, car ilz en ont obmis en d’aulcuns endroictz, et augmenté aux aultres, parquoy suppliant à leur obmission elle se trouvera en ce livre\(^{101}\).
\end{quote}

For Montalvo, his textual emendation of the Amadis is important, because he envisions its potential as a fruitful and exemplary story that in the past was simply in poor hands; as a result, it was read as a series of “lies” with no benefit to society. However, he programs the reader’s reception of the new Amadis by emphasizing the value of his improvements

\(^{100}\) “[I] corrected it from the old originals which were corrupt and poorly composed in old style, due to the fault of the diverse and bad writers, removing many superfluous words and replacing them with words in a more polished and elegant style regarding chivalry and chivalrous acts.” (My translation).

\(^{101}\) “And so it was that I found the remains of an ancient book written by hand in Picard language, upon which I believe the Spanish based their translation, not at all following the true original as one will be able to see through this one, because they made omissions in some parts and augmentations in others, the supplement to their omission will be found in this book” (My translation).
through the memorable metaphor of the cork saltshaker. Montalvo treats the manuscript
_Amadis_ as an already good story that can be boosted and “reinforced” by strengthening it
with good examples and doctrines. This is a notion that he borrows from the Greeks and
Romans who treated history, whether partly fictional or not, as valuable not because of its
relative veracity, but because of the lessons that could be learned from it.

For example, Livy, one of Montalvo’s referenced Roman Historians, writes in the
Praefatio to his _Ab Vrbe Condita_:

> Quae ante conditam condendamue Vrbem poeticis magis
decora fabulis quam incorruptis rerum gestarum
monumentis traduntur, ea nec adfirmare nec refellere in
animo est. Datur haec uenia antiquitati ut miscendo humana
diuinis primordia urbium augustiora faciat; et, si cui populo
licere oportet consecrare origines suas et ad deos referre
auctores, ea belli gloria est populo Romano ut, cum suum
conditorisque sui parentem Martem potissimum ferat, tam
et hoc gentes humanae patiantur aequo animo quam
imperium patiuntur [...] Hoc illud est praeceptum in
cognitione rerum salubre ac frugiferum, omnis te exempli
documenta in inlustri posita monumento intueri; inde tibi
tuaeque rei publicae quod imitere capias, inde foedum
inceptu foedum exitu quod uites. 102

Montalvo’s self-alignment with Livy allows him to shift the focus from the lack of
historical truth in his fictional story, at a time in which fiction was considered a wasteful
genre, to give it value by pointing to the practical examples and doctrines that it contains.

---

Belles Lettres, 1940, p. 3-4 :« Quant aux événements qui ont précédé immédiatement la fondation de Rome
ou ont devancé la pensée même de sa fondation, à ces traditions embellies par des légendes poétiques plutôt
que fondées sur des documents authentiques, je n’ai l’intention ni de les garantir ni de les démentir. On
accorde aux anciens la permission de mêler le merveilleux aux actions humaines pour rendre l’origine des
villes plus vénérable ; et d’ailleurs, si jamais on doit reconnaître à une nation le droit de sanctifier son
origine et de la rattacher à une intervention des dieux, la gloire militaire de Rome est assez grande pour
que, quand elle attribue sa naissance et celle de son fondateur au dieu Mars de préférence à tout autre, le
genre humain accepte cette prétention sans difficulté, tout comme il accepte son autorité [...] Ce que
l’histoire offre surtout de salutaire et de fécond, ce sont les exemples instructifs de toute espèce qu’on
découvre à la lumière de l’ouvrage : on y trouve pour son bien et celui de son pays des modèles à suivre ;
on y trouve des actions honteuses tant par leurs causes que par leurs conséquences, et qu’il faut éviter. »
However, Herberay des Essarts represents his *Amadis* translation less as exemplary literature, and more as an amusing, delectable, and pleasing story that, judging by its name and alleged true manuscript form, must be claimed as originally French, thereby exalting Gaul (and himself for having made this correction):

> Et combien que ce qui s’offre en ceste traduction d’*Amadis*, ne soit tiré de nul auteur fameux pour luy donner couleur de verité, si trouvera on en elle tant de rencontres chevalureuses et plaisantes avec infiniz propos d’amours si delectables à ceulx qui ayment ou sont dignes d’aymer, que toute personne de bon jugement se doit persuader (voyre quasi contraindre à lire son histoire pour le passetemps et plaisir qu’il pourra recevoir en la bien voyant [...] Qui est en partie la cause pour laquelle j’ay entreprins la traduire, et aussi pour faire cognoistre à chascun mon intention qui tend à exalter la Gaule [...]  

While both Montalvo and Des Essarts are explicit in their Prologues about their particular textual interventions and contributions, they claim to make their textual emendations based upon different models.

While Montalvo looks back at classical antiquity for models and rivals, Des Essarts’ Prologue does not look for examples beyond France and the alleged Picard manuscript (rather than stating that he bases his translation upon Montalvo’s text), the only exemplary figure he mentions as being worth *imitating*, is François I, father of Charles Duc d’Orléans, who is Des Essarts’ addressee:

> Toutesfois je n’eusse esté jamais si temeraire, ny ne me fusse jusques là oublié de le presenter devant vostre excellence, n’estoit qu’à l’imitation de vostre tresillustre progeniteur, vous estes estimé le prince qui plus humainement et gratieusement reçoit aussi tost les moindres presens des petitz.

And the only rivals mentioned are contemporary ones, the Spanish:
Considering this, it can be said that while Montalvo alludes to Greek and Roman literary history, thus placing himself among its literary inheritors; Des Essarts alludes to the French monarchy, or the exemplification of a French heritage. There is a slippage between “nostre langue Françoys” and the “langage picard” that Des Essarts claims was the language of the primitive Amadis. Des Essarts’ claim assumes that the “langage picard” is equivalent to a singular “nostre langue Françoys” and that it was used in Gaul. The “Gaule” of the title Amadis de Gaule is a charged word that Des Essarts plays with in order to evoke a French heritage that traces back to the region inhabited by ancient Gauls which would later became a part of France. The Gauls were, however, a Celtic race comprised of many tribes and could not have used Picard language. Des Essarts’ mention of Gaul, however, does indirectly remind the reader of the French connection to the Romans, because after their conquest of Gaul it became a storehouse of Roman culture, including for example: customs, architecture, and literary tradition.

Both writers legitimize their translation projects as necessary, each considering a literary tradition that they are attempting to rival. Also, while Montalvo takes a serious tone to introducing his work, which will in its enhanced form impart exemplary wisdom that will lead to the welfare of his readers; Des Essarts adopts a lighter tone by characterizing the story as “plaisante,” made to “recréer” or entertain the mind of Charles Duc d’Orléans. Montalvo carves out a space for fictional literature by pointing to the examples of Greek and Roman historians whose chronicles were sometimes only partly based on truth, to secure a safe place for his work of fiction supplemented with practical
exempla, whereas Des Essarts makes a clear demarcation between the serious genres and the lesser genre of romance, which he represents as a welcome respite from the higher, more exhausting genres:

[L’œuv] que j’ay espressément mise en lumiere, non pour esperance d’en rapporter louenge (estant l’œuvre de trop peu de merite) mais [...] pour vous faire treshumble service, mesmement pour vous donner quelque fois dequoy recreer vostre gentil esprit, lors qu’il sera ennuyé de lire choses plu hautes et ardues.

Through the new version of an old story, made possible only by their translation work and their unique contributions to the text, Montalvo and Des Essarts show in their Prologues an awareness of their emergence as subjects that are distinguishable and memorable within their respective literary and political milieus. Montalvo gives yet one more reason to undertake his work, which is the wish to leave the shadow of a memory of himself on earth:

E yo esto considerando, desseando que de mí alguna sombra de memoria quedasse [...] quísele juntar con estos postrímeros que las cosas más livianas y de menor substancia escrivieron [...] corrigiendo estos tres libros de Amadís

This statement is somewhat surprising given the religious orthodoxy of the climate in which Montalvo writes, which would consider a memory left on earth as sheer vanitas given the more valuable after-life in Heaven. However, this is yet one more point that aligns Montalvo with the Romans; he borrows from them the concept of an afterlife which did not anticipate paradise in Heaven, but rather was preoccupied with the reputation a person left on earth. As Horace, who monumentalized those he wrote about

---

103 And I considering this, wishing to leave of myself a shadow of a memory, I gathered those light and insubstantial things that were previously written, and corrected these three Amadis books.
in his poetry, as we read in Carmen XXX: “Exegi monumentum aere perennius”\textsuperscript{104}, Montalvo adopts an awareness of monumentalizing himself through his writing.

While Montalvo’s ambition is not admittedly as great as that of the Roman poets (he does hope to leave a “shadow of a memory” of himself, not “a monument”) among the living, he is aware of becoming a perceptible and memorable subject through the written account he leaves behind. Des Essarts’ awareness as a perceptible subject also emerges in relation to his predecessors (he does not name Montalvo specifically). He announces that he has not been a docile translator, but rather a creative one despite the school of translators who prefer exact, rather than paraphrased translations:

\begin{quote}
je ne me soye assubjecty à le rendre de mot à mot : je vous supplye croyre que je l’ay fait, tant pource qu’il m’a semblé beaucoup de choses estre mal seantes aux personnes introductes, eu regard es meurs et façons du jour’huy, qu’aussi pour l’advis d’aulcuns mes amys, qui ont trouvé bon me delivrer de la commune superstition des translateurs, mesmement que ce n’est matiere où soit requise si scrupuleuse observance.
\end{quote}

To be subject to the previous translation by his Spanish counterpart would be to abdicate his own independence, which is counter-productive if only because he represents himself as a highly capable subject in a more modern world, the bearer of the current “meurs et façons” which is precisely what allows him to correct and thereby improve the text. Furthermore, Des Essarts’ perception of the degree of authority of the source text (Montalvo’s) can be measured by the liberties that he took as a translator. Yet, it is nine


« Ode XXX. Je l’ai achevé ce monument plus durable que le bronze, plus élevé que les pyramides des rois ; que rien ne saurait détruire : ni la pluie qui ronge, ni l’Aquilon furieux, ni la série des années sans nombre, ni la fuite des temps. Je ne mourrai pas tout entier, et la meilleure partie de moi-même échappera au trépas. Ma gloire, toujours nouvelle, grandira dans l’avenir tant que le pontife montera au Capitole avec la vestale silencieuse. Sur les bords où mugit l’impétueux Aufide, dans les arides campagnes où Daunus régna sur des peuples rustiques, on dira qu’illustrant mon humble naissance, le premier je transportai dans la poésie latine l’harmonie de la lyre éolienne. O Melpomène ! prends des sentiments de fierté dignes de ton ouvrage, et viens en souriant ceindre ma tête du laurier d’Apollon. »
years later, in 1549, that Du Bellay will declare in his *Défense et Illustration de la langue française* that the activity of translating (loose or exact translation), while it proves that French is capable of encompassing the same subjects that were taken up in Greek, Latin, and other romance languages, is not enough to truly rival other languages.\(^{105}\)

In conclusion, it is remarkable to note that the prologues of Montalvo and Des Essarts have such numerous similarities given that they were written more than forty years apart, and arose out of different cultures. While perhaps these similarities are not too surprising, considering the frequent interaction between Spain and France (even if not always friendly), and the prevailing literary conventions that governed what was appropriate and customary to include in a Prologue, it is still notable to analyze the ways in which each translator resorts to and adapts his paratextual discourse to usher a work into his own respective court, language, and culture. Both translators characterize themselves as critical readers of a previous *Amadis* version and of political events, they are both conscious of their literary rivals and predecessors, they both believe their intervention is critical in order to update and illustrate their respective languages, they both offer detailed, individual stories of “discovery” of an obscure text in order to couch their product as something that is fascinatingly old, but also new.

This being said, the entire paratextual apparatus that ushered Montalvo’s Spanish *Amadis* into Spain and Des Essarts’ French *Amadis* into France was remarkably not similar as a whole. The following section will discuss what was different in the introductory pages of each respective *Amadis* version and how Des Essarts’ historical

---

\(^{105}\) « […] toutes sciences se peuvent fidèlement et copieusement traiter en icelle, comme on peut voir en si grand nombre de livres grecs et latins, voire bien italiens, espagnols et autres, traduits en français par maintes excellentes plumes de notre temps. Toutefois ce tant louable labeur de traduire ne me semble moyen unique et suffisant pour élever notre vulgaire à l’égal et parangon des autres plus fameuses langues » (p. 210).
advantage allowed him to have more foresight in regard to how he would introduce his
Amadis to an even wider audience, and with the support of literary voices that echoed his
own.

The production, dissemination, and reception of the French Amadis

We have until now considered what is similar to both Montalvo’s and Des
Essarts’ Amadis versions, that is, the opening prologues by each translator respectively.
However, what is not similar to the Amadis versions of Montalvo and Des Essarts is that
while Montalvo did not enhance his first volume with sonnets, dizains, and weight of the
prestigious literary reputation of his friends recommending the work, Des Essarts does
this in his translation. The French Amadis Book I arrives in the French market and into
the hands of French readers with more than just a single prologue as part of its
introductory, paratextual apparatus. In order of appearance, it includes three liminal
poems in French, one written by Michel Le Clerc, one by Mellin de Saint-Gelais, and one
by Antoine Macault; a prologue in French by Herberay Des Essarts; and finally
Montalvo’s original Spanish prologue translated into French.

The liminal poems function to program and serve as signposts for reception. The
first Amadis volume contains only three short liminal poems and a dedication not to
François I, but his second son. However, once the Amadis volumes have been
successfully acclaimed by the reading public (by volume 3), Des Essarts finally dedicates
his work to François I; by Book IX, an avalanche of poets decorate the liminal pages of
the Amadis, hoping to link the name of such a success to their own names.106

106 See Michel Simonin « La disgrâce d’Amadis » Studi Francesi, Anno XXVIII, fasc.1, gennaio-aprile,
1984, p. 12.
The liminal poems of Book I carry the weight of well-known poets such as Michel Le Clerc, Mellin de Saint-Gelais, official court poet, and Antoine Macault. The first *dizain* by Michel Le Clerc addresses readers directly:

**MICHEL LE CLERC, SEIGNEUR DE MAISONS, AUX LECTEURS**

Qui vouldra voir maintes *lances briser*,
*Harnois froisser, escuz tailler et fendre*,
Qui vouldra voir l’amant amour priser,
Et par amour les *combatz* entreprendre,
Veigne Amadis visiter et entendre
*Que des Essars par diligent ouvrage*
A retourné en son premier langaige,
Et soit certain qu’Espagne en cest affaire,
Cognitostra bien que France a l’avantage
*Au bien parler autant comme au bien faire*.107

While *lecteurs* are the intended addressee, Le Clerc evokes multiple senses that go beyond passive reading: sight “Qui vouldra voir” (v. 1, 3) and hearing “Veigne Amadis visiter et entendre” (v. 5). The poem piques the curiosity of the reader for “seeing” marvelous chivalric deeds by foreshadowing battles and romance. Le Clerc lauds Des Essarts for his alleged rescue of the *Amadís* story from Spanish through his translation in to French: “Que des Essars par diligent ouvrage/ A retourné en son premier langaige” (v. 6-7). The word “premier” in verse 7 can be read as meaning “original” and also “first” in the sense of “primary”. However, Leclerc will be contradicted by Des Essarts in the matter of the “premier langaige” of the *Amadís* by the peritexts of the book that precede and follow this poem. The statement made by Des Essarts immediately preceding Leclerc’s poem reads:

---

LE PREMIER
Livre de Amadis de Gaule, qui
TRAICTE DE MAINTES ADVENTURES D’ARMES ET D’AMOURS, QU’EUENT PLUSIEURS CHEVALIERS & DAMES, TANT DU ROYAUME DE LA GRAND BRETaigne, QUE D’AULTRES PAYS. TRADUIT NOUVELLEMENT D’ESPAGNOL EN FRANÇOYS PAR LE SEIGNEUR DES ESSARTS, NICOLAS DE HERBERAY.
Acuerdo Olvido.
Patere aut abstine. Nul ne s’y frotte.
Avec privilege du Roy.
1540.108

Thus, we learn that Des Essarts has translated the Amadís from Spanish “Traduit nouvellement D’espagnol en Françoys” into the official language of the court, after Francis I’s Villers-Cotterêts decree the preceding year 1539. However, after Leclerc’s poem (and Mellin de Saint-Gelais’ followed by Antoine Macault’s) in Des Essarts’ “Prologue” he writes:

[…] ay prins plaisir à le communiquer par translation (soubz vostre auctorité) à ceulx qui n’entenderont le langage Espagnol, pour faire revivre la renommée d’Amadis (laquelle par l’injure et l’antiquité du temps, estoit estaincte en ceste nostre France). Et aussi pource qu’il est tout certain qu’il fut premier mis en nostre langue Françoys, estant Amadis Gaulois, & non Espaignol. Et qu’ainsi soit j’en ay trouvé encore quelque reste d’ung vieil livre escript à la main en langaige Picard, sur lequel j’estime que les Espagnolz ont fait leur traduction, non pas du tout suyvant le vray original.109

It is an apparent contradiction for Leclerc to say that Des Essarts is bringing Amadís back to “son premier Françoys” when later Des Essarts will also say in yet another apparent contradiction that “il est tout certain qu’il fut premier mis en nostre langue Françoys,

109 Ibid., p. 166.
estant Amadís Gaulois, & non Espaignol” but in the same paragraph he also states that he found “quelque reste d’ung vieil livre escript à la main en langaige Picard, sur lequel j’estime que les Espagnolz ont fait leur traduction, non pas du tout suyvant le vray original”. Thus, Des Essarts is admittedly not bringing the Amadís “back” to the “Françoyys” of the court, but forward in yet another translation from the alleged original Amadís in Picard into an Amadís in “Françoys”, presumably after having also passed through an Amadís “Espaignol”. It is very interesting that Des Essarts seems to conflate “Picard” and “Françoys” into the same “langue Françoys” and “Françoys” the year after Francis I’s Villers-Cotterêts degree declared “Françoys”, a very specific French spoken in the court, the language of the kingdom, even to the detriment of other languages, dialects, and the commonly used Latin in Francis’ territory. Perhaps this apparent contradiction can be explained by the presence of the more differentiated “other” that is the Spanish language. Perhaps vis-à-vis the Spanish language, the languages other than the courtly “Françoys” (such as Picard) were still appropriated by the French under the label “langue Françoys” and “Françoys” to be claimed as their own because of their presence within the French territory of “Françoys” I.

Finally, in Leclerc’s liminal poem the presumably French reader’s pride is tapped through the promised proof of supremacy of the French, in speech and action, in comparison to Spanish rivals: “Et soit certain qu’Espagne en cest affaire,/ Cognoistra bien que France a l’advantage/ Au bien parler autant comme au bien faire” (v. 8-10). The juxtaposition of vocabulary implying war in the first half of the poem: “lances briser” (v. 1), “harnois froisser, escuz tailler et fendre” (v. 2), “combatz” (v.4), and the rivalry implied by the last five verses of the poem is interesting because it supports the idea that
supremacy among political rivals was fought for on the field as well as in the realm of letters. The poem is thematically divided exactly in half. The first five verses speak of battle and adventure in the physical sense, while the second five verses evoke a rivalry that is at the level of production that is both cultural and linguistic.

The second liminal poem is from the official court poet, Mellin de Saint-Gelais to Herberay Des Essarts:

MELLIN DE SAINCT GELAYS AU SEIGNEUR DES ESSARS, N. DE HERBERAY TRADUCTEUR DU PREMIER LIVRE D’AMADIS DE GAULE

Au grand desir, à l’instante requeste
De tant’amy dont tu peux disposer,
Vouldrois tu bien (o amy) t’opposer
Par vn refus de chose treshonneste ?
Chascun te prie, et je t’en admoneste,
Que l’Amadis qu’il t’a pleu exposer
Vueilles permettre et au monde exposer :
Car par telz faictz gloire et honneur s’acqueste.
Estimes tu que Caesar ou Camille,
Doibvent le cours de leur claire memoire
Au marbre, au fer, à cyseau ou enclume ?
Toute statue ou medalle est fragille
Au fil des ans, mais la durable gloire
Vient de main docte et bien disante plume.\(^{110}\)

Saint-Gelais grants approval to Herberay Des Essarts’s endeavor and even formulates an exhortation to write, claiming that it is the way to achieve truly lasting glory (“la durable gloire” v.13). Compared to the active world of war, or the material world of “statues” or “medals”, the literary world of writing is a surer way to obtaining long-lasting fame. Furthermore, in this poem Saint-Gelais takes up the same rhetorical strategy that Montalvo uses in his prologue many years beforehand: he places value on Des Essarts’ literary production by evoking the importance of predecessors in memorializing great

figures like Caesar through the medium of writing; without the “main docte” or “bien disante plume” of writers, there would be no lasting memory of anything or anyone worth remembering.

The third liminal poem also addresses readers directly:

ANTOINE MACAULT SECRETAIRE ET VALLET DE CHAMBRE DU ROY,
AUX LECTEURS

Divins espritz Françoys de hault sçavoir comblez,
Qui par vive vertu et merite louable,
En bien escripvant, ceulx qui bien font ressemblez,
Prenez exemple ici certain et honorable
Que loz immortel vient d’œuvre non perissable,
Comme est le present livre. Et vous oisifz cessartz
Suyvez ce translateur, qui des branchuz Essars
Du parler Espagnol, en essartant, deffriche
Nostre Amadis de Gaule : et le rend par ses artz
En son premier Françoys, doulx, orné, propre, et riche.\textsuperscript{111}

The rhetorical strategies that Antoine Macault employs in this poem are threefold: a stress on exemplarity, an evocation of French/Spanish rivalry, and emphasis on the text as a place in which the illustration of the French language takes place. “Prenez exemple ici certain et honorable” (v. 4) is a preemptive counter-argument against those “Divins espritz Françoys de hault sçavoir comblez” (v. 1) who might claim that the Amadis has nothing of intellectual value to offer, or that it is not a text from which good examples may be drawn. Verses 6-9 are an almost comic, rhyming, play on Des Essarts’ name to praise his cultivating and translating effort in making the Amadis “better” because from the “branchuz Essars / Du parler Espagnol” (“the branchy [entanglements?] of the Spanish language”), “en essartant” (in “weeding out”), he “deffriche” (“deciphers”)

\textsuperscript{111} Ibid., p. 163.
“Nostre Amadis de Gaule” (“Our Amadis de Gaule”).\textsuperscript{112} In verse 10 we see again a mention of Des Essarts’ translation of the Amadís into “son premier Françoys”.

The Amadís is presented as exemplary based on grounds that are objective: because it is the product of the difficult work of translation, which Des Essarts has undertaken. Des Essarts is the opposite of those “oisifz cessartz” (v. 6) and is lauded for his linguistic production. To increase the merit of the French Amadis, Macault evokes the salient French/Spanish rivalry and targets French pride by stressing that this version is “Nostre Amadis de Gaule” (v. 9). According to Macault, Des Essarts’ version has rescued the Amadís by putting it “En son premier Françoys” (v. 10), which by virtue of it being “doulx, orné, propre, et riche” (v. 10), is a more illustrious language worthy of attention.

The liminal poems that first ushered the French Amadis into France enhanced its reception because they included well-established literary voices, that, besides that of the translator himself, vouched for the quality and merits of the work. In his enlightening and very thorough article recounting the cycles of popularity and cyclical disfavor that the Amadis encountered throughout its serial publication\textsuperscript{113}, Michel Simonin emphasizes that the chronology and nature of the contracts between Des Essarts and his editors reveals that the initiative for both the origin and the responsibility of this publication was Des Essarts’. He paid the fees for the rights, and the printers received those rights to print the work.

The first publication implied that the printers take a risk on Des Essarts’ translation and make a substantial initial investment, which explains why Des Essarts’

was not compensated upfront. This publication was costly because of the in-folio format and length of Book I, the luxurious woodcut illustrations within the volume, and the purchase of the “gros romain” type font. The investment proved to be well worth the risk. Book I was a success and was reprinted three times in the first year alone. After the success of Book I, Des Essarts signed a lucrative contract for Books II, III, and IV.\textsuperscript{114} It is interesting to note that, while Book I needed the supportive voices of a court poet and two well-known figures in French literary circles, Book II had neither a dedication, nor any liminal poems. Simonin argues that this may be due to either precipitation on the part of the translator/printers or perhaps indifference; however it is also possible that at this point in time less marketing needed to be done on behalf of the second \textit{Amadis} book since its initial reception was so favorable.

It is perhaps best explained in a timeline\textsuperscript{115} what the major trends in production, dissemination and reception were for the French \textit{Amadis} volumes beginning with the initial publication of Book I in France in 1540:

\begin{itemize}
\item **1540**: Book I is published. It is a success and is reprinted three times that year.
\item **1541**: Book II is published. It is also a success and is reprinted three times that year.
\item **1542**: Book III is published. It is only reprinted one time in the months that followed its original publication. However, Des Essarts still signs a lucrative contract for Books IV and V.
\item **1543**: Book IV is published and reprinted once that year. Des Essarts includes a \textit{dizain} that addresses the King. Liminal pieces become more numerous.
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{114} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 8.
\textsuperscript{115} This timeline is indebted to Simonin’s aforementioned extensive article “La disgrâce d’Amadis” in which he recounts the various years in which the \textit{Amadis} fell from their initial immense popularity due to various attacks that caused their public “disgrace”.
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1544: Book V is printed and re-printed twice that year. This book and Book VI are dedicated to Francis I.

1545: Janot dies and his widow Jeanne de Marnef prints Amadis VI.

1547: Amadis VII is printed by Etienne Groulleau who married widow Marnef.

1548: Since Francis I dies, Book VIII is dedicated to Connétable Anne de Montmorency.

1548-1550: Amadis volumes are printed in-folio and in-octavo to cover paper costs and expand the readership.

1549: Marie Compain dies and Herberay Des Essarts is brokenhearted. Book VIII will be the last one that he translates.

1550: Sertenas obtains the rights for Books IX and X. Gilles Boileau replaces Des Essarts as the Amadis translator. Note: Reader-authors mentioned that Des Essarts’ translations were the best, and they were generally less satisfied with the quality of the work of ensuing translators. The various switches in translators, and the disappointment that followed, seems to be what Simonin points to as one of the first and major “disgrâces” of the Amadis collection.

1551: Des Essarts writes at the beginning of his Florès de Grèce that others have taken up the Amadis continuation. He shows preference for “la chronique” over the Amadis story which he characterizes at this point as “fabuleuse”. Simonin seems to attribute this change to his melancholic disposition after the death of Marie Compain. (It is interesting, in the case of this study, to note that the paratextual space is also used as a forum in which authors talk about their present or past (in the case of Des Essarts) projects, and also offer insights about how a work may have been received or conceived of in the past, and how that reception will have changed over time, hence making this space a signpost
of reception.) Amadis IX is corrected and re-issued. This time it is done by the Champenois Claude Colet after attacks on the Flemish Boileau. Simonin points out that while Des Essarts’ immense work on the first eight books elicited only a few liminal pieces praising the work, the Colet “correction” elicited a plethora of poetic praises from known literary figures of the time: Jodelle, Olivier de Magny, François Charbonnier, Claude Gruget, Antoine Vignon, Jean-Pierre de Mesmes, Jean Brinon. He further suggests that Book IX was thus not so much the product of the solitary work of a single translator, but rather the expression of the literary prowess willed by a group of people. However, another consideration may be that a revival of the credibility of the Amadis translations was necessary and facilitated by new voices that were still willing to attach their name to the work, despite the fact that it was considered a “correction”.

**After 1551:** Jacques Gohory replaces Colet as the Amadis translator and takes up the task of producing Book XI. He gives up after this first attempt because the commercial reception was not up to expectation. Simonin explains that Gohory’s intervention followed an unsuccessful personal agenda in which he tried to convince his Amadis readers that there is an obscure meaning in the work. This leads us to believe that the shifting reception or interpretation of the Amadis by its various French translators had a lot to do with its successful or unsuccessful reception by the reading public. Amadis XII, for example, will be given a different interpretation by yet another new translator, Guillaume Aubert, who saw in the Amadis “un théâtre de tout l’univers”. This would be the last volume printed before there would be a fifteen year break in the series. Popular reader reception proved to be mostly favorable overall however, because during this
hiatus Amadis volumes were reprinted and the Trésors d’Amadis, excerpts of the best sections out of the first eleven books of the collection, was printed.

The second half of the sixteenth-century marked a decline in popularity for Amadis among the first readers of the collection, which were the nobility and the high bourgeoisie. The genre of history will begin to take precedence in elite literary tastes over the genre of romance. The elite readership of the Amadis originally was very favorably inclined to the series because they believed in its power to illustrate and promote the French language. However, eventually they hoped that after having acquired the taste for reading the beautiful and refined language found in the Amadis, popular taste would shift from fiction to history, but that would not be the case among the wider readership. This created frictions among privileged and erudite readers, particularly humanists, and publishers who catered to popular literary tastes. The Amadis eventually became associated with “littérature de divertissement” pejoratively, and would be subsumed in a hierarchy of “better quality” texts according to the agendas of vocal humanist and religious figures.

Yet another “disgrace” brought upon the Amadis by external figures, was the attacks by translators among themselves who were jealous and impatient by Amadis’ long hegemony among the popular readership. Although the series was handled by more than one translator after Des Essarts, its monopoly over printing press space, time, and resources would eventually be the source of problems within the professional circles of literary and printing press agents. Erudite literary figures and strictly religious humanists began to attack the Amadis collection in the paratextual, introductory appurtenances of their works.
By and large, the attacks are based on two fronts: the lack of “morality” in many Amadis episodes deemed to corrupt readers, and the lack of “truth”, which should be sought out in “better quality” books in the genres of history, theology, and philosophy. Attacks that were taken perhaps less seriously were on the linguistic front.

1548: In his *Art Poétique*, Thomas Sébillet calls Amadis’ language precious “fleuri” and “au gré des demoiselles”.

**Before 1555**: Tahureau would designate the Amadis within the scope of “érotico-courtisane” literature and denounces it for its potential to corrupt readers.

1570: Amadis begins to lose the race against erudite preferences for historical narratives. Simonin stresses that romances of chivalry for a long time passed for credible historical sources worthy of faith, and eventually the genre of fiction and the genre of history both tried to occupy the same space of knowledge until they began to compete (“Disgrâce d’Amadis”, 31).

1574: In his *Quatrains*, Pibrac advises “ny de lire Amadis ou de petrarquiser”.

“Amadiser” becomes a pejorative term to explain the activity and behavior of a false or ridiculous lover.

1583: René Bretonnayau in his *La génération de l’homme* agrees with Brantome that Amadis can have a negative influence on readers’ behavior and morals.

1585-86: These were years of much criticism of the Amadis. The heroine in Habanc’s *Nouvelles histoires tant comiques que tragiques* falls from virtue due to her reading of Amadis and the use of aphrodisiacs. Tabourot’s *Bigarrures* condemns the power of language in Amadis to seduce women, and its potential to incite lustfulness.
1586: Nicolas Debaste in *Les Passions d’Amour* seconds the conviction that *Amadis* will negatively influence sexual behavior and morals.

1587: In his *Discours politiques et militaires*, La Noue exposes the immorality of the *Amadis*, claiming that the collection elicits one of the greatest evils which is that of cupidity.

1588: Montaigne dismisses *Amadis* in his *Essais* as being “à quoi l’enfance s’amuse”.

The most prevalent accusation against *Amadis* during the *fin de siècle* was a preoccupation with how it allegedly fostered carnal desire, lustfulness, and lasciviousness. A secondary accusation was that it spread a taste for occultism, vain sciences, and magic. Finally, it began to drop down on the list of erudite and powerful literary figures who were trying to set the agenda about what “high quality reading” was; they began to advocate for and favor narratives that contained historical “truth”, not fiction.

While the *Amadis* were attacked on many fronts toward the end of the sixteenth-century, the collection did have its occasional defenders whose arguments were more solidly made on the grounds of the beautiful language it contains. Proof of *Amadis’* lasting success due to its linguistic qualities lies in that the *Thrésors* were first printed in 1559 in France and they were printed and circulated as late as 1606. The style, language, and rhetoric found in *Amadis* were celebrated almost unanimously until around 1550, thereafter it began to suffer attacks on the aforementioned fronts. These attacks were mainly ideological, that is, driven by the shifting political, moral, and cultural agendas of the most conservative upper classes, and market-driven, that is, fostered by rival authors/translator competing for popular readership.
One might posit that after Francis I’s death in 1547, the Franco-Spanish rivalry embodied by the two monarchs diminished the resonance of this rivalry and thus could have perhaps triggered the waning popularity of the Amadis. Or perhaps in the 1550s it had run the most intense course of its ascension into popularity and thus was considered a threat by that decade in the eyes of humanist moralists (because it could influence a large amount of people) hence why they attacked it and cautioned people against it. Rival authors and translators would also be in the camp against the popularity of the Amadis in their attempt to regain footing in the book market.
Chapter 3. Lyric Poetry as Political Tool: Clément Marot’s *Œuvres* (1538-1543) and Maurice Scève’s *Délie* (1544)

Clément Marot (1496-1544) was the principal and official poet of Francis I’s court; this particular position marks his *Œuvres* as a privileged textual space because his poetry memorializes numerous important political, social and cultural events that punctuated Francis I’s reign. Literary scholars recognize that Marot’s work is of outstanding importance in the literary landscape, particularly with regard to the development of the concept of *auctoritas*, a pivotal notion in the emancipation of the modern author. Marot was deeply involved in the publication process of his writings, inscribed a highly personal voice in his text, created a network of literary alliances, and did not shrink from asserting an intellectual independence that was due to his elevated status of an inspired poet, even if that attitude involved criticizing the powerful.¹¹⁶

This chapter will focus on the rhetorical strategies employed to represent the political rivalry between two of the most powerful monarchs of sixteenth-century Europe, Francis I and Charles V, in a selection of poems from Marot’s *Œuvres*.¹¹⁷

Secondly, the poetry of Maurice Scève’s *Délie* (1544) will be analyzed in order to examine how this poetic work represents the rivalry of these two monarchs in a different tone due to its influence by Andrea Alciato’s tradition involving emblems¹¹⁸. Maurice Scève is also a major French poet of the first half of the sixteenth century, however, he is writing from a different context and point of view than that of Marot because the former

---


is a Lyons poet and is not writing from the court’s inner circle. His *Délie* is recognized by scholars as a text that,

marks the full-scale introduction into French of love poetry based on the Italian tradition stemming from Petrarch’s collection of lyric poems, the *Rerum Vulgarium Fragmenta* (1374), better known as the *Canzoniere* (Songbook) or *Rime Sparse* (Scattered Rhymes).\(^{119}\)

The *Délie* also stands as an example of one of the earliest incorporations of the hybrid genre that included the interweaving of emblems and text after Andrea Alciato, the Milanese jurist credited with the creation of the emblem\(^{120}\):

the genre actually took shape in France between 1536 and 1560. Not only were the French the first to imitate Alciato, but it was in France, beginning with Wechel, that printers began to format emblems in regular patterns on a single page or on facing pages in such a way as to emphasize the organic unity of text and illustration. Emblems were anthologized in collections of poetry and influenced the poetry of Maurice Scève in ways that were essential to the economy of his *Délie* (1544).\(^ {121}\)

These two considerations are important for our study, because while some epigrams of the *Délie* stray from the subject of love and the beloved to focus on the monarchical figures of Charles V and Francis I, the emblematic rhetorical strategy remains. Whether it is an emblem of the beloved that is forged in the language of an epigram, or an emblem of the individualized, iconic images of the monarchs, the strategy is consistent throughout the collection. Scève’s *Délie*, because of its pictorial and lexical form and composition, emphasizes to a stronger degree the importance of emblems in the political life and history of sixteenth-century kingdoms. Furthermore, Scève’s epigrams, because of their


\(^{120}\) See Russell, p. 168.

\(^{121}\) ibid, p. 169.
brevity and tightly squared structure limited by the number ten, are closer in form than Clément Marot’s long poems, to the devise, or “(Italian impresa), a related emblematic form”122. Russell points out the importance of devices and emblems at a time in which monarchs were trying to forge an identifying image and identity for themselves and for the territories that marked their kingdoms:

Devices encapsulated the owner’s personal ideal or intention in a closely related combination of visual sign and short motto. The device was a much more disciplined and theoretically self-conscious form than the emblem and expressed the concerns of individual members of noble families in ways that heraldic symbolism, belonging to and designating entire families, could not—a real attraction at a time of developing individualism (p. 170).

In light of this, we will study how both poetic corpuses rely on emblematic images in language and with woodcuts and language respectively, to represent this rivalry, and at points both texts converge and diverge to praise and criticize these images.

The opening poem of Clément Marot’s Cantiques de la Paix, “Cantique de la Chrestienté sur la veuë de l’Empereur et du Roy au voyage de Nice”123 was first published in 1538 in L’Abouchement de nostre sainct pere le Pape, l’Empereur et le Roy (Mayer 251)124. The meeting at Nice in June of 1538 was overseen by Pope Paul III. The canticle derives its name from the Latin canticum, meaning song or poem, and carries the connotation of religious song125. In conjunction with the intellectual and traditional influence of Erasmian pacifism and Christianity126 the poem also relies on figures of classical mythology such as “Mars” and “Pallas”, with “Mars” dominating as the

---

122 See Russell, p. 170.
123 OC, p. 240.
126 Ibid.
ubiquitous figure of the warrior king representing the warring monarchs Francis and Charles.

The mythical god “Mars” takes on the role of a character opposed by the figure “Paix”, a goddess. The word “Paix” implicates not only the heavily coded mythological world of gods and goddesses of the classical tradition, but it also evokes the lexicological register of the Christian religious tradition in which peace is a spiritual virtue. The two characters, Mars and Peace, are antitheses of each other, and as it was characteristic in the syncretic and humanistic tradition in which Marot wrote, both figures co-exist seamlessly in the poem:

\[
\text{Si Mars crué vous en feistes descendre,} \\
\text{Ne pouvez vous le faire condescendre} \\
\text{À s’en aller, pour ça bas donner lieu} \\
\text{À Paix la belle, humble fille de Dieu ? (v. 9-12).}
\]

The conciliatory tone of the poem conjures the warring past of the two monarchs, and attempts to characterize them as warring brothers, as equals, that must make peace because they are not true enemies. The poet recasts their relationship through rhetorical devices that balance the disparity of political power between them and aims to reconcile past conflicts.

Even though Charles V is referred to as “l’Empereur” and Francis I as “Roy”, the poem attempts to equalize them. The poetic voice acts as a referee between what he characterizes as two estranged brothers. The poet is asking them to bridge the alienating distance that exists between the two. Powerful because they open and close the cantique as a whole and give it its song-like structure by acting as an echoing refrain, the first verses aptly epitomize the conciliatory tone of the poem:

\[
\text{Approche toy, Charles (tant loing tu soys)}
\]
Du magnanime et puissant Roy Françoys
Approche toy, Françoys (tant loing soys tu)
De Charles plein de prudence et vertu. (v. 1-4, 87-90)

The chiasmic structure “Charles”/ “Françoys”, “Françoys”/ “Charles” further contributes mimetically to the harmony of the poem as a whole.127

The verses that follow the opening four recall the tumultuous past between the two; and a third figure, the goddess Peace, is brought in by name as a moderator, as the monarchs approach each other, in order to break the bilateral tension between them:

Non pour touts deux en bataille vous joindre,
Ne par fureur de voz lances vous poindre ;
Mais pour tirer la Paix tant désirée
Du ciel très hault, là où s’est retirée. (v. 5-8)

The poem establishes the brotherhood, and thus futile warring, between the monarchs by evoking that France and Spain have blindly shed noble blood in their battles:

À tout le moins ayez compassion
Du noble sang et de France et d’Espaigne,
Dedans lequel ce cruel Mars se baigne. (v. 28-30)

The poet further alludes to brotherhood by referring to the alleged Trojan origins of both Francis I and Charles V. In Illustrations de Gaule et singularités de Troye by Jean Lemaire de Belges the myth is such that Charles and Francis trace their origins back to the Trojans128:

Que pensez vous ? cherchez vous les moyens
De voz malheurs, nobles Princes Troyens ?
Jà pour tenir ou voz droictz ou voz tortz,
Sont ruez jus voz plus vaillants Hectors. (v. 49-52)

To further support this confraternity, both Francis I and Charles V are also referred to as “Princes chevaleureux” (v. 15).

127 See OC II, note 420, p. 683.
128 See OC II, note 418, p. 683.
The poet insists upon the equal status and noble origins of the two monarchs, and their respective valiant warriors, in order to magnify the squandering of precious blood in their battles, and to convince them to halt conflict. The rhetorical strategy includes characters of Greek classical mythology so prized and recognized in France and Spain, as well as the Christian religious tradition that both shared. The blending of mythological and religious characters and imagery works together to weave a convincing scenario in which the monarchs are portrayed as committing a mistake on many levels with their fighting; not only are they behaving against the law of God as warring brothers, but also against classical codes of war in which they are shedding common familial blood from the same lineage.

The religious language in this poem evokes a pivotal tradition that the two monarchs shared, Christianity. This is important considering that the Ottoman Turks were Muslim and thus controversial allies with France after the disaster at Pavia. If the poet will stand as an effective advocate for peace, he will have to directly or indirectly address the issue of Francis I’s alliance with the Ottoman Turks, and he does so indirectly by stressing the shared religious traditions of Charles V as Holy Roman Emperor and Francis I. As De Lamar Jensen writes,

With such an alliance [Franco-Ottoman] to keep pressure on the Habsburg empire in the east, Francis might stand a chance of regaining control of Milan and increasing his influence in the Mediterranean where there Turks had now become a formidable naval power. So the groundwork was laid for a long-term cooperation between two countries, one Christian and the other Moslem, that seemed to have nothing in common except their hatred and fear of the Habsburgs […] Yet perhaps they had more mutual interests
than have usually been seen [...] the commercial advantages of cooperation.\textsuperscript{129}

Because religious affiliation and allegiance was of such paramount importance and so contested during the reign of these two monarchs, the poet resorts to establishing brotherhood not only through dynastic lineage, but also through a spiritual one. This is one way in which conciliation is sought, in light of the political implications of forming non-Christian alliances against the Holy Roman Empire. Ambiguity regarding allegiances and alliances was in itself, however, a political strategy that was in Francis’s favor for a certain amount of time:

As long as it lasted [the Franco-Ottoman alliance], the Habsburgs could never be sure when the French and Turks might combine and when they might not. For this reason the thunder of the alliance diminished with time as its ineffectiveness was manifested.\textsuperscript{130}

Although the Franco-Ottoman alliance seemed convenient and even necessary in order to balance the growing territorial expanse of Charles V’s lands after Francis lost the battle at Pavia, the Franco-Ottoman alliance proved largely inefficient, and so it was ultimately better for France to be on good terms with Charles V. In the second half of the sixteenth century, the Franco-Ottoman alliance crumbled under the pressure of Christian alliances against Islam, particularly after the 1559 Treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis, which halted the Habsburg-Valois wars, and the 1571 formation of the Holy League which was “a last great Christian crusade

\begin{footnotes}
\item[130] \textit{Ibid}, p. 459.
\end{footnotes}
against Islam, and an attempt to interdict the annual harassments by the Turkish fleet."\textsuperscript{131}

Furthermore, the poem incorporates real and negative historical happenings of war that could have easily been re-awakened, and also needed to be addressed, in the memory of readers in this poem. For example, Louis de la Trémoille, prominent French war chief, had been killed at the battle of Pavia in February 1525\textsuperscript{132}. The poem stresses the counterproductive loss of valiant war chiefs in the constant battles of Charles and Francis:

\textbf{Mars} cy devant souloit taindre ses dards
Dedans le sang de voz simples soldards ;
Mais maintenant (ô Dieu quel dur esclandre)
Plaisir ne prend fors à celluy espadre
Des nobles chefs, meritants diadesmes. (v. 31-35)

The disaster at Pavia was a historical moment deeply imprinted in historical memory at the time. And not only were valiant chiefs lost, but Francis I was himself injured and imprisoned with an estimated 12,000 dead and injured soldiers in the French army.\textsuperscript{133}

The poet aims to persuade the two monarchs to make peace by depicting an optimistic future scene in which the goddess \textit{Paix} descends triumphant from heaven with a Laurel crown, and Mars bloody and dusty will flee at the sight of the reconciled and powerfully united Francis and Charles:

\textbf{Paix} descendra, portant en main l’Olive,
Laurier en teste, en face couleur vifve,
Tousjours riant, clere comme le jour,
Pour venir faire en mes terres sejour.

\textbf{Et Mars} souillé tout de sang et de pouldre,
Deslogera plus soubdain que la fouldre ;

\textsuperscript{131} \textit{Ibid}, p. 459.
\textsuperscript{132} See \textit{OC II}, note 417, p. 683.
\textsuperscript{133} \textit{OC II}, p. 683, note 417.
Car il n’est cueur (tant soit gros) qui ne tremble,
Si voz vouloirs on sent unys ensemble. (v. 61-68)

What is implied here is that an alliance between Francis and Charles will be more productive and powerful than if they use their political powers and forces against each other.

Yet another mythological character plays an important role at the end of the poem; it is Pallas. Although there are several male mythological characters that carry this name, such as Pallas, son of Crius and associated with war, Pallas the giant, Pallas son of Pandion, Pallas son of Evander, Pallas son of Lycaon, and Pallas father of Euryalus, it is most likely that the character represented here is the female Pallas Athena. This is because she fought in the Trojan War, which is alluded to in this poem, and because she often is the patroness and companion of heroes at war. Yet, she is unlike Mars in that she does not favor resorting to brute force, but rather she counsels heroes to resolve conflict with the use of wisdom and strategy, ending in battle only as a last resort. This is evident in the poem, because it is Pallas who will shield the heroes (Francis and Charles) with a cloud, so that they will not be tempted by Mars’ urging toward battle. It is Pallas’ cloud that will enable them to withhold from a fight:

Vienne sur champs Mars avec son armée
Vous presenter la bataille termée ;
Il la perdra. Ainsi doncques unys
Et de pitié Paternelle munys,
Vous eslirez quelque bien heureux lieu,
Là où viendra de vous deux au milieu
Pallas sans plus. Pallas (à sa venue)
Vous couvrira d’une celeste nue
Pour empescher que les malings trompeurs,
D’heureuse Paix trop malheureux rompeurs,
Ne puissent veoir les moyens que tiendrez
Alors qu’au poinct tant désiré viendrez ;
Si qu’ilz seront tout à coup esbahys,
Que sur le soir l’ung et l’autre pays
Reluyra tout de beaulx feuz de liesse
Pour le retour de Paix, noble Deesse (v. 69-84).

The feminine mythological characters representing peace and wisdom are Paix (Peace), and Pallas (Athena); they are the antitheses of the male mythological characters representing war: Mars and Hector.

The second poem that appears in Marot’s Œuvres (1543), “À la royne de Hongrie venue en France Salut”, also addresses the subject of Francis and Charles’ rivalry. It was first published in Les Cantiques de la paix in 1539 (Mayer 86). The “royne de Hongrie” is Marie de Habsbourg, Charles V’s sister who had previously played a mediating role at Nice between the monarchs, and who interferes again in 1538 to prevent Francis I from helping the Flemish.

The second stanza of the poem comments on tumultuous French-Spanish political relations and heralds the coming of the queen as a good sign:

Ô combien fut le peuple resjouy
D’Espaigne et France, après a oyu
Qu’icy venoys ! « Celan nous est ung signe »
(ce disoyent ilz) « que l’amour s’enracine
Es cueurs Royaulx ; cela est ung presaige,
Que dieu nous veult monstrer son doulx vissage
Et que la paix dedans Nice tractée,
Est une paix pour jamais arrestée. » (v. 17-24)

The words “s’enracine” and “arrestée” demonstrate a longing for a lasting peace and a binding treaty that will ensure cordial and tranquil relations between the two “cueurs Royaulx” of France and Spain. Once again, as in the first poem, in this second poem a feminine figure, this time a historical one, is the bearer of Peace. She is a “presaige” and

134 OC II, pp. 243-5.
135 See OC II, note 421, page 683.
bon “signe” that stands in between the warring Kings. The poetic voice of this second poem highlights in the second stanza this very gendered notion:

Ce qui plus tost entre aux cueurs feminins
(D’aультant qu’ilz sont doulx, piteux et begnins)
Que ceulx des Roys qui, pour honneur acquerre,
Sont inclinés à prouesse et à guerre. (v. 57-60).

The verses above imply that the hearts of women are more inclined toward the theological and diplomatic virtues of delicateness, pity, and goodness (“doulx, piteux et begnins”); whereas, the hearts of men are more inclined battle in the pursuit and acquisition of honor as it is obtained by exploits and war (“pour honneur acquerre, sont inclinés à prouesse et à guerre”). In these verses, it is likely that Marot is remembering the treaty of Cambrai positively which was also known as the “paix des Dames” or “women’s peace” because it was secured in 1529 by the diplomatic abilities of three influential women: Louise de Savoie, Marguerite de Navarre, and Margaret of Austria.

Louise de Savoie, Francis I’s mother, was preoccupied from early on in his life with his political position and supported and guided him until he became king after the death of Louis XII. She played a significant role in the administrative side of the monarchy:

When Francis I became King, he left the details of the government almost entirely to his mother and to his chancellor, reserving for himself the occupation and excitement of perpetual wars.136

Marguerite de Navarre was Francis I’s older sister. She was remarkably gifted with language and rhetoric, as is demonstrated not only in her negotiations to free her brother Francis I from imprisonment at Pavia, but also in her dexterous writing of the famed collection of short stories in the Heptameron, and the religious poem “Mirroir d’une ame

pécheresse”. She was in her position of power a devout defender and political protector of other writers such as Clément Marot and François Rabelais.

Finally, Margaret of Austria was the daughter of Maximilian of Austria and of Mary Burgundy; Philip the Fair was her older brother, and thus she was the aunt of Charles V. She had a direct relationship of authority to Charles V at an early age because she was appointed his guardian by Maximilian of Austria when Charles was of a very young age. She was also appointed regent of the Low Countries by Maximilian. Her skill with language and diplomacy was superior as shown by the treaties that she fruitfully negotiated and her dynamic participation in political life.

In the closing stanza (v. 61-72), the poet takes on the role of Ambassador between the queen “Royne prudente et meure” (v. 61), and King Francis I, “Le Salomon de France, nostre Roy” (v. 64). He thanks the queen for having left her home to come to France, “Qui as laissé ton peuple et ta demeure” (v. 62), and places himself at her feet as a small voice “plus petit” (v. 71), speaking to a mighty and praiseworthy figure likened to a divine figure “le grand Prince des Anges” (v. 69). The figure of Charles V disappears completely toward the end of the poem, and the queen is praised instead. Francis I is referred to as “Le Salomon de France” and she is praised as well as a prudent queen who is “si hauté” (v. 67), but there is no further mention of Charles V. This poem, thus, praises Francis I and the queen, but remains silent upon any virtue that may be assigned similarly to Charles V. Instead it is the queen who receives all praise and honor. Biblical figures are used in metaphorical language to bestow praise and status to the queen who is likened to the queen of Saba, and Francis I to Solomon. Charles V, however, is left without a biblical counterpart in this poem.
The third cantique that follows in this edition is the “Cantique sur l’Entrée de l’Empereur à Paris”. It was originally published in 1539 (Mayer 254)\textsuperscript{137}. The title refers to the historical, peaceful passing of Charles V through France, with Francis I’s permission, from the Pyrenees to Flanders in 1539 to control a rebel uprising.\textsuperscript{138} This peaceful passing was celebrated throughout France as a sign of improved relations between the two monarchs.

The first stanza is characterized by coupled contrasting negative and positive images, side by side. On the one hand, a memory of warring Cesar taking over Gaul, on the other hand the Emperor (an improved Cesar figure), who conquers not land but people’s hearts:

Or est Cesar, qui tant d’honneur acquit,  
Encor ung coup en ce beau monde né.  
Or est Cesar, qui les Gaules conquit,  
Encor ung coup en Gaule retourné ;  
De legions non point environné  
Pour guerroyer mais plein d’amour nayfve (v. 1-6)\textsuperscript{139}

And another pair of contrasting images: the sword, signifying war, and the olive, signifying peace. The “Aigle” is a symbol for the Emperor Charles V.

Non point au vent l’Aigle noir couronné,  
Non point en main le glaive, mais l’olive. (v. 7, 8).

The anaphora “Non point” in verses 7 and 8 stress the way in which negation and opposition function rhetorically in the stanza to promote peace over a history of war.

The second stanza names only the French king and refers to the Emperor as simply “luy” (v. 9), and instead of Charles V taking Francis I captive, it is both that “avec eulx guerre meinent captive” (v. 11). Through this image, the poet glosses over the

\textsuperscript{137} OC II, pp. 845-6.  
\textsuperscript{138} Ibid, note 426, p. 683.  
\textsuperscript{139} Ibid, p. 245.
unsavory memory of captivity and transforms it into an image of harmony and accord in which the monarchs unify their forces against war and discord:

Françoys et luy viennent droict de la rive  
De Loyre à Seine affin de Paris veoir ;  
Et avec eulx guerre meinent captive  
Qui à discord les souloit esmouvoir (v. 9-12).

The poet, adopting an ambassadorial voice, proudly displays Paris not merely as a place to pass by, but a place that the two monarchs have come to see: “affin de Paris veoir”;

Paris is characterized as a city to behold from its longest river, the Loire, to its most central one, the Seine (v. 10).

The third stanza attributes to each monarch a reason for meeting and the supposed honorable and cordial approach toward each other:

L’ung (pour au faict de ses pays pourveoir)  
Passe par cy, sans peur ne deffiance ;  
L’aultre, de cueur trop hault pour decevoir,  
Luy donne Loy de commander en France ;  
Si que l’on est en dispute et doubtance  
Qui a le plus de hault loz merité :  
Ou de Cesar la grande confiance  
Ou de Françoys la grand’ fidelité (v. 13-20).

The first “l’ung” refers to Charles V who needs Paris in order to take care of the affairs of his territories. His passing “sans peur ne deffiance” is thanks to the French king who has gracefully granted safe passage to him. “L’aultre” refers to Francis I, who possessing the virtue of a “cueur trop hault pour decevoir”, as his name aptly refers to his “franchise”, grants Charles V the right to command in France (v. 16). In these verses, Francis I is praised as virtuous, rather than lacking in negative emotions, such as the “sans peur” of Charles V suggests. Also, it remains clear that power and authority are still derived from
Francis I, since he is the agent that grants ruling authority to Charles V, not vice-versa (v. 16).

Verses 17-20 highlight the rivalry between Francis I and Charles V through the rhetorical strategy of ambiguity. These verses suggest that both the Emperor, here referred to through metonymy as “Cesar”, and Francis I are so closely matched in virtue and worthiness that they are rightly close rivals in the fidelity and trust they have earned from their subjects:

Si que l’on est en dispute et doubtance
Qui a le plus de hault loz merité:
Ou de Cesar la grande confiance
Ou de Françoys la grand’ fidelité (v. 17-20).

The superlative structure of language, as in “le plus” (v. 18), “la grande” (v. 19), and “la grand’” (v. 20), focus on the competition for supremacy. The “dispute et doubtance” (v. 17) arises not out of conflict between the two, but in the difficulty of judging who has earned the most praise, and who has achieved the greatest amount of confidence and faithfulness from his subjects.

There is a similar rhetorical use of ambiguity in the last stanza of the poem, particularly in the closing verses 27 and 28, which leave open to the reader’s interpretation who “le plus grand des Chrestiens” might be since both monarchs pass through the gates of Paris:

Ô Roys unys plus que d’affinité
Bien heureurse est la gent qui n’est point morte
Sans veoir premier vostre ferme unité
Qui le repos de tant de monde porte.
Vien doncq’, Cesar, et une paix apporte
Perpetuelle entre nous et les tiens.
Haulse (Paris) haulse bien hault ta porte:
Car entrer veult le plus grand des Chrestiens.

140 See OC II, note 428, p. 684.
Paris is praised as a city, by the greatness of its door, and the poet’s words symbolically utter the words that will open it to the coming of the greatest of Christians and of peace. There is again a stress on unity among the monarchs and how their unification is celebrated by “tant de monde” (v. 24) who can rest in finally welcoming peace in light of a history of strife.

The fourth cantique out of this series of five, is entitled “La Cantique de la Royne sur la maladie et convalescence du Roy”. This poem was first published in Les Cantiques de la paix in 1539 (Mayer 86), and it regards Francis I’s historically documented illness which is spoken about with concern in this poem. Although Charles V is not named directly in these verses, it does concern him because the queen in this title is Eleanor of Austria, Charles V’s sister. Francis I had married her on July 7, 1530 after his release from imprisonment in Madrid. In this poem, the poet adopts the queen’s point of view and assumes a concerned and praiseful voice. All of the feminine adjectives and past participles indicate that it is a feminine speaking voice from the outset in the first stanza:

S’esbahit on si je suis esplorée ?
S’estahit on si suis descolorée,
Voyant celluy qui m’a tant honorée
Estre à la mort ? (v. 1-4)

The poet bestows upon the figure of the queen a voice that is full of admiration for King Francis I and worry of his demise. Through the figure of Eleanor of Austria and the seemingly strong and devoted alliance she has formed with Francis I, this poem continues the motif of peace between Spain and France. Because Eleanor is such a strong symbol of

---

Charles V’s family, her concern for Francis I’s life takes on a political dimension conveying that the two kingdoms are not in rivalry, but are rather essential to each other. Thus, the loss of Francis I’s life becomes a pressing and worrisome concern for Eleanor of Austria, according to this poem.

As in the previous cantique in which authority and power to rule in France are bestowed upon Charles V by Francis I, and not vice-versa, in this poem, the poet characterizes the queen as being a grateful subject of Francis I from whom her authority and power is ultimately derived:

Ne soit (helas) ce mien larmoyant œil
Si malheureux que de voir au cercueil
Jecter celluy qui en si doulx accueil
M’a couronnée,
Qui m’a sur chef la couronne donnée,
La plus d’honneur et gloyre environnée,
Dont aujourd’huy l’Europe soit aornée (v. 13-19).

The all-encompassing “l’ Europe” in verse 19, gives Francis I an acknowledged power that reaches beyond France to bestow honor and glory. The poem is full of aggrandizing, praiseful language for King Francis I. He is “ au sommet de prudence/ Pour dominer” (v. 27, 28), the result of God’s “ labeur parfaict” (v. 31), “ ung Roy de si grand’ renommée” (v. 41). Through the voice of the queen, the poet suggests a respectful and admiring attitude from the house of Habsburg to France.

Similarly, through the figure of the queen, the poet reinforces a committed alliance between Charles V’s family and Francis I, because even when Francis is near death because of illness, Eleanor professes her faithfulness to him:

Femme d’ung Roy de si grand’ renommée.
Rien plus ne soit que pouldre consummée.
Pouldre avec luy (toutesfoys) inhumée
Ce bien j’auray.
Because, above all, marriage signified a political alliance between kingdoms and entire families, the words that the poet attributes to the queen, Charles V’s sister, carry political weight.

The last cantique that appears in the series of five in poem form in Marot’s Œuvres of 1543 is entitled “Cantique sur la maladie de s’amie”. It was first published in Etienne Dolet’s 1542 edition (Mayer 105). It is the first cantique that breaks with the motif of Francis I and Charles V in this sequence. It is instead reminiscent of medieval poetry that characterizes love as a sickness. The poetic voice is male, as can be ascertained by the lack of feminine agreements in the language used, and the poet is a love-struck supplicant for the health of a beloved woman who in turn has given him the sickness of love:

Dieu, qui vouluz le plus hault ciel laisser  
Et ta haultesse en la terre abaisser,  
Là ou santé donnas à maints et maintes,  
Vueilles ouyr de toutes mes complaintes  
Une sans plus. Vueilles donner santé  
À celle là par qui suis tourmenté (v. 1-6).

The beloved is described as the classic beloved “belle dame sans merci”. She is young “N’ayt point l’honneur de la faire enlaydie./ Assez à temps viendra vieillesse palle/ Qui de ce faire a charge principalle” (v. 24-26), beautiful “Helas, Seigneur, il semble tant est belle/ Que plaisir prins à la composer telle” (v. 11-12), and cruel “Il est bien vrai que ceste grand’ beauté/ A desservy, pour sa grand’ cruaulté” (v. 19-20).

---

It sharply contrasts the other four preceding *cantiques*, except that in its context it seemingly adds weight to the fourth; just as the poet adopts the voice of Eleanor of Austria pleading for the health of her husband Francis I, so does the poet-lover plead for the health of his beloved.

Also in Marot’s 1543 *Œuvres* but among his epistles, the fifth is entitled “Marot à l’Empereur”, followed immediately by “L’adieu de France à l’Empereur”; they take up again the subject of Charles V. The epistle “Marot à L’Empereur” makes reference anew to the passage of Emperor Charles V through France, and again refers to him indirectly through metonymy as “Cesar” (v. 4) and symbolically through his emblematic insignia: the eagle “l’Aigle” (v. 30), and his motto “plus oultre” (v. 32):

À l’Aigle aussi, quand le vol de son aële  
Plus ne pourra sur la terre s’estendre  
Pour voller plus oultre, si fera fendre  
Touts les neuf cieulx jusque au lieu Angelique (v. 30-33).

Marot faithfully returns to the same figures, symbols and metaphors. The motif of Charles, as Cesar wielding peace instead of conquering through war, resurfaces in this epistle in the opening verses:

Si la faveur du Ciel, à ton passaige  
En France, faict de grands biens ung presaige,  
Aussi promet croistre l’heur qui te suyt,  
Cesar Auguste, à l’effèct qui s’ensuyt (v. 1-4).

The stress on peaceful conquest of the hearts of the people, however, instead of evoking Cesar’s military conquests, attempt to model Charles V as a new Cesar that is more
virtuous because he does not need to resort to arms, and in turn is more representative of Erasmian ideals:\footnote{See \textit{OC II}, p. 691, note 525: “La conquête des Gaules par les armes donna à Jules César la gloire militaire; celle qui se fait par les cœurs donne à l’empereur une gloire plus éclatante et plus conforme à l’idéal pacifique erasmien.”}:

\begin{quote}
Et pour garder ce que tu as acquis,
Aulcune force y tenir n’est reequis ;
Mais seulement une paix bien fermée
Par alliance, en amour confirmée,
Dont adviendra ferme tranquillité,
Et soubz la foy catholique unité (v. 17-2).
\end{quote}

The motif of brotherhood between Francis I and Charles V returns as a strategy to level the imbalance of power between the two rulers. Although Francis I is a king and Charles V is Holy Roman Emperor, the poet refers to them primarily as brothers:

\begin{quote}
Aussi promet croistre l’heure qui te suyt,
Cesar Auguste, à l’effect qui s’ensuyt. 
Ta conscience en la fidelité
Du Roy (ton frere) et son humanité (v. 3-6).
\end{quote}

Furthermore, the poet calls them both kings, thus symbolically bridging their differences in title:

\begin{quote}
Paix, qui tiendra les Provinces ouvertes
Et peuplera les regions desertes,
Des Roys unys la force assemblera
Dont le surplus du monde tremblera (v. 23-26).
\end{quote}

It becomes clear that the two subjects being spoken of are Francis I and Charles V, because of the iconic symbols that represent each of them respectively. For Francis I it is the salamander, and for Charles V the eagle. Francis I’s motto “nutrisco et exanguo” is alluded to in verses 28-29, “Après son fait mortel estainct en centre,/ Nourrir au feu d’une vie immortelle” which often accompanies the salamander in royal iconography.

The closing stanza of this epistle promotes peace between the two metaphorically through
their emblematic animals and imagines the intrinsic, powerful qualities of each unfolding positively and appropriately as long as they keep in favor of the goddess figure, Peace:

Paix, qui fera la vifve Salamandre,
Après son faict mortel estainct en centre,
Nourrir au feu d’une vie immortelle.
À l’Aigle aussi, quand le vol de son aële
Plus ne pourra sur la terre s’estendre
Pour voldre plus outle, si fera fendre
Touts les neuf cieulx jusque au lieu Angelique
Promys à ceulx qui ayment paix publicque. (v. 27-34)

The striking image of angels makes a sharp contrast with the image of an eagle, and renders the eagle less powerful in relation to angels who are everlasting in opposition to what is terrestrial and thus ephemeral: “son aële/ Plus ne pourra sur la terre s’estendre” (v. 30-31). While the salamanderhas everlasting life “une vie immortelle” (v. 29), the eagle has a perishable power that is limited. While one may consider that the Eagle, representing Charles V, implies indirect praise for the Emperor because heaven is reserved for him “lieu Angelique/Promys à ceulx qui ayment paix publicque” (v. 33-4); François Rigolot points out that this praise, however, remains in ambiguity by recalling that Marot had given the title of “the modern Eagle” to Francis I the poet.  

The shorter epistle that immediately follows, entitled “L’Adieu de France à l’Empereur”, was also originally published circa 1541 (Mayer 90) in Les Cantiques de la paix. It is only fifteen verses in length, and it is a send-off to the Emperor after a sojourn in France. The tone is praiseful and melancholy, and the poet makes reference anew to the dynastic ties between Charles V and France from the opening verses:

Adieu, Cesar, Prince bien fortuné,
De vray honneur par vertu couronné.
Adieu, le chef de la noble toison,

144 See OC II, note 527.
Au départir de la propre maison
Dont le bon duc, ton grand ayeul, fut né (v. 1-5).

In verse 3, the “chef de la noble toison” is a metonymic reference to the Ordre de la Toison D’or, a chivalric order of select noblemen originally founded by Philip the Good (1396-1467) Valois Duke of Burgundy. Charles V is referred to as the “chef” because he is the direct descendant of its founder. From oldest to youngest: Philip was the father of Charles the Bold, who was the father of Mary of Burgundy, who was the mother of Philip I the Handsome, who was the father of Emperor Charles V. Verses 4 and 5 point out that Charles V is leaving “la propre maison/ Dont le bon duc, ton grand ayeul, fut né” because Philip the Good was born in Dijon, France, which was the capital city of the Duchy of Burgundy. Thus, France and the Emperor have historical ties that the poet evokes specifically and emphatically in this poem. The historical memory of the poet stretches back several generations in an attempt to unearth the unity that should reign between the two monarchs, thus making an argument for a peaceful alliance between them.

The poem concludes with another strategy that highlights the unity that should exist between France and the Emperor. The poet refers to the French people, from the perspective of the Emperor, as les “tiens” who look forward to his return to France:

Le suppliant qu’ung jour jà ordonné
Te voye icy, des tiens environné :
J’entends des tiens qui sont miens par raison (v. 10-13).

The French poet, representing a French voice, aims to blur the lines between les “tiens” and les “miens”, signifying that they are one family.

Finally, the closing verses end in a hopeful tone, projecting into the future a time in which the Emperor will return to France, as his return will be joyfully awaited:

Or j’attendray ceste heureuse saison
En grand désir que tu soys retourné.
Adieu, Cesar (v. 13-15).

The final “Adieu” of verse 15, is an echo of the opening “Adieu” of verse 1, and it establishes that although there are ties between the Emperor and France, he does not live in France or rule there like Francis I. Thus a cordial alliance is supposed between France and the Empire, but not one that engulfs France and Francis I into disposssession of its identity and sovereignty.

Appearing in the Œuvres de 1544 under the heading “CHANTZ DIVERS DU RECUEIL”, the first poem “France à l’Empereur à son arrivée”, originally appeared in 1541(?) in the Berthelin edition of the Cantiques de la paix (Mayer 90).\footnote{OC II, page 701, note 47.} It also alludes to the passing of Charles V through France from the Pyrenees to Paris, where he arrived on January 1, 1540.\footnote{Ibid.} The theme of the poem is the contrast between the earthly world of the impermanent, and the divine world of the immortal. It stresses the vanitas of political reign, particularly that of Charles V in its ambiguous tone, which vacillates between praise and has undertones of warning against earthly pride.

Rhetorically, the poem begins with three direct questions:

\begin{quote}
Si ce bas monde et toute sa rondeur
Est embelly par la claire splendeur
Du seul renom qui court en ta personne,
Que doy je faire, ayant receu tant d’heur,
De veoir à l’œil la haultesse et grandeur
De ta sacrée et auguste couronne ?
Sera ce assez que j’en dresse et ordonne
Arc triumphant, Pyramide et Colonne,
Pour vray record à la posterité ?
Suffira il, Cesar, que je m’adonne
À te louer, tant que tout lieu resonne
Ta grand’ vertu et ma prosperité ? (v. 1-12, p. 320)
\end{quote}
The words “ce bas monde”, “Arc triomphant, Pyramide et Colonne”, and “tout lieu” designate the earthly temporary vanities of the human world in which the poet writes, and in which the monarch reigns. The celestial world stands in opposition to the earthly one, yet although it is connected, it is altogether apart.

After these three questions, the poem pivots upon the sharp word “Non;” (verse 13) which negates all three questions at once. The poet explains that the magnanimity of a ruler, the emperor, is joined to something divine, given that he is the Holy Roman emperor, however, the closing verses warn against earthly pride:

Non; car je voy ta magnanimité
De si près joincte à la divinité
Que si je veulx parfaire chose telle,
Je fay grand tort à l’immortalité,
Qui en louant ceste benignité
Se pense rendre encor plus immortelle. (v. 13-18)

The phrase “se pense rendre encor plus immortelle” is a construction that warns against the narcissism of wanting to be “even more immortal”, which is in a humorous way, a type of oxymoron that pokes fun at the overzealous, self-centered desire to be remembered and to last forever.

Following after the CHANTZ DIVERS DU RECUEIL, are the EPIGRAMMES DU RECUEIL, in which Marot writes an epigram entitled “À l’Empereur”, addressing Charles V as he arrives in Paris on the symbolic first day of the New Year: January 1, 1540. Although Francis I and Charles V had allegedly made peace at the treaty of Aigues-Mortes in July of 1538, the poem can be read as a tongue-in-cheek way of remembering the “luck” that Charles V seemed to have in acquiring so many territories after the deaths of Maximilian I of Habsburg and Ferdinand II of Aragon, and his election to the imperial throne. It seemed that destiny has unremittingly been in his favor:
À l’Empereur

Lors que (Cesar) Paris il te pleut veoir,
Et que pour toy la Ville estoit ornée,
Un jour devant il ne feit que pleuvoir,
Et l’endemain claire fut la journée.
Si donc faveur du Ciel te fut donnée,
Cela, Cesar, ne nous est admirable :
Car le Ciel est, comme par destinée,
Tout coustumier de t’estre favorable. (v. 1-8, p. 325)

In the first verse, the poet takes up again a tone that praises Paris, since it is a city that is beautiful to behold: “Lorsque (Cesar) Paris il te pleut veoir”. In Renaissance thought, fortune played an important role in the turning of events, and history was often interpreted as having been partly pre-written and partly left up to fortune. Here, the poet stresses that everything was orchestrated in favor of the emperor. The most beautiful city was decorated: “Et que pour toy la Ville estoit ornée” (v. 2), and even the elements of nature accommodated his entrance: “Un jour devant il ne feit que pleuvoir, / Et l’endemain claire fut la journée” (v. 3). Finally, the Emperor continues to have a divine favor that is not surprising to the poet: “Si donc faveur du Ciel te fut donnée,/Cela, Cesar, ne nous est admirable:/ Car le Ciel est, comme par destinée,/ Tout coustumier de t’estre favorable” (v. 5-8).

The closing verses evoke Charles V’s win of the Imperial Throne of Holy Roman Emperor over all the other candidates, which is diplomatically attributed to divine favor. This particular poem can be read as being ironic in tone, and it is equivocal, perhaps intentionally, whether or not the poem is obsequious toward the Emperor. Attributing Charles V’s success to something that was given to him (“faveur du Ciel te fut donnée” (v. 5)) reduces him to the status of a passive receiver, rather than a meritorious agent.
Marot’s “Sermon tresutile et saultaire du bon pasteur et du mauvais”\textsuperscript{148}, which was likely first published in Geneva in 1539 (Mayer 84)\textsuperscript{149}, also includes an allusion to both Francis I and Charles V with an understanding of their long-term rivalry as candidates to the imperial throne. This poem is religious in tone and comprises several prayers addressed to God. Verses 445-460 conclude the poem with references to Francis I and Charles V, in order to settle their disputes over power with a strong last verse attributing the only real Kingship to God. The prayer for the two monarchs begins at verse 445 and continues as follows:

Prions aussi tous unanimement
Levans au ciel yeux et mains humblement
Que l’\textit{Empereur} et \textit{Françoys} nostre Roy,
Tous deux esleuz fermement je le croy,
Puisse\textit{nt} \textit{regner si bien en ces bas lieux}
Qu’\textit{heritiers soient du Royaulme des cieulx}
Et que fyance en Dieu par toute voye
Soit leur clarté qui les mene et convoye..
Car c’est l’estoille en tenebres ardante
Par qui les Roys viennent à leur actente (v. 445-454).

These verses focus exclusively on the terrestrial political power of the Emperor and the King, mentioning that \textit{both} were “chosen” (“esleuz”), which has both political and religious connotations of privilege. The poet acknowledges their political power, but does not put it above the infinite, divine power of God. The poet places their royal power lower in the order of values with the words: “Puissent regner si bien en \textit{ces bas lieux}” (v. 449, my italics). The implied figure and ultimate King, God, is evoked as a third agent that breaks the bilateral friction, and reframes the competition between the two rival rulers. The poet subjects them both below God and God’s celestial kingdom above:

C’est \textit{le vray fort} en qui se fault fyer

\textsuperscript{148} \textit{OC II}, p. 479-492.
\textsuperscript{149} \textit{Ibid}, p. 729, note50.
Et dont chacun se doit fortifier
C’est luy qui rend toute force debille
Et par ung seul en faict tuer dix mille.
Donq luy est du doute louenge et gloire
Comme au seul Roy qui donne la victoire (v. 455-460, my emphasis).

The words “le vray fort”, “C’est luy”, “par ung seul”, “luy est”, “seul Roy qui donne la victoire” emphasize God as the sole and supreme King, thereby breaking the bilateral tension and mutual focus between Francis I and Charles V. The poet recasts the relationship of Francis I and Charles V by making it instead triangular, with God clearly at the head. The poet points skyward to remind the monarchs that there is a power greater than they are, and to which they are both subject. The ego-centric political battles between the two are tempered by the poetic voice warning that “C’est luy qui rend toute force debille” (v. 457) and “luy est du toute louenge et gloire/ Comme au seul Roy” (v. 459-460).

The poem that immediately follows, “Du coq à l’asne faict à Venise par ledict Marot le dernier jour de juillet MVCXXXVI” is a plea for peace that points out war, particularly between “Les Françoys” v. 184 and “Les Espaignols” v. 185 for the sake of territorial acquisition, as unintelligent, savage, and a mistake:

Des nouvelles de par deçà:
L’autre jour, quand il trespassa,
L’empereur, il ne l’estoit pas
Et n’avoit pas passé le pas
Pour dire qu’il fust trespassé.
Il est bien vray qu’il est passé
De l’Ytalye en la Prouvence.
Les Françoys crient : « Vive France ! »
Les Espaignols : « Vive l’empire ! »
Il n’y a pas pour tous à rire.
Le plus hardy n’est sans terreur.
N’est ce pas ung trop grand erreur,
Pour des biens qui ne sont que terre,
D’exiter si horrible guerre ?
Les gensdarmes sont furieux,
Chocquans au visaige et aux yeulx.
Il ne fault qu’une telle lorgne
Pour faire ung gentilhomme borgne.
Il ne fault qu’un traict d’arbaleste,
Passant au travers de la teste,
Pour estonner ung bon cerveau.
J’aymerois autant estre ung veau
Qui va droict à la boucherie
Qu’aller à telle tuerie. (v. 177-200)

The poet suggests that it is savage, or animal-like, to go directly into such slaughter without considering other options besides war. This is particularly evident in verses 197-200. The “bon cerveau” is in opposition to the “veau/ Qui va droict à la boucherie”. The poet does not shrink away from pointing specifically to French-Spanish rivalry and mentions it directly by name in verses 184-185 before commenting on its absurdity.

While Clément Marot’s aforementioned poems spanned in print the years 1538-1543, Maurice Scève’s Délie: Objet de plus haute vertu took up again the same subject of Franco-Spanish rivalry through the figures of Francis I and Charles V in his 1544 collection of poems, in epigram form. The epigram as a word and genre originally signified “inscription” in the Latin épigramma, formed by épi or “on” and graphein or “to write”. It is not until the sixteenth century that it acquires its meaning as “short poem or satirical portrait”150. Scève’s dizains are in sharp contrast to the long, story-telling poems of Marot, and they signify meaning in tandem with equally squared, enigmatic woodcuts that are interspersed consistently throughout the text every nine poems. Scève manages to represent the historical rivalry of Francis I and Charles V in the smaller space

of ten verses, consisting of ten syllables only, per poem; thus giving his representation a
sharper tone “en si durs epigrammes”\textsuperscript{151}.

D53 is the first poem in the collection that strays from the motif of love, and
moves away from Délie as the center of contemplation in a shift to focus on politics. In
this poem, the object of highest virtue is Francis I. The epigram is still in line with the
theme of praise of a higher being, except that in this case the King, instead of the
feminine beloved, is introduced as the praiseworthy center. His name appears at a central
position in the epigram, verse 4, and in a central position within the verse, syllable 3. His
first name appears in all capital letters, thereby making it stand out from the entire text.
The poem is an attempt to explain, by introducing a third figure, the figure of God
“L’Architecteur de la Machine ronde, Multipliant sa divine puissance” (v. 1-2) as the
agent behind Francis I’s temporary fall at Pavia\textsuperscript{152}, thus discrediting Charles V for this
defeat in battle:

\begin{verbatim}
L’Architecteur de la Machine ronde,
Multipliant sa divine puissance,
Pour enrichir la pauvreté du Monde
Créa FRANÇOIS d’admirable prestance,
Duquel voulant démontrer la constance,
Vertu occulte, il l’a soudain soumis
Aux faibles mains de ses fiers ennemis,
Chose sans lui vraiment impossible.
   Puis, l’acceptant de ses prouves amis,
   L’a remis sus en sa force invincible. (81)
\end{verbatim}

The poem explains that God was simply testing Francis I’s faithfulness which was
a “vertu occulte” (v. 6), a hidden virtue in him, and so, God submitted him to the “faibles

\textsuperscript{151} Verse 6 in Scève’s \textit{huitain} which opens the collection of epigrams and appears before the first poem that
is marked with the Roman numeral I. All of the poems cited in this chapter are from Maurice Scève. \textit{Délie; Objet de plus haute vertu.} Éd. Françoise Charpentier. Paris: Gallimard, 1984.
\textsuperscript{152} Charpentier points out that this \textit{dizain} is alluding to Francis I’s defeat by Charles V’s army at Pavia in
1525 and his subsequent captivity in Madrid. See LIII, note 1, pg. 317.
mains de ses fiers ennemis”, or the feeble hands of his prideful enemies. Here, the poem manages to criticize both rivals, Francis I and Charles V, while also praising Francis I. Francis I is criticized for his “hidden” virtue and Charles V is reduced to a proud and passive enemy with “feeble hands”. Francis I is ultimately praised because he is restored to power by God, who “l’acceptant de ses prouves amis” (v. 9) returns force to him after passing the test.

The poem manages, however, to submit both monarchs to a third and greater power that they both seem to recognize. In its small and square structure, this poem emphasizes the emblematic nature of a name, through its typography, and in the highlighted way that it appears in the economy of letters. It is also significant that the poem appears after the woodcut “La Chandelle et le Soleil”, because its composition as an image resonates within the hierarchy established in the poem. There is a greater light and a lesser one; God representing the light of the sun above and the King the light of a candle below.

D54 also follows this woodcut representative of God’s divine power over earthly matters, and elaborates upon the fate of Francis I’s against Charles V as having been previously written by divine power:

Glorieux nom, glorieuse entreprise
En coeur Royal, haut siège de l’honneur,
Lui fit combattre en si dure surprise
L’hoir de Jason, guidé par le bonheur.
De palme aussi le juste Coronneur
L’en a orné, durant qu’il a vécu.
   Car se faisant de sa Patrie écu,
Fit confesser à sa Fame importune
Que celui n’est, ni peut être vaincu,
Qui combat seul Ennemi et Fortune. (82)
The mythical figure Jason, of the Golden Fleece, is evoked as a champion to suggest that Charles V’s victory was pre-written, given that his ancestor was a conquering warrior. One of Charles V’s emblems was Jason, and he was assigned the title of “premier dignitaire de la Toison d’Or”. God is the “Glorieux nom” (v. 1) and the “coeur Royal” (v. 2) is Francis I, who is called to fight Jason’s heir. Evoking the crucified King, Jesus, crowned with palms, Francis I is equated to an only temporarily defeated king: “De palme aussi le juste Coronneur/ L’en orné” (v. 5 and 6) who would be subjected to an earthly, powerful monarch by divine will. Francis I as an emblematic figure of his Kingdom is emphasized in the verse “Car se faisant de sa Patrie écu” (v. 7), because an écu, or shield, was emblematic of a royal dynasty and its territories. The poem concludes on a forgiving note toward Francis I, “Qui combat seul Ennemi et Fortune” (v. 10), who was alone fighting an enemy predestined to conquer and against Fortune which was against him.

D55 plays with yet another one of Charles V’s emblems, the eagle, and distorts its powerful connotations by equating it with Icarus, whose wings melted because he flew too close to the sun, and by bringing in the homophone “Autruche” to portray “Austria” house of the Habsburgs as being represented instead by the clumsy, flightless bird, the ostrich:

L’Aigle volant plus loin qu’onques ne fit,
Cuidait rentrer en son Empire antique ;
Passa la Mer, où assez tôt défut
Un nouveau Monstre en ce pays d’Afrique ;
Puis prit son vol droit au Soleil Gallique
Duquel l’ardeur ne vive ne mourante,
Mais en son chaud modéré demourante

---

En s’attrempant, peu à peu lentement
La transmua en une Autruche errante,
Qui vole bas et fuit légèrement.

The poem transforms the emblem of the eagle into a new, comic emblem unflatteringly depicting an ostrich. Here, Francis I is represented by the “Soleil Gallique” (v. 5), the sun, typically representative of God. The Icarus myth is also evoked, but re-written to produce a comic effect. Charles V, like the overly ambitious Icarus, flies too close to the sun (Francis I, France) and thus suffers a punishment as a result. While Icarus falls because the wax attaching his wings melts, the Eagle Charles V is turned into an erring bird: “une Autruche errante” (v. 9), “Qui vole bas et fuit légèrement” (v. 10) that moves pathetically in comparison.

D115 reinforces the Golden Fleece as an emblem representing Charles V (v. 7):

> Par ton regard sévèrement piteux
> Tu m’éblouis premièrement la vue,
> Puis du regard de son feu dépiteux
> Surpris le Cœur et l’Âme à l’impourvue,
> Tant que depuis, après mainte revue,
> J’ars de plus fort sans novelle achoison.
> Ce même temps la superbe Toison,
> D’ambition qui à tout mal consent
> Toute aveuglée, épandit sa poison
> Dessus le juste et Royal innocent. (p. 116, my emphasis)

Francis I, on the other hand, is associated with innocence and justice in the closing verse:

> “le juste et Royal innocent” (v. 10). A major motif in the poem is the subject of vision, highlighted by the repetition of words associated with sight: “regard”, “vue”, “impourvue”, “revue” and “aveuglée”. This can be read as a self-referential theme that emphasizes sight as a major faculty that enables the understanding of signs, or emblems.

Scève’s clean-cut epigrams are striking to the reader’s sight and they are replete with emblematic images that evoke both monarchs through synecdoche and associate
them with virtue or vice, mythological heroes, or villains, in binary forms. Francis I, for example, is associated with innocence and justice and Charles V with “ambition”, in a pejorative sense as it “à tout mal consent” or “gives way to all evil” (v. 8).

D116 carries forward the binary qualities of “innocence” associated with Francis I and “ambition” associated with Charles V, except that in this epigram the two monarchs are metaphorically represented as the biblical figures of Cain and Abel. Here, the theme of rivalry between brothers returns, but within the framework of a biblical text. Furthermore, the poem elaborates on the implications an encounter between “ambition” and “innocence”. Because the epigram is in fact so short, sharply evocative biblical names give a powerful and weighty meaning to the poem; these emblematic\(^{155}\) names alone resurrect all of the connotations and historical interpretations of the Bible story:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Insatiable est l’appétit de l’homme} \\
\text{Trop efféné en sa cupidité,} \\
\text{Qui de la Terre ayant en main la pomme,} \\
\text{Ne peut souler si grand’ avidité,} \\
\text{Mais (ô l’horreur !) pour sa commodité} \\
\text{Viole foi, honneur et innocence.} \\
\text{Ne pleure plus, France, car la présence} \\
\text{Du sang d’Abel devant Dieu criera} \\
\text{Si hautement que pour si grande offense} \\
\text{L’aîné Caïn devant toi tremblera. (p. 116)}
\end{align*}
\]

The first verses (1-6) serve to characterize Charles V as the epitome of human cupidity, and the sinful quality of Adam, evoked by the famed apple: “ayant en main la pomme” (v. 3). It is he who violates everything that Francis I and France stand for in sharp contrast: “fois, honneur, et innocence” (v. 6).

The second half of the epigram cloaks the two monarchs in the robes of Abel and Caïn, thus pitting them as two famous, rival brothers. There is no question about who is

\(^{155}\) Here I am using the word “emblematic” in its proper sense as “figure symbolique”. See *Dictionnaire étymologique*, p. 275.
the “sinful” brother in the poem, or in the biblical story. The plight of France, and by extension of Francis I, is associated with Abel in verses 7 and 8: “Ne pleure plus, France, car la présence/ Du sang d’Abel devant Dieu criera”. Charles V, or the offending, murderous brother Caïn, is lowered before the eyes of divine justice who will make him “tremble” (v. 10). Once again, the binary rivalry between Francis I and Charles V is set off by the third figure of God. While in some poems both monarchs are placed as equally flawed, mortal beings clearly subordinate to God, in this poem there is one party that is clearly justified. The poem suggests that France is ultimately triumphant despite how it may appear on Earth, because in an era to come, it will be on the right side of divine justice.

The next poem in the collection that addresses the rivalry of the two monarchs does not appear until D298, but it reinforces through repetition, the willed association between ambition magnified into the biblical vice, avarice (v. 5), and Charles V, so that by now it evokes him through periphrasis as early as verse 1 in the poem:

Est-il possible, ô vaine Ambition,
Que les plus grands puissent outrecuider
Si vainement, que la fruition,
N’ayant pouvoir de leurs combles vider,
Les vienne ainsi d’avarice brider,
Que moins ils ont quant plus cuident avoir ?
    Aussi Fortune en leur plus haut pouvoir
    Se feint de honte être ailleurs endormie,
    Comme à chacun évidemment fit voir
    Celle Province aux Charles ennemie. (p. 217)

The last verse confirms that the opening verse indeed refers to Charles V, but not only him, also another Charles that was also enemy to the province of Picardie: Charles Le
The preposition in the plural form “aux”, in verse 10, signals that the identical name “Charles” refers to two Charles and not one. This detail points to both Charles Le Téméraire’s defeat at Beauvais in 1472 and Charles V’s more recent defeat at Landrecies in 1542. The identical name playfully points to these losses, as if they had been inscribed by fate in the name itself. This rhetorical strategy in the poem gives the name a cursed and undesirable quality when possessed by any enemy of France, across historical time. It also extends the underlying current of fate’s influence over life: particularly including battles, politics, and the course of history.

The last epigram to conjure the opposition of Francis and Charles is D318:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Jà tout hautain en moi je me paonnais} \\
\text{De ce qu’Amour l’avait pu inciter ;} \\
\text{Mais sûrement, à ce que je connais,} \\
\text{Quand il me vint du bien féliciter} \\
\text{Et la promesse au long me réciter,} \\
\text{Il me servit d’un très faux Truchement.} \\
\text{Que dirai donc de cet abouchement} \\
\text{Que Ligurie et Provence et Venice} \\
\text{Ont vu, en vain assembler richement} \\
\text{Espagne, France et Italie à Nice ?}
\end{align*}
\]

This epigram takes up the motif of love, so ubiquitous in the Délie, and he returns as a character, given the capitalization. The poem casts a shadow upon Love as deceitful. The tone of the poem is skeptical, and it pivots upon the word “Mais” of the third verse. While in the opening verses the poetic voice depicts himself as a showy and proud bird figure, not the ostrich, but the peacock (the verb paonner, came from paon, and meant in the sixteenth century, “to strut about”). Yet, he is skeptical of language; specifically of diplomatic language such as felicitations (v. 4) and (v. 5) promises. This type of speech

---

157 See Dictionnaire étymologique, p. 575.
confirms the falsehood behind Love’s promises, or in this political context, of promises of peace: “Il me servit d’un très faux Truchement” (v. 6). Here, “truchement” is to be taken in the figurative sense meaning “Intermediary”\(^{158}\), referring to the figure Amour, who is a “faux”, or false arbitrator bearing deceitful discourse.

From the break at verse 7 until the end of the poem at verse 10, the poetic “je”, taking up the role of diplomat or ambassador, asks himself the disappointing question: “What will I say of this meeting, that Ligurie, Provence, and Venice saw, in vain, Spain, France, and Italy assemble at Nice?” These closing verses make a historical allusion to the 1538 meeting, mediated by Pope Paul III, in which Francis I and Charles V signed a truce.\(^{159}\) Tensions were high between the two monarchs and they had to negotiate “personally and separately” with the Pope in a monastery because Francis I would not allow the fortress of Nice to be used for this gathering.\(^{160}\) The two monarchs did not actually discuss the truce face to face.\(^{161}\)

In this epigram there is a continuation of the binary tension being broken up by a third figure. In verse 10, the political heads are represented by the countries that are emblematic of their identity. Through the rhetorical device of synecdoche, all of France is used to evoke Francis I, Spain conjures Charles V, and Italy stands for Pope Paul III, the

\(^{158}\) Ibid., p. 803.

\(^{159}\) See Françoise Charpentier, note 1, page 327.


\(^{161}\) Ibid. “For the Emperor, the war of 1536-7 had been on the whole far less successful than those of 1522-9. Francis had overrun almost the whole of Savoy and Piedmont, he had invaded Artois, and successfully repelled two invasions of France. He was content for the present to rest upon his conquests, to hold Savoy, an outpost for defense, a ready road for attack, and to defer the settlement of other outstanding questions for a season. Charles was the more willing to leave Savoy in Francis’ possession because the Duke had offended him deeply in the matter of Nice. On the other hand he needed peace above all for his affairs in Germany, and to meet the Turkish danger. A long truce with the appearance of durability suited him as well or better than a peace, which could only have been secured at the price of humiliating and damaging concessions. In fact the two Powers, after violent oscillations to and fro, had reached a position of comparatively stable equilibrium. They had learnt their own limitations, and the strength of their adversaries”, pg. 73.
mediating figure at the truce signing. The poetic “je” of this poem, and the mythological figure, Amour, are relegated to ambassadorial positions that are passive and powerless amidst the two strong monarchs. Only another large figurehead represented by Italy, and closer to the power status of both Kings, the Pope, is able to step in, and only with limited success.

The historic rivalry between Francis I and Charles V is represented in the various poems of Clément Marot and the short, squared epigrams of Maurice Scève through the use of emblems so as to indirectly praise, warn, and criticize the two powerful monarchs. Both poetic texts draw from well-known secular literary stories and as well as the Catholic religious tradition of biblical narratives to associating the monarchs with emblematic characters in these stories in an attempt to illustrate that war is unintelligent and illogical. Both poets introduce third-party figures such as God, Pallas, Noble Women, and Peace, to destabilize the binary friction between Francis I and Charles V. In this way, the relationship of the monarchs to each other is recast as involving more than each other and also as subject to the push and pull of other acting forces.

Both poets attempt to ground the monarchs by positioning God unquestionably above both of them, and reframing their vision of themselves as subjects of a greater power that is truly behind each of their victories and their defeats. Scève is perhaps the more audacious of the two poets in that he goes as far as creating a parody out of Charles V through his twisting of the Eagle emblem that represents Charles into an awkward ostrich.

What the poems of both Clément Marot and Maurice Scève do very effectively is to cause the reader to ask “What is power, and who really has it?” If Charles V and
Francis I are subject to the temptations of a war-hungry Mars, to the persuasive arguments of eloquent and influential noble women, to the directives of the Pope, to the common and invested family members in their lineage, to the wheel of Fortune and the inscriptions of Fate, and to the ultimate unwavering power of an Almighty God, and even to a certain extent, to the pen of poets, then does it truly make sense for them to consider themselves as all-powerful and wage war over that?
Chapter 4. The Rivalry of Francis I and Charles V in Joachim Du Bellay’s *Songe* (1558)

« *Cet homme-là m’a fait plus de mal que tous les Français.* »

- *Emperor Charles V referring to Guillaume Du Bellay, captain and diplomat under King Francis I’s reign.*

Joachim Du Bellay’s voyage and stay in Rome (1553-1557) with Cardinal Jean Du Bellay was a defining moment in his career as a poet. It is from this experience of walking the streets that once housed the great Roman poets of classical antiquity that he began to incorporate visions and flashback-like dreams about the past in juxtaposition with the immediacy of his observations of the present moment into his poetry. It is from this angle that for the purposes of this chapter, we will study how, under the reign of Henri II (1547-1559), Du Bellay looks back to represent the momentous rivalry between Charles V and his growing empire vis-à-vis France under Francis I.

Francis I lived from 1494 until 1547 and ruled for thirty two years as King of France from the year 1515 until his death. He had a relatively long reign and is recognized by some historians and scholars as a notable king because of his robustness, relative longevity and health, and for his protection of artists as well as his promotion of the French language as an official language over Latin. His successor, Henry II, who was born in 1519 and lived until 1559 when he died from a tournament injury, had a much shorter reign. Some historians, such as R.J. Knecht, evaluate this as a decline in terms of royal presence and authority in comparison to the rule of Francis because after Henry’s short time as king, “France was then precipitated into the brief reign of the fifteen-year-

---

old Francis II, followed by the minority of his brother, Charles IX, during which royal authority was seriously weakened”.

This chapter analysis will take into consideration the Songe, a collection written during Du Bellay’s exile in Rome (1553-1557), which is made up of the last 15 sonnets in Du Bellay’s collection of poetry entitled Les Antiquités de Rome (1558). In this chapter, I argue that Du Bellay’s sonnets can be read as anti-Imperialist because emblems and symbols representing Charles V are broken down and demystified into terrestrial and ephemeral objects. The poet’s visions, or dreams, in the Songe collection focus on the motif of vanitas and eventual destruction and demise as their common thread, and this is intricately associated with the Empire of Charles V, rival of France under the reign of the great King Francis I, in particular.

Scholars have made cases for different readings of Du Bellay’s Songe. There is a general consensus that this poetic sequence is particularly obscure and difficult to decipher because of its heavy symbolism. In the realm of literary criticism, this poetic sequence has generated a variety of possible readings which will be briefly outlined here.

Hassan Melehy reads the Songe in “Joachim Du Bellay’s Dream Language: The Songe as Allegory of Poetic Signification” through the lens of psychoanalysis, taking fundamental interpretive premises from Freud and Lacan as a basis for his argument. While acknowledging Gilbert Gadoffre’s “magisterial deciphering of the Songe as a Gallicanist allegory of pontifical Rome” (4) and Michael Riffaterre’s claim that “the

---

purpose of the obscurity in the *Songe* is to reveal rather than to conceal” (4), he suggests an additional possible reading. For Melehy, the seemingly obscure signs in the *Songe* reveal something because of their relation to each other: the elasticity of poetic signification due to sign placement and sign inter-association. What is de-stressed is the relation of signifier to signified. The reading that Melehy is suggesting through a Lacanian lens is that the *Songe* is exemplifying, in its apparent obscurity and chain of signs, the polysemy of linguistic signs: when placed next to each other they can produce several and mutable layers of meaning that go beyond what these signs can signify outside of the associational context found in the poetic structure:

As Jacques Lacan has observed in numerous places, Freud offers an elaborate theory of the associational relations between linguistic signs in his works on the unconscious. Du Bellay presents relations among signs that […] are associational in similar fashion, so that meaning comes to be seen as a matter of relations among signs rather than as grounded in the objects to which signs refer. The procedures of Du Bellay’s allegory become more apparent when viewed in the perspective Freud provides, in which the potential of signs to produce meaning is greatly extended and transmutations in the relations between signifier and signified continually occurr. (4)

Thus, Melehy finds in the *Songe* a revelation, through language, signs, and poetic structure, an illustration of how words signify.

In another reading put forth in the article “Du Bellay’s *Songe* Re-Examined”, Thomas Zamparelli characterizes the *Songe* as a poetic sequence that is mainly “a manifestation of the fantasy mode”166. Furthermore, he claims that there is no need to decipher the symbolic imagery in the sonnets:

[W]e also need to take our cue from the narrator himself, who reacts with wonderment tinged, at times, with fear at the sheer prodigiousness of what he sees, yet seems, on the whole uninterested in deciphering these visions. [...] re-examining these sonnets, we note that much of the sense of ambiguity and obscurity derives from the fact that the narrator does not link the “microtext” of individual sonnets to the “macrotext” (Katz’s terminology, p. 1)\textsuperscript{167} of Rome’s rise and fall. In effect, message and symbol never come entirely together in the Songe the way they do frequently in the Antiquitez proper…(220)

For Zamparelli, the Songe is a suite of fantastical visions that create tension and ambiguity in the reader. Zamparelli’s reading ultimately concludes that “this tension and ambiguity need not be resolved and, in fact, need not be sustained if we are to consider this work a manifestation of the fantastic mode” (220). While he does not discard the possibility of the Songe pointing to something historical, he does not read too specifically into the significance of each of the symbols in the Songe but does consider in his claim the possibility of fantasy as a means “to recreate through écriture itself the pictorial-symbolic history of the Eternal City in a series of vignettes offered to Henri II” (220) and “to intensify a certain vision of historical reality, but also to pictorially create a series of stylized models or paradigms of that reality” (221).

Other scholars have read more specific meanings in the symbolism of the Songe. For example, in his article “Le Songe de J. Du Bellay et le sens des recueils romains”\textsuperscript{168}, Guy Demerson points to several different readings of this poetic sequence in a similar

vein as his own as he argues for a reading of more specific political significance therein. He points to the Petrarchan intertext Canzone 24 and concludes that whereas the Italian sonnet is about the beloved woman’s demise, the French sonnets are about the fall of the Eternal City, thus becoming political in significance: “[l]e lyrisme [du Songe] est devenu allégorie politique” (170) and “[l]e symbolisme du Songe est politique” (171).

Furthermore, he notes that while in Petrarch’s Visions death is represented by a supernatural being, in the Songe it is represented by something much more plausible and recognizable: “les chiens dévorants, la tempête et la foudre représentent par allégorie […] des coalitions d’envahisseurs trop réels, des combats datables” (174).

Based on linguistic evidence, Demerson first establishes the point that there is significance in the tenses used in the Antiquitez and in the Songe. He claims that the imperfect tense of the Antiquitez gives them a nostalgic tone, whereas the perfect tense of the Songe makes the fall depicted in the sonnets point to a more vivid reality. He contrasts that while the Antiquitez wanted a resurrection for Rome, the Songe did not commemorate the glory of Roman monuments for readers in 1558, but rather destroys these monuments before their eyes and characterizes their destruction as alluding to a state of politics recognizable to readers of that time (171). With respect to political allegory, Demerson claims that the eagle in the Songe becomes a sinister worm, which does not equate Rome with the typical Phoenix, but rather the “anti-Phénix” (172). He argues that the Songe points to the “décomposition sans remède de Rome” (172).

Demerson further supports his political argument by citing Dutch humanist scholar Jan van der Noot’s assertion that the Songe is political as well, even if he claims that it is a commentary on how the religious mission of the clergy is corrupted by politics
Demerson remarks that the Songe contains specific anti-imperial emblems, based on mythological intertextuality and allusion, such as the struck eagle (“l’aigle foudroyée”), which is a symbol of the degraded Empire. For him the Songe is an attack on *translatio*, the passage of the Empire from Rome to the Germanic Holy Roman Empire (173). Also as a supporting point, he cites Saint Gélais’ pejorative play on words through a slippage of the word *Aigle* (Eagle) into *Autruche* (Ostrich), the prominent imperial emblem (173). Other Du Bellay poems outside of the Songe continue this pattern; in the allegorical images of the *Tragiques Regrets de Charles V*, Du Bellay turns the eagle into a crow, thus degrading it (173). Brantôme acknowledges that there is a similarity between the destiny of Charles V and that of Rome in that they have a similar streak of triumphs, suites of bloodshed, and an ensuing fall (173). Demerson sees very concretely in the last sonnet of the Songe a strongly evocative link to Charles V. In this climactic sonnet, Rome is defined as “la soeur du grand Typhée”, and Typhée was an alias for Charles V in anti-imperial propaganda (174).

While some scholars, such as Cynthia Skenazi169, argue that the Antiquitez and its annexed *Songe* are a warning to the dedicatee Henri II against nurturing any imperialist tendencies, I argue that it can be strikingly read as a backward glance and criticism of a powerful rival of his monarchy: Charles V and his expansion in his quest to form a universal monarchy and the simultaneous and destructive wars fought against France under Francis I’s reign. A study of the way emblems are treated in these poems, as well as a close reading of language that was associated with Charles V, supports this argument. The mythological emblems that are embedded throughout the poetic collection

are a medium through which Du Bellay’s catastrophic Songe juxtaposes Roman futile ambition with that of Charles V who so insisted in placing himself as an inheritor of the greatness of the Roman Empire. In this way, the poetry advocates in France and in French for a ceasefire in violence.

Moreover, when read in light of Du Bellay’s Défense et Illustration de la langue française, it becomes clear that the poet would not consider rivalry between civilizations to be fruitless at the level of language and culture. As illustrated in the Défense, competition in this rivalry and the drive to emulation can lead to literary production and productivity, thus being creative. However, such a rivalry is destructive for both parties when it involves violent wars and battles that deplete life, resources, and energy.

While Du Bellay’s Défense and his Songe suggest a simultaneous admiration and criticism of Rome, the poetry does not advocate for a translato imperii that would pass on Rome’s catastrophic political fate to France, but rather a translato studii in which the greatness of Roman language, arts, and culture would be emulated by French language, arts, and culture. Since the Middle Ages, there was a widespread belief that the transfer of what is studied (translato studii) and a transfer of political supremacy and imperial power (translato imperii) would be passed down from classical antiquity (Greece and Rome) to a select civilization of then modern-day Europe¹⁷⁰, and monarchs ruling over different kingdoms in the first half of the sixteenth-century, such as Charles V, Francis I, and Henry VIII fought over who had inherited this powerful legacy. However, Du Bellay’s poetry points vividly to the baggage that could come with this inheritance should the French emulate the Romans too closely.

Charles V saw and portrayed himself as a Cesar and as the inheritor of the mighty Roman civilization. The emblems and symbols that were associated with him by artists, sculptors, armorers, and writers (to name a few skilled in the art of representation) were Roman in style and form. We can analyze how a pictorial form of representation that extends beyond poetry, but shares with it an emblematic symbolism, is found in material objects destined for Emperor Charles V and parallels the symbolism in Du Bellay’s *Songe*.

In his illuminating analysis entitled “A Parade Shield of Charles V”\(^{171}\), Stephen V. Grancsay explains the elements of a scene that has been chiseled into an ornate, nine-pound shield made in Milan circa 1555 and presented to Charles V. On this tough surface, the Emperor is represented “mounted on an armored horse on whose peytrel is a double-headed eagle in a shield surmounted by the imperial crown, with an eagle on either side” (125) and he “wears parade armor in the style of a Roman Caesar with shoulder and skirt pendants” (126).

On this scenic and carefully embossed shield, three prominent men appear on horseback in front of the other horsemen: the Duke of Alva is to the left of Charles V, and his brother Ferdinand I is to his right. Charles V is identified, not only by his conspicuous placement at the front and center of the shield, but also by the insignia used to make him identifiable on the hard russet surface: his horse’s peytrel is different from that of all the others, as it contains two very large eagles facing inward toward a smaller crowned shield (with a double-headed eagle with heads facing outward, so that the eagles actually appear to be facing each other) surrounded by the collar of the Golden Fleece.

In a similar analysis of emblems used to represent Charles V, Ángeles Jordano studies in “The Plus Oultra Writing Cabinet of Charles V: Expression of the Sacred Imperialism of the Austrias” another Italian work of craftsmanship created circa 1532. The pictorial representation on this cabinet was achieved on wood through the technique of marquetry, or intarsia, which was used in Italy to decorate furniture. The scenes are made up of stained veneers of wood that together make up the elements of each vignette. The Plus Oultra cabinet is one of the most elaborate, oldest, and most unique examples of its kind still conserved in Europe and the scenes crafted onto it were on display at the Victoria and Albert Museum of London in the year 2010. (23) It is believed that the cabinet was given to Charles V as a gift during his stay in Mantua in 1532.173

The Plus Oultra cabinet is named as such because upon opening the fall-front lid the emblems of Charles V are revealed and they cover the entire surface: the two Pillars of Hercules and his motto “Plus Oultra”. In this cabinet, like in the emblem of the embossed shield, the myth of Jason and the Golden Fleece is alluded to through a cloth that is draped on the branch of a tree in one of the cabinet’s surfaces, thus keeping in line with the imperial ideology of the Order of the Golden Fleece of which Charles V was the head.174 Another feature of the cabinet is that it contains medallions depicting Roman Emperors which, as Jordano suggests, is a way of declaring and reinforcing Charles V as the successor of these figures and of the Roman Empire. (18) Charles V does not appear as another icon in the style and succession line of the other Roman emperors represented, however. This could be because he was then the living inheritor, or because although he
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inherited their legacy, he would not inherit their fate. In addition, it is worth noting that the theme of vanitas appears already in images of the cabinet\textsuperscript{175}, which is a theme we see again in the \textit{Songe} sequence: time consumes all things.

Out of the fifteen sonnets that make up the \textit{Songe}, Sonnet IV depicts in detail one of the key emblems used to represent Emperor Charles V, which is the grand double columns forged in stone (verses 1-8). Within the following 8 verses we see “columnes d’ivoire” (v. 1), “Portant ailes au doz” (v. 6) and “Empereurs” (v. 8) which together evoke Charles V emblematic herculean columns, the eagle, and his title of Emperor, respectively:

\begin{quote}
Je vy hault eslevé sur \textbf{columnes d’ivoire},
Dont les bases estoient du plus riche metal,
A chapiteaux d’albastre & frizes de crystal,
Le double front d’un arc dressé pour la mémoire.

A chaque face estoit protraicte une victoire,
\textbf{Portant ailes au doz.} avec habit nymphal,
Et hault assise y fut sur un char triomphal
\textbf{Des Empereurs Romains} la plus antique gloire. (p. 32, my emphasis)
\end{quote}

The sestet that concludes the sonnet is surprising in its ending because the first half of it (verses 9 to 11) stresses an apparent immortality: the columnar structure seemed to be made (“sembloit estre fait”) not by a corporeal human being but by the blacksmith roman god of fire, Vulcan.\textsuperscript{176} The “paternelle foudre” or paternal lightning was the forging tool of a god-like monument representing the Emperor:

\begin{quote}
L’ouvrage ne monstroit un artifice humain,
Mais sembloit estre fait de celle propre main
Qui forge en aguisant la paternelle foudre. (p. 32)
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{175} We see vanitas through depictions on the cabinet of hour glasses and the passing of time.

\textsuperscript{176} See note 1, page 32.
However, the last tercet turns sharply upon the exclamation “Las” in verse 12, and there is a twist in the tone of the poem, which leads into the surprising fall of the last verse. Verses 1-13 build up the poem as a column and in the last verse the beautiful and perfect column is suddenly and shockingly collapsed with the words : “D’une soudaine cheute estre reduict en poudre” (v. 14).

Las, je ne veulx plus voir rien de beau sous les cieux, Puis qu’un œuvre si beau j’ai veu devant mes yeux D’une soudaine cheute estre reduict en poudre. (p. 32)

Sonnet IV in the Songe sequence continues the motif of the collection which is that of the inherent temporality and impermanence of the terrestrial world. This motif reflects the paradoxical nature of a monarch who may only seem to be all-powerful, yet as part of the material world he is equally subject to the passage of time, to death, to defeat, and to destruction. The last word “poudre” also elicits a biblical echo of the Lenten message that forewarns: “Remember you are dust and to dust you shall return”. The poem illustrates that nothing terrestrial or material is immune to this biblical proclamation. In her article “Du Bellay and the Language of Alchemy: The Songe”, Heather Ingman points out that the buildings in the Songe sonnets II-IV evoke those of the city in Revelation 21.11-23, thus supporting that the biblical message of vanitas is intricately woven as a common thread throughout Du Bellay’s collection. The biblical and the political were inseparable traditions for many European monarchies, and especially that of Charles V’s Holy Roman Empire and that of Francis I.

This sonnet is also significant in Du Bellay’s 1558 Songe because it takes up again the architectural images that are so present in his 1549 Défense et Illustration de la
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langue française, to express vanity, except that in this collection it is in the context of the charged symbolism of the Herculean towers that symbolize Charles V. In the Deffence, we see a contrast between the ephemeral quality of princes’ castles and the grandiose buildings representing their monarchy and power, and the language of that kingdom—which comes closer to immortality and is cultivated by its poets:

Car la plus haute excellence de leur république [romaine], voire du temps d'Auguste, n’était assez forte pour se défendre contre l’injure du temps, par le moyen de son Capitole, de ses thermes et magnifiques palais, sans le bénéfice de leur langue, pour laquelle seulement nous les louons, nous les admirons, nous les adorons. Sommes-nous donc moindres que les Grecs et Romains, qui faisons si peu de cas de la nôtre ? (II, Ch. XII, p. 259, my emphasis).

Furthermore, in the Défense, he associates the fall of architecture with the fall of monarchies:

Mais vous ne serez jà si bons maçons (vous, qui êtes si grands zélateurs des langues grecque et latine) que leur puissiez rendre cette forme que leur donnèrent premièremment ces bons et excellents architectes ; et si vous espérez (comme fit Esculape des membres d’Hippolyte) que par ces fragments recueillis elles puissent être ressuscitées, vous vous abusez, ne pensant point qu’à la chute de si superbes édifices conjointe à la ruine fatale de ces deux puissantes monarchies, une partie devint poudre, et l’autre doit être en beaucoup de pièces, lesquelles vouloir réduire en un serait chose impossible […] (Défense et Illustration, Ch. XI, p. 228, my emphasis).

The poet also suggests that the pursuit of material grandeur is a misguided vice:

Ce qu’advient à tous ceux qui mettent l’assurance de leur immortalité au marbre, au cuivre, aux colosses, aux pyramides, aux laborieux édifices, et autres choses non moins sujettes aux injures du ciel et du temps, de la flamme et du fer, que de frais excessifs et perpétuelle sollicitude. Les allèchements de Vénus, la gueule et les otieuses plumes ont chassé d’entre les hommes tout désir de l’immortalité : mais encore est-ce chose plus indigne, que ceux qui
d’ignorance toutes espèces de vices font leur plus grande gloire, se moquent de ceux qui en ce tant louable labeur poétique emploient les heures que les autres consument aux jeux, aux bains, aux banquets, et autres tels menus plaisirs (Livre II, Ch. 5, pg. 242-43, my emphasis).

Du Bellay’s poetry as seen in the Antiquitez and Songe as well as his philosophy in the Défense, praise the immortal, intellectual, and spiritual qualities of the written word and of language, whereas he bestows a negative value to the pursuit of material grandeur and acquisition. Charles V falls in line with the misguided legacy of the Romans who sought immortality through their architecture and imperial expansion, whereas in sharp contrast Francis I was a king to be remembered for his protection and promotion of the arts, of poets, and of the French language.

Sonnet VI evokes the Holy Roman Empire of which Charles V was elected emperor by recalling the mythical foundation of Rome through the story of the twins Romulus and Remus “ceste couple jumelle” at the breast of a wolf-mother (v. 1-4). The first stanza depicts the peaceful scene of the wolf-mother nourishing the young who were happily playing “mignardement joüer” (v. 3) and the mother was caressing her young (v. 4):

Une Louve je vy sous l’antre d’un rocher
Allaictant deux bessons : je vis à sa mamelle
Mignardement joüer ceste couple jumelle,
Et d’un col allongé la Louve les lecher. (v. 1-4)

The second stanza, however, shows that outside of her territory “hors de là sa pasture” (v. 5) she is cruel and violent without cause, and is unduly on the offensive:

Je la vy hors de là sa pasture chercher,
Et courant par les champs, d’une fureur nouvelle
Ensanglanter la dent & la patte cruelle
Sur les menus troppeaux pour sa soif estancher. (v. 5-8)
The poem’s sestet depicts a tragic resolution to this type of cruel behavior toward foreign neighbors by telling of a return attack that ends up killing the violent wolf-mother and her young:

\begin{quote}
Je vy mille veneurs descendre des montagnes  
Qui bornent d’un costé les Lombardes campagnes,  
Et vy de cent espieux luy donner dans le flanc.  
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
Je la vy de son long sur la plaine estendue,  
Poussant mille sanglotz, se veautrer en son sang,  
Et dessus un vieux tronc la despouille pendue. (v. 9-14)
\end{quote}

In the veiled language of symbolism, the poem criticizes the brutal behaviors of expanding empires, such as Rome. Rome, like the wolf-mother, would be kind only toward her own, but when she ventured out of her pastures she would show cruelty and violence by shedding blood. The story shows then that the outcome of such behavior is ultimately disastrous and that this way of operating is untenable. The poem’s backward glance at the fall of Rome is not without purpose, however; it is an indirect criticism of the expanding Holy Roman Empire of Charles V, whose Roman legacy carries this dark symbolism turned into a bad omen in the poet’s vision.

The mythological background that explains Charles V’s emblem of herculean columns and “plus ultra” as his motto within the emblem is relevant here, because it is related to the idea of imperial expansion. In the Greek myth, Heracles’ (Hercules) placed those columns where it was allegedly the end of the earth, thus the motto “non plus ultra”, or “no further beyond”. Charles V took up these same columns, but amended the motto by eliminating the negation “non” to make it read as only “plus ultra”, or “further beyond”. In the encyclopedia of Spanish Emblems, it is explained that Charles V saw
himself as taking up the work that was left by Hercules and going beyond the limits that had been set to conquer the “New World”, that is, going beyond the border of what was known, conquered land with respect to his empire. This is significant because in taking up this emblem, Charles V is aligning himself with Greco-Roman mythology, Roman ideas of conquest, and embodying that which is outlined in this sonnet from the *Songe*.

Charles V, like the mother-wolf who engendered the mythical founders of Rome, Romulus and Remus, goes beyond his borders as she does:

> Je la vy hors de là sa pasture chercher,  
> Et courant par les champs, d’une fureur nouvelle  
> Ensanlanter la dent & la patte cruelle  
> Sur les menus troppeaux pour sa soif estancher. (v. 5-8)

Sonnet VII evokes from verse 1 the codes denoted by bird emblems, which includes the eagle of Charles V, and which Rabelais and Marot already parody in their work (see Chapters 1 and 3). The Icarus myth, much referred to by French Renaissance poets, is prominent in Roman mythology to warn against unbridled ambition. This sonnet can be read as a history of Charles V’s continuing legacy. In the reading I propose, Charles is “l’oyeau, qui la lumiere fuit, / Comme un vermet renaistre de sa cendre.” (verses 13-14). Like his forefathers, he is bound to make the same mistakes in overreaching his capacities. The poem stresses that the bird “Suivant encor le maternel exemple” (verse 4) is doomed to follow the actions of his ancestors, presumably ad infinitum:

> Je vy l’Oyseau, qui le Soleil contemple,  
> D’un foible vol au ciel s’avanturer,  
> Et peu à peu ses ailes aseurer,  
> *Suivant encor le maternel exemple.*
Je le vy croistre, & d’un voler plus ample
Des plus hauts monts la hauteur mesurer,
Percer la nuë, & ses ailes tirer
Jusques au lieu ou des Dieux est le temple.

Là se perdit : puis soudain je l’ay veu
Rouant par l’aire en tourbillon de feu,
Tout enflammé sur la plaine descendre.

Je vy son corps en poudre tout reduit,
Et vy l’oyseau, qui la lumiere fuit,
Comme un vermet renaiusre de sa cendre.

The repetition of the words “Je vy” in verses 1, 5 and 12 give the poet the role of witness to this fateful occurrence and it gives the story an immediacy that resurrects it from Roman times to make it true and relevant for the political realm of the sixteenth century. The verb “renaistre” that appears in verse 14 of the poem suggests that history, because of lineages and fate, repeats itself.

Sonnet VIII depicts a rising flood “un fier Torrent” becoming a monster that squashed villages and castles alike (“Qui villes & chasteaux couvoit sous sa poitrine” (v. 6)), as well as indiscriminately devouring beasts of good and bad nature, “Et sembloit devourer d’une egale rapine/ Les plus doux animaux & les plus orgueilleux.” (v. 7-8):

VIII

Je vi un fier Torrent, dont les flots escumeux
Rongeoyent les fondememts d’une vieille ruine :
Je le vy tout couvert d’une obscure bruine,
Qui s’elevoit par l’air en tourbillons fumeux :

Dont se formoit un corps à sept cheffz merveilleux,
Qui villes &   chasteaux couvoit sous sa poitrine,
Et sembloit devourer d’une egale rapine
Les plus doux animaux & les plus orgueilleux.
J’estois emerveillé de voir ce monstre enorme
Changer en cent façons son effroyable forme,
Lors que je vy sortir d’un antre Scythien

Ce vent impetueux, qui soufle la froidure,
Dissiper ces nuaux, & en si peu que rien
S’esvanouïr par l’air ceste horrible figure.

The growing mass that kept devouring everything in its path strongly evokes Charles V and his rapidly growing empire. The threat of Charles V was truly a growing and frightful one for many Europeans who were not under his rule. The Sack of Rome (1527), for example, was precipitated by the Emperor’s disapproval of Pope Clement VII’s alliance with Francis I in the League of Cognac.

Furthermore, one of the main reasons why Francis I and Henri VIII put themselves up as candidates for the seat of Holy Roman Emperor was their fear of Charles’ growing power through his multiple territorial acquisitions, most of which he inherited or married into, but some of which he won or retained by force of battle, particularly in Italy which was one of the most highly contested territories. In 1494, after the death of the King of Naples, prince of the House of Aragon, Charles VIII of France entered Milan, Florence, Rome and finally Naples where he was crowned King in 1495; however this did not last long, because Ferdinand of Spain, Maximilian of Austria, the Pope, Venice, and the Duke of Milan Ludovic Sforza united forces against Charles VIII and forced him to retreat to France.178 This only intensified the conflict further, because Louis XII, Charles VIII’s successor and Francis’ predecessor, would take up again the feat of regaining Naples; he also claimed personal rights to Milan by way of his

grandmother Valentine Visconti. Louis XII was successful for a time because he was able
to capture Ludovic Sforza and Milan, and then Naples in 1501 thanks to a secret
agreement with Ferdinand of Aragon based on a proposal to share the Kingdom of
Naples. However, the Spanish expelled the French from this territory in 1504.

Pope Julius II was also organizing coalitions against the French in Northern Italy
and after being surrounded the French had to retreat. Louis XII negotiated with Pope Leo
X and Henry VIII of England but had to abandon Milan; this, however, did not end the
fighting, because Francis I, Louis XII’s successor and cousin, would yet again take up the
challenge of regaining Milan. Francis I was successful for a time as well because in 1516
he signed the Concordat de Bologne with Pope Leo X forging peace with the Swiss allies
of the Duke of Milan after having defeated them with powerful artillery. This created a
balance of power, temporarily, with the Spanish presence in Naples and the French
victory and presence in Milan. However, this too would not last long and would only
engender more fighting, because imperial forces expelled the French from Milan and
Francis I would make three successive offensive attempts to recuperate it.

It is the last attempt in Italy which resulted in Francis’ infamous defeat at Pavia in
1525 and his subsequent imprisonment in Madrid. As a condition of his liberty, Francis
then was forced to sign a treaty giving up Bourgogne and Milan suzerainty over Flanders
and Artois. After Francis’ release, Henry VIII, concerned about Charles V’s growing
power, tried to forge ties with him. Francis I’s humiliation and defeat at Pavia and
Madrid would only further create a personal and politically intense rivalry between
Francis I and Charles V in the years that followed.

\[179\] Ibid, p. 171.
Sonnet VIII as a whole shows the progression of rising with the tide, the expansion of its waters covering large territories, and the transformation of the water into a monster “ce monstre enorme” (v. 9). The last tercet collapses the dream by showing that the monster is vanished. It is unclear if the “vent impetueux” (v. 12) vanquishes the monster, or if it simply clears away the dream-like fog of the dreamer. The “émerveillement ” of verse 9 is something that all of Europe felt at witnessing Charles V growing hegemony over the western hemisphere. His kingdom literally changed its form “in a hundred ways” (v. 10) during his reign because of the shifting frontiers of lands under his rule.

In her article “Le poète et le roi dans les Antiquitez de Rome et le Songe de Du Bellay”, Cynthia Skenazi presents an alternate reading of the Songe by suggesting that the anti-imperialist tone can be read as being directed toward Henri II, because he was known as “un nouvel Auguste, l’Auguste Français”\(^{180}\). She suggests that the poems aim to depict France under Henry II as not immune to adopting the imperialist desires and impulses exemplified by Rome and that the pacifist orientation of the poetic sequence is an attempt to temper these tendencies and expansionist wars as political goals. In addition, she stresses that the religious, social, and moral advantages of peace are brought up again and again in the collection with the aim of protecting the translatio studii and flourishing of the arts and letters that could not as effectively take place in the midst of constant war.\(^{181}\)


\(^{181}\) Ibid, 45-6.
Skenazi supports her argument by pointing to the opening sonnet dedication of the *Antiquités de Rome* which is dedicated to Henry II, thus supporting that he is the primary intended audience of all the poems:

```
AV ROY

Ne vous pouvant donner ces ouvrages antiques
Pour vostre Sainct-Germain ou pour Fontainbleau,
Je les vous donne (Sire) en ce petit tableau
Peint, le mieux que j’ay peu, de couleurs poëtiques :

Qui mis sous vostre nom devant les yeux publique,
Si vous le daignez voir en son jour le plus beau,
Se pourra bien vanter d’avoir hours du tumbeau
Tiré des vieux Romains les poudreuses reliques.

Que vous puissent les Dieux un jour donner tant d’heur,
De rebastir en France une telle grandeur
Que je la voudrois bien peindre en vostre langage :

Et peult estre qu’alors vostre grand’ Majesté,
Repensant à mes vers, diroit qu’ils ont esté
De vostre Monarchie un bienheureux presage.182
```

She posits that the didactic tone and the horrifying lessons of the *Songe* are directed at him as a veiled warning against imperialist tendencies. Skenazi further supports this by highlighting the Renaissance regard toward history as an example from which to learn, and by pointing as well to the fact that the rise of the Duc de Guise was worrisome for pacifists in the kingdom of Henri II because he was a partisan of imperialist and belligerent policies:

```
Les guerres fratricides, l’orgueil conquérant, l’hubris qui ont provoqué la chute de la ville éternelle, pourraient bien préfigurer le destin d’une France menacée par les ambitions
```

182 Ed. Chamard, p. 3; Skenazi citation on her p. 41.
imperialistes du duc de Guise et les troubles civils causés par les tensions religieuses.\textsuperscript{183}

Considering both readings--the one that Skenazi proposes regarding a contemporary warning for Henri II, or the one that I am proposing regarding the poet’s backward glance and criticism of Charles V--they are both possible. They do not mutually exclude each other, because the criticized principle is the same: the debunking of imperialist tendencies and discrediting a penchant toward war for territorial acquisition and expansion. The example of Rome can be evoked as an example to both condemn the policies and behavior of Charles V and to forewarn Henri II, “nouvel Auguste”.

In addition, both Charles V and Henri II (as well as Francis I) were identified at one point or another by the mythical figure of Hercules; multiple symbolisms in the poems can be interpreted as referring to either monarch. Most historians and emblematists specializing in sixteenth-century Europe agree that “Charles’ device was invented—some thought divinely inspired—to foretell the expansion of his rule ‘beyond the columns of Hercules’ into the new world.”\textsuperscript{184} On the flip side, Skenazi claims,

Le sonnet 10 [des Antiquitez] fait ainsi référence à Hercule (que Du Bellay et ses contemporains liaient à Henri II), seul capable de rétablir l’ordre ébranlé par les guerres civiles romaines (S 10, v. 6). Et au sonnet 10 des Antiquitez répond, de façon symétrique le sonnet 10 du Songe où une nymène invoque “le discord mutin” et “ce hydre nouveau digne de cent Hercules” prospérant dans la ville (s 10, vv. 9-11): une nouvelle fois, l’allusion à Hercule fait figure d’adresse au roi que le poète conjure de veiller au maintien du calme en France et en Italie.\textsuperscript{185}

\textsuperscript{183} Ibid, p. 46.
\textsuperscript{185} Skenazi, p. 46.
Skenazi directs her reading in light of Hercules designating Henri II, and while she provides ample examples of the symbolic relationship between the mythical figure and Henri II, there also exists a symbolic and emblematic relationship between Hercules and Charles V, which allows more room for interpretation and multiple layers of readings.

The Spanish emblem maker, Francisco Gómez de la Reguera, represented Charles V’s through his herculean columns in heraldry. In Spanish poetry, Charles V was also associated with the motto that surrounded in ribbon his herculean columns:

Dilata o Carlos, español Alcides,
   tu agusto nombre; gloria ya de España
sera cuanto Neptuno ciñe y baña,
esfera breve, si con él la mides.

   Si tierra oprimes, si cristal divides,
la tierra y el cristal te desengaña,
que no hay un mundo a tu menor hazaña,
si al cielo muchos mundos no le pides.

   No profana ambición, no afecto vano
miro el PLUS ULTRA de quien tiembla al suelo,
si poco fue a tu nombre soberano.

   Pues sólo pudo tu divino celo
con heroico desprecio de lo humano
poner el non plus ultra allá en el cielo.

[Empresa XX, de Carlos V, p. 169]^{186}

Furthermore, because both Charles V and the French monarch Francis I were once both eligible for the seat of Holy Roman Emperor, it is within the imaginary of poets that the French monarch is as all-powerful as the emperor, because he should have been in that seat if it were not for the highly dubious electoral process, buying of votes,

---

and the will to a continuing tradition of Habsburgs in the imperial throne. As Debora Schwartz writes,

The Holy Roman Empire was regarded as the Christian "descendant" of classical Rome. The French kings regarded Charlemagne, crowned as Holy Roman Emperor on New Year's Day in the year 800, as their "National Hero" in part because he represented political legitimacy: the direct transfer of political power from Greece, to the Roman Empire, to the Holy Roman Empire (Charlemagne), to the Kings of France.\footnote{187}

Thus, the highly contested nature of political legitimacy was one of the major sources of rivalry and conflict between Charles V and Francis I.

On the French side, both Francis I and his successor Henri II, were identified in literature with a Gallic Hercules. The myth of a Gallic Hercules dates back to the Greek sophist Lucian who developed an image of Hercules that became known as “Gallic” because he claimed to have seen this mythical god in Gaul.\footnote{188} The god was portrayed paradoxically as capable of waging war because he held a club on one hand and a bow on the other, yet he was also aged and relied on his tongue, or more precisely, his eloquence to persuade others. The depiction of the Gallic Hercules in Lucian’s \textit{Heracles} symbolizes the power of influential linguistic expression in a very graphic way by portraying the god as effortlessly leading his followers through thin chains of gold and amber that were connected on one side to the god’s pierced tongue and on the other to his followers’ ears. (242) The Greek orator Isocrates was the first credited with bringing to the forefront that Hercules was eloquent as well as strong. (242)

During the French Renaissance, writers and artists alike revived this Gallic Hercules myth\footnote{189}, and influential figures such as Desiderius Erasmus (1469-1536) promoted it as an example to follow in order to emphasize the use of eloquence over brute strength by ruling monarchs. Joannes Annius of Viterbo, a Renaissance mythographer, published in 1498 a collection of writings that he ascribed to Xenophon entitled *De his quae praecesserunt inundationem terrarum*. Here, the myth of the Gallic Hercules is developed in such a way that Hercules arrives at Gaul after leaving Libya and marries the daughter of the Celtic king, Galatea. The union of Hercules and Galatea produces a son named Galateus, from whom allegedly the name Gaul was derived. Later, the poet Jean Lemaire de Belges (1473-1525) would expand on this source in his *Illustrations de Gaule et singularitez de Troye* to provide proof of the 'extraction Herculienne et Troyenne de la nation Gallicane et Française' (II, 469).\footnote{190} Through the mythologies of Annius and Lemaire de Belges, an ancestral link was established leading from the Gallic Hercules to the Pepin Kings and Charlemagne. \footnote{244} Geoffroy Tory’s 1529 *Champfleury* would further develop and make this mythological god the King of Gaul. In 1547 Guillaume Budé would reiterate the Gallic Hercules myth in his *Institution du Prince*, ch. XIV. \footnote{247}

Both Du Bellay and Ronsard mention the Gallic Hercules in their writing\footnote{191}. Du Bellay, at the end of his *Deffence* (1549) writes: “Vous souvienne…de votre Hercule Gallique, tirant les peuples apres luy par leurs oreilles avecques une chesne attachée à sa langue”, and Ronsard in his first book of *Odes* (1550) : “Un grand peuple d’écoliers/
Furthermore, in his 1555 “Hymne du Treschrestien Roy de France Henri II. de ce nom” Ronsard again works with the Gallic Hercules figure to associate him with the French monarchy. Robert Hallowell writes:

In associating **Henri II** with the **Gallic Hercules**, Ronsard was of course following the precedent of linking the reigning French monarch to the god set during the reign of **François I**. In 1532 the king had been so portrayed on the occasion of the royal entrance of Queen Eleonore into Rouen. Both Mellin de Saint-Gelais and Jean Bouchet had also made this flattering comparison. Indeed, the identification of **François I** with the **Gallic Hercules** became so fixed that Jodelle, writing several years after the king's death, addressed a sonnet to the then Duc d'Anjou, later Henri III, and referred to his ancestor as 'l'autre Hercule François'. (253)

Thus we can appreciate how French Renaissance authors appropriated the Gallic Hercules myth from Greek literature not only to mythologically explain their ancestry linked to Greek civilization, but also to promote peace over brute force in the politics of the French monarchy.

Could the symbolism of the *Songe* be equivocating between both Charles V and Henri II? Can both monarchs occupy the same symbolic space? The very nature of Franco-Spanish rivalry suggests an attempt to do so, because both kingdoms were struggling to occupy the same seat of importance politically and to be the recipients of the same cultural inheritance. It makes sense then, that the symbols and emblems in the *Songe* would collide with each other to make more than one signified possible because French and Habsburg monarchs were and would continue trying to fill the same political and semantic space of superior importance. The Franco-Spanish rivalry was also a fierce rivalry for the appropriation of Greco-Roman and biblical symbols and emblems that legitimized power and superiority.
The title *Songe*, or dream, indicates a genre that is by its very nature, open to interpretation. This is at once the strength and the weakness of the collection. It is a strength because of the plethora of interpretations and readings that it credibly generates, and a weakness because of its elusive quality for readers who seek stable and definite meanings. The dream-like quality of the *Songe* however has a strong advantage for a critically-thinking humanist, because it is fertile ground for criticizing the past or forewarning contemporary powerful monarchs (of all shapes, sizes, and time periods), because of its respectfully indirect, oracular, and timeless nature. Yet another remarkable quality of the *Songe* sequence is its unique way of representing Renaissance poetry in France. In this collection we can see what so permeated this literary tradition, which is the presence and interweaving of biblical and Italian (particularly Petrarchan) intertexts, greco-roman mythology, heavily coded symbolism, and the motif of oracular visions.

The parade shield and writing cabinet of Charles V, like Du Bellay’s poetic collection, can also be seen as microcosms of the trends of Renaissance representation. The shield’s rough metal surface was embossed; the veneers of the writing cabinet were cut on wood; and the paper used for the *Songe* was printed on; yet, these are all examples of Renaissance representation. All three objects are products of biblical, Italian, Greco-Roman, and western imperial thought and traditions interwoven together to create meaning and art about a contemporary political rival.

In both of the possible readings discussed, what is ultimately at the heart of the argument behind the poetic sequence is the promotion of a fundamental peace; it is intentionally not clear who is being criticized, and I suggest that this is because of the rivalry between monarchs who were trying to appropriate the same symbolic space.
However, the goal is still the same, advocating for a ceasefire which would create space for the arts and letters to flourish. The rivalry is actually not eliminated fully in this enterprise, because kingdoms can arguably still compete with each other, however, on different grounds: on the grounds of language, literature, and the arts. Ideally, the main players would no longer be men of the sword, but rather men of the pen (and women writers such as Marguerite de Navarre, Pernette du Guillet and Louise Labé for example). Perhaps this is why the humanist’s dream of peace for the fullest blossoming of their craft, and the shift to a battleground restricted to words and the intellect would never fully come to be realized; because men of the sword would no longer have a role in the world.
Conclusion

In order to make reviewing and forward-thinking concluding statements with regard to what has been analyzed thus far in this dissertation, it would be useful to discuss what, in light of this particular research and methodology, has been accomplished as a contribution. In addition, we will examine what can be further studied in the field of French Renaissance literature, what some of the limitations of the investigations might be, and what avenues for future examination are open.

The main contribution of this dissertation is the grouping of a variety of works published in France by different authors between 1530 and 1560 under the lens of how the rivalry between France under Francis I and Spain under Charles V spurred and nourished these texts. One of the main aims of my study was to follow and encourage a line of inquiry that focuses on the relationship between two contemporary rival kingdoms and cultures. In each chapter, I sought to show a different facet of Franco-Spanish rivalry. The first chapter focused on the workings of parody in French against the image of Charles V within a work of prose fiction. The second chapter showed how linguistic and cultural rivalry resulted in the French-language Amadis de Gaule in competition with the earlier Spanish-language version, Amadís de Gaula. The third chapter showed how lyric poetry from Francis I’s principal court poet, Marot, and the Lyonnais poet, Scève, represent the rivalry of these two monarchs and their respective kingdoms. Finally, chapter four analyzed how literary representations from both sides aim to attribute the same mythical-symbolic space to Francis I, his successor Henri II, and Charles V to legitimize their supremacy and claims to power, as well as to influence politics and political/historical memory.
This dissertation’s scope of research is only a beginning of what can be further considered with regard to the relationship between French and Spanish language and letters in the 1500s. While this study analyzed representation in French and in Renaissance France of Franco-Spanish rivalry, a similar project could be done inversely within this time period. For example, how were Francis I and France represented in Spanish, in Spain’s literature? Was this uniform throughout the sixteenth century? How was Charles V represented by Spaniards across different decades of the sixteenth century in relation to France?

Although it was already breaking into the seventeenth century, Lope de Vega’s play Carlos V en Francia (1604), a theatrical literary production that falls under the historical subgenre of Golden-Age comedias\textsuperscript{192} is an example of a work of literature that would lend itself to this direction in literary criticism.

Within French literature itself, a study that encompasses other texts by Renaissance authors within this time period would also delve further into the questions asked here. Researchers can also look to the earliest part of the century, or the second half of the sixteenth century for further exploration. Guillaume Du Bellay’s Ogdoades offers ground for analysis for scholars who would delve into analyzing his text in Latin and French chronicling the rivalry between Francis I and Charles V. Although only fragments of this work remain, there is material to work with. Du Bellay wrote about the years 1515-1521 in Latin in the first part of this text, and the French portion appears in his brother Martin Du Bellay’s Mémoires (1569).

\textsuperscript{192} See a study by Elaine Bunn. “Negotiating Empire and Desire in Lope de Vega’s Carlos V en Francia”. Hispanic Review 72.1 (Winter, 2004), pp. 29-42.
The topic of the French and Spanish Amadis versions alone supplies vast opportunities for future research and publication. There is an entire community of scholars across the Spanish and French sides of scholarship that is centered around this voluminous cycle of the chivalric romance genre. The detailed and extensive scholarship of Michel Bideaux on the French Amadis, as his Amadis de Gaule Livre I testifies, is yet another example of a direction that scholarship on French-Spanish language and literature can go. His outstanding critical edition details word for word how the entire Amadis de Gaule Livre I in French is different from the Amadís de Gaula I in Spanish as a source text. Since there are twelve volumes of the Amadis in Spanish and twenty four in French, this work is very substantial and would be a significant contribution to the field of Translation Studies as well as that of French Renaissance literature.

In a similar vein that focuses on French-Spanish translation from a linguistic perspective, there are some interesting and relatively recent investigations. For example, Isabel Veloso from the Universidad Autonoma de Madrid analyzes how orthotypographic differences in the closely-related romance languages that are Spanish and French can cause errors and disparities in translation. Her article “Ortotipografía comparada (francés-español)” published in 2004 by Thélème, a Spanish-language journal on French Studies, shows a branching into this line of inquiry in French-Spanish comparative studies.¹⁹³

That I am aware of, not much work has been done on Herberay des Essarts’ other translations from Spanish into French, given the posthumous findings of his library that contained numerous volumes in Spanish. The interest in Spanish literature by Frenchmen

and women of letters in Renaissance France could be studied further. The topic of how French Renaissance translators had to “frame” or “sell” their translations to the reading public in a politically tumultuous time with their neighbors is also an interesting line of inquiry.

For example, why was Maurice Scève’s translation *La Deplourable fin de Flamete* not favorably received in France in comparison the Herberay des Essarts’ French *Amadis*? Was it simply a question of content? Was the story simply not as well written, or not as interesting? Was it a question of literary genre and a lasting penchant for medieval romances of chivalry that made the difference? How, for example, did Scève present (or not present) his translation to the reading public in comparison to des Essarts? Did it make a difference that des Essarts included a skillfully written “Prologue” that claimed that because the *Amadis de Gaula* was “of Gaul” and thus must have been originally French (not Spanish, or even Galician) make a substantial difference in its reception?

More work can be done by current scholars on Herberay des Essarts’s Spanish to French translations that preceded his more famous *Amadis* cycle, namely: *Electra, tragedie de Sophocle* from 1530 and Diego de San Pedro’s *Tractado de amores de Arnalte a Lucenda* which appeared as a translation in France under the title *L’amant mal traicté de s’amye* in Paris, printed by Sertenas in 1539. Research along the lines of Yves Giraud’s investigation “Les apports du roman espagnol à la Renaissance française : Herberay des Essarts et Diego de San Pedro” is an example of yet another approach that is possible on the level of genre. In his article, Giraud focuses on what structural and
linguistic elements the Spanish novel had and how they were either preserved or altered by the French translator to fit the sensibilities of a French reading public. Giraud notes,

Alors que Dassy traduisait “bêtement” (si j’ose dire), Herberay, qui a sans doute pris conscience des enjeux narratifs soumet le texte à un amendement continu. Même s’il laisse subsister quelques juxtapositions sans raccord, il se montre plus soucieux de la continuité de la trame narrative, du fil du recit d’Arnalte. Il ajoute des formules de liaison ou de reprise […] et parfois il insiste en introduisant une apostrophe au voyageur […] Relevons encore que, s’il omet une poésie à la reine de Castille et, vers la fin, une très longue prière en vers à la Vierge développant le thème des sept angoisses […] il ajoute toute la fin, se montrant soucieux de refermer le cadre, de rattacher cet épisode au prologue et à l’histoire et de compléter le dénouement en lui donnant une forme ouverte.\textsuperscript{194}

From this analysis we can deduce that Giraud gives considerable credit and praise to the work of Herberay des Essarts, who was not “faithfully” translating a text word for word, but rather seeing it as a whole work of literature and taking creative license to add, change, and generally “improve” a text. However, since the translator-writer is working from a source text from the Spanish literary tradition and with different cultural norms and conventions, it is essential to give credit to the Spanish source and acknowledge its contribution to the shaping of at least some Renaissance works of literature written in French in the sixteenth century.

Furthermore, for those interested in studying reader reception and early readership by women, there are very interesting points of inquiry from which to start with the Amadis in Spanish and French. We know that some of the earliest women readers of this cycle were as diverse as the mother of Santa Teresa de Jesús (Teresa de Avila), Queen

\textsuperscript{194} See Yves Giraud. « Les apports du roman espagnol à la Renaissance française : Herberay des Essarts et Diego de San Pedro ». \textit{Le Roman à la Renaissance, Actes du colloque international dirigé par Michel Simonin} (Université de Tours, Centre d’études supérieures de la Renaissance, 1990), publiés par Christine de Buzon, Lyon, RHR, 2012, p. 61.
Isabelle de Valois, and Beatriz Bernal to whom the 1545 Cristalíán de España, the only book of chivalry written by a woman, is credited. Sixteenth-century clerics and humanist moralists, such as Juan Luis Vivès singled out women as a readership because, in their view, they were especially vulnerable to negative influences. Michel Simonin has written in his “Disgrâce d’Amadis” a section about the cycles of reception pertaining to the Amadis cycle and an interesting trend regarding women readers: when the Amadis was most attacked, it was criticized as a book that would have negative influences, especially on those most vulnerable (women), but interestingly enough, after a few years passed the Amadis cycle was pejoratively referred to by its critics as a book written exclusively for a female readership.

Yet another niche for expansion in French-Spanish scholarship regarding the Amadis is what happened to it when it reached the colonies. In his brilliant book Los libros del conquistador, Irving Leonard writes about how romances of chivalry, and particularly the Amadis, were taken in boats along with cargo to the Americas on Spanish ships. We know this from written records that list boat cargo. What happened when the Amadís reached the Americas? How did it influence discourse about the Americas that Spaniards were sending back to the peninsular monarchy across the ocean? We know, for example, that Bernal Díaz del Castillo, Spanish author and soldier who accompanied Hernán Cortés to the conquest of Mexico, described Mexico using imagery from the Spanish Amadís. Thus, we can say that his reading of this romance of chivalry was a lens through which he saw and recorded “historical” records. Did it shape how they saw the “Other” that they encountered and how they saw their own mission? Beatriz Pastor’s book Discursos narrativos de la conquista: mitificación y emergencia, and Irving
Leonard’s *Los Libros del Conquistador* are excellent points of departure for more research that asks how romances of chivalry influenced the European episteme and the historical chronicles and literature they were writing as they were assimilating new discoveries, different civilizations, and new realities. We can then ask: was the French or Spanish *Amadís* ever in the hands of French colony settlers, such as, Jacques Cartier (1491-1557), Jean-François de la Rocque de Roberval (1500-1560), or Samuel de Champlain (1567-1635)?

With regard to the question of *translatio studii*, this theme can continue to be a part of further research if extended to include a synchronic consideration of the contemporary powers that were Spain and France in the sixteenth century. How, in literature, did Spanish and French texts continue to battle and claim for their respective kingdoms the legacy of the Greeks and the Romans?
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