

©[2014]

JENIFER BRANTON-DESRIS
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

“PUIS QUE AINSI EST.” THE MATERIAL AND RHETORICAL EFFECTS OF
BOOK PRODUCTION ON FRENCH RENAISSANCE TALES

By

JENIFER BRANTON-DESRIS

A Dissertation submitted to the
Graduate School-New Brunswick
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Graduate Program in French

written under the direction of

Professor François Cornilliat

and approved by

New Brunswick, NJ
October 2014

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

“Puis que ainsi est.” The material and rhetorical effects of book production
on French Renaissance tales

By JENIFER BRANTON-DESRIS

Dissertation Director: Professor François Cornilliat

Collections of *nouvelles* were very popular in the sixteenth century, despite their status as an “unworthy” genre. Numerous editions of some of the most popular collections were printed quickly. This study aims to determine the extent to which practices in the French book industry affected the rhetorical status and value of texts printed then; it focuses on Bonaventure Des Périers’ *Nouvelles Récréations et Joyeux Devis* (1558), Noël Du Fail’s *Propos rustiques* (1548) and *Baliverneries d’Eutrapel* (1549), and Marguerite de Navarre’s *Heptaméron* (1558). Two of the works were published posthumously, but the public response to different editions of each author’s collection ranged from acceptance to disdain. Noël Du Fail was alive when his two collections were initially printed, and was involved in a second edition of each, but counterfeit, interpolated editions actually became dominant. The first Part of this study is an examination of practices in the book industry, and the involvement of several of the booksellers, to determine the material nature and the most likely reasons for the presence of variant editions. Questions of authenticity play an important role in the justification for printing new editions and their reception. In Part II, the focus shifts on differences between the editions themselves. We see how variants and interpolations change the rhetorical substance of a work with respect to both *inventio* and *dispositio*. The proposed “contracts” with the reader found in the beginning of the *Nouvelles Récréations* and the *Propos rustiques* and the

Baliverneries d'Eutrapel are fulfilled in different ways in the alternate editions, whereas the extraordinary differences between the first two printed editions of the *Heptaméron* allow for a different form of comparison. Ultimately, the industry possesses the power and the incentive to alter the structure and meaning of collections of tales; while the product that contemporary readers might have known and liked best may not have been the text intended by the author, it is important to recognize that these “faulty” versions have a logic of their own and, as such, have a lot to tell us about the history and poetics of the genre.

.

Acknowledgments

To Professor François Cornilliat: thank you for your guidance, patience and wisdom. Thank you for having my back every time a new personal challenge caused yet another delay in this process. You allowed me to explore my ideas and take them in new directions whenever the evidence led me away from the original plan, and you reinvigorated my confidence and perseverance every time you became as excited as I did about a new discovery.

To Professor Mary Speer: thank you, as always, for your inimitable combination of professionalism and warmth, and for your every demand for precision. You have been more of a mentor than you could ever know.

To Professors Ana Pairet and Tom Conley: thank you for agreeing to patiently read this insignificant vision of sixteenth-century literature in a rather unconventional manner.

To the Graduate Program Committee and the entire French Department: I am under no delusions that this would ever have come to fruition without the unfailing (financial, pedagogical, and moral) support of this ever-changing group of people. Thank you.

To my husband, Alan Desris: thank you for not letting me give up when life got in the way of pursuing my dream. Thank you for resigning yourself to not seeing me for these past several months, and for accepting the single dad lifestyle as I finish this. Thank you for seeing me as more than I could ever believe I am.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgments.....	iv
Table of Contents.....	v
Note on Citation Protocols.....	viii
Introduction – <i>Contes</i> and <i>nouvelles</i> : at the crossroads of genres, between authors, editors and <i>libraires</i>	1
<i>Nouvelles</i> of the mid-century.....	4
Problems of definition.....	10
Oral versus written.....	14
Sources and models.....	24
Rhetoric, poetry and fiction.....	30
Invention and imitation.....	36
Part I: Collections of Tales as a Material Commodity – The Commanding Role of Booksellers and Editors.....	46
Introduction: the drive of a profit-based industry.....	47
Chapter 1: Bonaventure Des Périers’ <i>Nouvelles Recreations et Joyeux Devis</i>	51
The early printers: De Tournes and Granjon.....	54
Additions and the Du Pré family.....	61
Chapter 2: Noël Du Fail’s <i>Propos Rustiques</i> and <i>Baliverneries d’Eutrapel</i>	76
The book cultures of Lyon and Paris.....	81
Counterfeit book culture.....	88
A potential collaboration.....	95

Chapter 3: Marguerite de Navarre’s <i>Heptaméron</i>	101
Manuscript tradition.....	102
Printed formats.....	109
Boaistuau’s edition.....	114
Gruget’s edition.....	128
The translator as editor.....	135
Conclusion.....	152
Part II: Rhetorical effects: Collateral Damage or Discursive Strategies?.....	155
Introduction: Variant Editions and the Conversion of a Genre.....	156
Chapter 1: The Pleasant and Useful <i>Nouvelles Recreations et Joyeux Devis</i>	160
Henri Estienne: critic.....	167
Reading the additional tales.....	175
The order of the tales.....	202
Chapter 2: Shifting Targets: Satire and Parody in Noël Du Fail’s <i>Propos Rustiques</i> and their Interpolations.....	215
Spelling.....	218
Du Fail’s rhetoric.....	227
Reading the interpolations.....	240
Additional chapters.....	258
Chapter 3: <i>L’Heptaméron</i> in the hands of Gruget and Boaistuau	267
Gruget: translator.....	269
Gruget’s approach.....	277
Boaistuau: translator.....	300

Boaistuau’s approach.....	310
Conclusion.....	327
General Conclusion	331
Appendices.....	340
Appendix A: Earliest Editions 1547-1625.....	341
A.1: Chronological list of editions.....	341
A.2: List of editions by bookseller.....	350
A.2.A: Booksellers with multiple printings.....	350
A.2.B: Booksellers with a single printing.....	357
Appendix B: Du Fail’s Variants.....	362
Table 1: Variants in the 1549 text as compared to the 1547 text.....	362
Table 2: Interpolations that remain in the Du Fail 1549 edition.....	363
Endnotes	364
Works Cited.....	423

Note on citation protocol:

Several different editions of each text are cited throughout this study. To maintain the integrity of each reference, edition-specific spellings have been retained. However, in conformity with modern standards for readability, abbreviations have been resolved, apostrophes have been introduced throughout, and the letters *i* and *u* have been changed to *j* and *v* where appropriate.

INTRODUCTION

***CONTES AND NOUVELLES: AT THE CROSSROADS OF GENRES,
BETWEEN AUTHORS, EDITORS AND LIBRAIRES***

Collections of short narrative *tales* and *stories*¹ were quite popular in Renaissance Europe, and France was no exception. Short prose tales were barely acknowledged in the public forum, yet they developed in various forms and were published by a number of houses. Re-editions and re-publications of tales were as common as those of poetry, and a number of collections, including Marguerite de Navarre's well-known *Heptaméron*, were published posthumously by admirers and devotees. Renaissance French works were typically explicitly inspired by others, and this is also true of the *nouvelle*. In the case of the *nouvelle*, however, and unlike most other genres, most models were more modern rather than classical. Hence, the *Heptaméron* imitated Boccaccio's *Decameron*.² So, by the mid-century, and at the height of the poetic development spearheaded by Ronsard, Du Bellay and the rest of those who would become known as the Pléiade, many readers in France were devouring the collections of tales being published alongside genres that were considered more "serious". Treatises on the latter applied rhetorical concepts inspired by the Classical tradition, were plentiful, and tended to ignore or even reject short narrative collections and other forms of prose fictional writing.³ Many writers were theorizing about literature and the rhetoric of most forms of writing; there were numerous debates on the acceptability of certain forms that evolved with the period and on precisely how each was to be approached. Yet the status of prose fiction in those debates remained dubious, even though it played an important role in the development of both printing and reading. This contradiction between the popularity of such collections and their lack of intellectual or theoretical acknowledgement invites us to question the role and place of short narrative writing in France's book culture.

A number of factors and influences must then be considered when attempting to contextualize the collections of tales in this study. For example, in sixteenth-century France, as everywhere in Europe throughout the Renaissance, a spectacular evolution in the book industry was occurring.⁴ Books were being printed, sold and read as never before with the recent development of movable type printing presses. Readership expanded as fast as the book industry itself as a reflection of the growth of the merchant class, even though members of the financial elite remained the main buyers. Also, the borrowing of books was a cultural commonality, thereby adding to the emergent readership (Martin, "Culture écrite" 226-227). The exchange of literary texts between geographically, culturally and linguistically diverse groups of people increased with the relative ease with which books could now be printed and sold. As Rudolf Hirsch points out, Lyon led the way in the production of books in the French vernacular, and, of course, other vernaculars which formed the Lyonnais international market (116-117). Also, publishers and printer-sellers in cities with large international markets often sought out texts from other countries for which they could get the rights to print in France, either in translation or in their original language (Davis 255, 258).

By the mid-century, the proliferation of publishing houses, especially in Paris and Lyon, and the growing ease of the printing process, allowed a greater number of writers than ever to publish, edit and republish their works for wider consumption. The trend extended to the frequent posthumous publication of many works, often edited and / or prefaced by an author's friends and colleagues: Des Périers's *Nouvelles Recreations et Joyeux Devis* is an example. Sometimes they were edited and / or prefaced by an author's admirers and devotees, as in, presumably, the case of Marguerite de Navarre's

Heptaméron. People wanted to read these works, though they may have been written years before and though many originated in theoretically passé schools of style or thought. Des Périers was a “Marotic” poet, yet his collection was published alongside the new poetry of the Pléiade. Other works, such as the oddly collected *Discours non plus mélancoliques que divers*, were written anonymously by different people and introduced by the editors themselves, “pour le plaisir & profit.” Still others did in fact participate in the publication of their own works; Du Fail released several editions of his first two books. These editions, however, were not as successful as a series of counterfeit ones published in direct competition to the author’s own. All this indicates a certain amount of public favor and appreciation for collections of short prose works, but there is a striking contrast between these editorial strategies and those of poetry, which served the relentless self-promotion of the poets. Such collections seem to acquire a life of their own, which is integral to the existence and reception of the texts. One cannot separate, therefore, the detailed study of their complex editorial history from an analysis of the texts as literature.

Nouvelles of the mid-century

I wish to focus on the period ranging from 1547-1559, that of Henri II’s reign, for several reasons. First, the reign falls at a time of great literary achievement, of which collections of tales are an often unacknowledged part. In addition, Henri II’s reign fits between two significant upheavals of the book industry, which resulted from conflicts within the industry and demanded the imposition of laws by François I and Charles IX, Henri’s father and son, respectively.⁵ Third, despite the fact that the *contes* and *nouvelles* are an often neglected or even despised form with respect to other literary genres, their

popularity seems to reach new heights by the mid-century. Short narrative collections had been available for quite some time, and story-telling was a common courtly pastime, but collections of tales were not saturating the market until around this period.⁶ Many attribute the renewed appeal of such collections to the 1545 translation of Boccaccio's *Decameron* by Antoine le Maçon, which was a great success.

A number of notable texts were published in book format for the first time during the period in question, even though several of them had been written earlier. Noël Du Fail's *Propos Rustiques* (1547) and *Les Balivernerries d'Eutrapel* (1548), A.D.S.D.'s *Comptes du monde aventureux* (1555), the *Discours non plus melancoliques que divers* (1557), and Bonaventure Des Périers's *Nouvelles Recreations et joyeux devis* (1558) are all examples of collections initially printed during this particular period. Likewise, Pierre Boaistuau's infamous edition of the *Histoire des Amans Fortunez* (1557) and Claude Gruget's well-received edition of the *Heptaméron des Nouvelles* (1558) by Marguerite de Navarre were also initially published during Henri II's reign: the problematic publication history of the work complicates its use in this study, yet provides significant information on the question at hand.⁷ The posthumous publication of Des Périers' *Nouvelles Recreations et Joyeux Devis* introduces a series of interesting complexities that play out quite differently from the posthumous publication of the *Heptaméron*. Noël Du Fail was the only living and known author of collections printed during this period and a different set of problems will arise in our examination of the printing industry surrounding his work.⁸ On the other hand, the *Comptes du monde aventureux* and the *Discours non plus melancoliques que divers* will add little to the questions that we raise in a close study of

the other authors' works, and will serve as occasional points of comparison, but will not be the primary object of study.

In order to understand the place collections of tales came to occupy in this very specific time, we will need to study them in the particular context defined by the evolving book industry, a developing readership, and a sophisticated intellectual climate engaged in a deep reflection on matters of rhetoric and poetics. First, empirical data need to be collected and evaluated in order to establish a sense of how popular different editions of this study's target publications were and which were the most accepted or known by the period's readers.⁹ It will also be interesting to note the conditions under which various collections were finalized for publication, which will help to establish the broader context of the period's curiosity for tales. The same collection was frequently printed under several variant editions, which will be a key point for comparison in analyzing the production process. In most cases, the editions bore significant changes and the author's potential role in authorizing those interpolations and additions varied widely. To say the least, authorship was not always the determining factor in the public's adoption of one edition over another.

Secondly, close-reading and analysis of several examples from the collections will show that collections of tales were as much a product of their times' rhetorical climate as other genres. As such, they were as likely to contain examples of well-turned writing as any other text. In the second part of the study, the value of tales as entertainment will also be examined; this is especially important because entertainment, insofar as it was (or appeared to be) disconnected from literature's obligation to both please *and* instruct, was often considered no more than a way to forget about one's

troubles and the tense political-economic climate of the period, though the argument was often made that such levity was important to maintaining one's sanity. However, new theories on entertainment and laughter may help shed light on various rhetorical ploys used in such collections, perhaps making them even more potent examples of the application of classical strategies in prose writing. More important, the entertainment value of the collections must be examined as part of the rhetorical value of the works in question.

In this respect, it is crucial to look at successive editions in order to evaluate the various "contracts" they offered to the reader and to assess the extent to which variant editions fulfilled them. In some cases, it will be shown that the printing industry's eagerly produced variants corrupted the initial rhetorical intent and value of a collection. We can then assign prose tale collections a more precise and more flexible role within the period's literary discourse, without dismissing them as mere entertainment, as was often the case with contemporary theorists.

Frequently, we will find that the dismissal of *contes* and *nouvelles* and questions of generic convention play off of each other. Thus, in contrast to other written works, short prose fiction poses a unique problem in the study of genre function for both modern and contemporary commentators. As Didier Souiller remarks in his recent study on the early modern *nouvelle* in Europe: "La nouvelle, en effet, bénéficie du point de vue de l'histoire des genres, d'une situation privilégiée: au regard de la poétique traditionnelle et, en particulier, de la *Poétique* d'Aristote, ce genre n'existe pas" ("Effectively, the tale benefits from its unique situation vis-à-vis its point of view on the history of genres. With regards to traditional poetics and, in particular, Aristotle's *Poetics*, this genre does not

exist.” 264).¹⁰ Authors who would then choose to work in this unacknowledged genre, made the conscious decision to be free of certain traditional restraints, thereby challenging the status quo of literature while working in a setting that was familiar to many readers.

This “non-existent” genre was not, of course, limited to France. The genre of short prose story collections had also become popular in Italy and the *Decameron* (1384) was still considered by the French and Italians alike to be the arch-model. Yet even the arch-model remained lost amid the theoretical fever sweeping France and Italy. As such, no French treatises exist on the *conte*, the *nouvelle*, or collections thereof, in whatever form they are found. Only Francesco Bonciani saw fit to give a lecture on the *novella* in Italy as late as 1574.¹¹ Balthassar Castiglione’s popular *Il Cortegiano* (1528) mentions short prose narratives during a discussion on pleasantries, but only to say that short tales and stories are an example of such pleasantries and that they are best presented orally (Book II, chapters 48-57). In other words, their form is incidental to the joke itself and written collections are not considered.

While modern critics acknowledge the tale as having a varied and valid history, the rhetorical tradition does not see fit to examine stories at all, at least when they are not part of a larger piece. Therefore, in its published reality, the tale may or may not share the same rhetorical influences and aims as other genres of the period. The Renaissance prose novel, from Rabelais to *Amadis*, often encounters many similar problems,¹² and in fact often did so from early on in the Greco-Roman tradition, as Apuleius’s *Metamorphoses* or *Asinus aureus* (late 2nd century B.C.E.)¹³ can attest.¹⁴ In a sense, such classical precedents do make the problems less acute by virtue of establishing some form of

tradition. The poet Etienne Jodelle, who vehemently criticized the genre in principle in his Preface to Claude Collet's *Histoire Palladienne* (1555),¹⁵ did allow for some exceptions of well-written prose fiction; he notes specifically the *Asinus aureus*. For his part, Joachim Du Bellay, whose *Deffence et illustration de la langue françoise* (1549), as we will see, dismissed long fiction altogether, made a friendly allusion to Rabelais on account of his use of such classical sources as Lucian and Aristophanes – neither of whom wrote novels.¹⁶ In the case of the *Golden Ass*, the definition problem is compounded because the novel's loose structure and the insertion of the Cupid and Psyche tale in the middle also make it a relevant model to collections of short fiction. Further, when found in a collected format, one that seems almost traditional to the published story of the sixteenth century, the question of an individual tale's value and meaning is complicated by (and secondary to) the collection's elaborate framework.

When short fiction is addressed, however rarely, it is presented throughout history only as a form of entertainment, or as a means to laughter as in Castiglione's example. Yet, among the many significant intellectual influences of Antiquity, Horace's *Ars poetica* (c. 19 B.C.E.) most famously held that poetry should offer a mixture of both entertainment and usefulness and that it should be moving as well as beautiful.¹⁷ Perhaps this is true of short literary narrative as well, considering the theoretical tendencies of the literary world at the time considered in this study. To concede the importance of entertainment in narrative would indicate that entertainment itself bears a more significant value than is often acknowledged in the theoretical treatises of the period. If this is the case, then collections of short prose narrative also hold a more significant place in the literary corpus of the mid-sixteenth century than they are often assigned.

Problems of definition

Because tales are left out of rhetorical discussions, stories take on a number of forms and end up constrained by various sets of structural rules, chosen in a state of relative liberty by the authors. As Gary Ferguson and David LaGuardia put it: “In terms of its formal characteristics, then, the *nouvelle* is distinguished amidst a multiplicity of short narrative forms by its hybridity. The genre may be a new one in its historical context, but it still derives its formal meaning and characteristics from the place that it occupies in a series of generic intertexts” (3).¹⁸ The *nouvelle*, then, exists in relation to other generic forms, and is dependent upon a reader’s awareness of these other forms for its meaning. Authors of tales exploit various genres simultaneously in order to weave a tapestry of narrative and commentary into their texts. Often as a result, form and function appear at first glance to be so liberal that it sometimes becomes difficult to determine which types of short narrative can be categorized under any specific generic classification.

In particular, the role and intentions of the narrator in such collections frequently vary, also by the authors’ choice. The narrator might appear to be reflective of the author, as in the anonymous A.D.S.D. of the *Comptes du monde aventureux*, or there could be a series of narrators whose words are being transcribed by an outside observer, as in the *Propos Rustiques*. Various interpretations of the collections overall commonly revolve around the narrator’s role and structural place within them, particularly given the vast number of possible arrangements. Given the fluidity of this genre’s properties, only an examination of several collections from various perspectives will allow insight into the validity of the period’s enduring taste for, and frequent dismissal of, the form.

The liberty in structure and form just mentioned complicates characterization of the *conte* or *nouvelle* as a fixed and established genre. Several examples illustrate that point very quickly. In the Renaissance, some tales are written in poetic verse form, while the great majority is in prose.¹⁹ Some tales or stories have one protagonist, who goes on a series of adventures, yet others follow a series of unrelated characters in unrelated places; still others include groupings of short narratives about one person, place or subject matter.²⁰ Some collections, like the *Heptaméron*, have a purposely rigid structure: here, the group of five men and five women are trapped due to flooding and decide to spend the afternoons of their ten-day wait “assis à noz aises,” while, “chacun dira quelque histoire qu’il aura veuë ou bien ouy dire à quelque homme digne de foy” (“seated at our leisure, while everyone will tell a story he has seen or heard from a trustworthy person” 16).²¹ By contrast, Noël Du Fail claims to recount peasant discussions he overheard, stating that he had been invited to listen to these discussions and that as a result: “les ouy jazer et deviser privément de leur affaires Rustiques, desquels ay fait, par heures rompues et de relaiz, un brief discours” (“heard them chatting and talking privately about their own rustic affaires, from which I have written a brief discourse, much later.” *Propos Rustiques* 50).²² The structure Du Fail chooses for his first collection is drastically different from the *Heptaméron*, but he claims to present a form of truth, however elaborated it may be, as does Marguerite de Navarre.

Structurally, Bonaventure Des Périers presents his *Nouvelles Recreations et Joyeux Devis* in a distinctly different way. There is in fact no clear structure and the tales and stories are introduced in a prefatory sonnet as follows: “Icy n’y ha seulement que pour rire” (“Only laughter may be found here.” line 4, page 2).²³ The loose structure is

also signaled by Des Périers' recommendation to the reader to feel free to read the stories out of order.²⁴ His tales, like those in the *Heptaméron*, are meant to entertain, but, contrary to those in the *Heptaméron* and the *Propos Rustiques*, they do not claim to bear truth. In addition, he diminishes the value of the collection as anything but light-hearted entertainment and the reader must determine if he is being sincere, or simply employing a rhetorical strategy to engage his unsuspecting reader. Du Fail, however, presents his work as an anthropological experiment based in truth. Thus basic structure and the idea of fiction versus non-fiction become ambiguous, open-ended choices. These are only a few examples of differences found in the genre and such differences increase exponentially with each additional case, further hindering our ability to place the *contes* and *nouvelles* in a neatly defined category.

Large-scale generic definition is extremely challenging, perhaps even hopeless, as illustrated above, even in collections of stories from one specific period. Further, sub-categories and different names for tales provide room for interpretation within acceptable terminology. While the reader naturally looks to the named form of the narratives, whether they are *contes*, *nouvelles*, *facéties*, or *légendes* may indicate an author's intended purpose for recounting each story.²⁵ For instance, Jeanne Flore's *Contes Amoureux* (1532), if in fact that was the author's name, were limited to love stories intended to convince a certain Madame Cebille of love's importance. They were not just simple "pleasantries" as some would expect; there was a moral to the stories.²⁶ Noël Du Fail refers to his first work as *Les Propos Rustiques* and his second as *Baliverneries ou Contes nouveaux d'Eutrapel, autrement dit Leon Ladulphi*. In the previously cited quote, from his first Prologue, he highlights the idea of recounting the spoken word.²⁷ Moreover,

in the title of Du Fail's second book, the reader is given an immediate sense of indecisiveness on the author's part – or perhaps an attempt to clarify the intended meaning of the work – with not one, but two generic names. Marguerite de Navarre names each of her tales *nouvelles*, translating Boccaccio's title into the *Cent Nouvelles* (47). In addition, the characters' presence at the abbaye de Prémontrés, their daily scripture readings and Parleme's suggestion that they present only true stories subtly remind the reader that the Gospels were commonly referred to as *nouvelles*.²⁸ The subject matter of many of these stories does not, however, evoke the Gospels, and ambiguities then abound.

Bonaventure Des Périers also contradicts himself, by labeling each new tale of his *Recreations* as a numbered *nouvelle*, referring, as Gabriel-A. Pérouse notes, “non pas à un écrit, mais à un événement” (“not to a written story, but to an event” *Nouvelles françaises du XVI^e siècle: Images de la vie du temps* 32), though Des Périers does not indicate that his stories bear any truth in any other way. According to Pérouse, Des Périers also blends the sense of the title *nouvelle* with the Italian genre of *novella*, a genre of short fiction, primarily written, which emphasizes plot development (35). Considering the conflated definitions of what little terminology is provided by the genre, it is no great surprise when Des Périers writes in the first *nouvelle*, serving as a prologue: “je vous donne ces plaisans Comptes” (“I give you these pleasant tales” 14). Within the span of only a few short lines, Des Périers has titled his works “nouvelles,” and “comptes.” Such lack of clarity begs the question of the author's intended purpose: did he mean to confuse the reader, was it mere happenstance that he seems to use these terms interchangeably, or was there some other, perhaps rhetorical, reason for a conflation of terminology? At a

time when writers were very careful about choosing their words, it is most likely an intentional comment by Des Périers, perhaps on the very lack of rules dictating collections of tales. Whether derived from decision or confusion, the wide variety of terms used by authors in describing their collections points to a significant problem in generic conventions.

Oral versus written

The fluid rules of generic convention are only one of the problems encountered when studying collections of *contes*. In addition, both oral and written traditions play overlapping roles in many of the tales and in the form of these tales, thus adding multiple layers of complexity to collected stories. Oral tradition consists of oral history or *nouvelles* that have been recounted throughout the years and are linked to a folkloric heritage. Such *nouvelles* are difficult to trace, but remain a part of the dialogue even when the written tradition often insists on their authenticity; accordingly, the role of the oral storyteller as a part of the framework for a particular collection potentially fulfills several functions. For its part, the written tradition comprises first of tales which have already been written down, either in manuscript or, later, in book format, and which contribute a great deal to subsequent editions. Second are tales, which are supposedly derived directly from oral sources: the latter are, as we just saw, extremely difficult to confirm. Finally, the framing of tales for a reading audience plays on both the oral and written dimensions, and allows the author to “speak” to his readers. It is important to look distinctly at the oral and written traditions in order to understand the various sub-texts of any collection of stories, but it is imperative to remember to separate them, particularly as

they pertain to works that derive quite often from folklore.²⁹ Many studies of oral European and Arab traditions derive at least some of their information from written texts, and many studies of written traditions work from assumptions about the role of an oral origin.³⁰ As a result, the interplay between these traditions as they pertain to collections of tales, specifically those in sixteenth-century France, can be nearly impossible to sort through. However, one must understand that such complexity is a resource for these collections to draw on.

Specific examples of the role of both oral and written traditions in the texts reflected on in this study will demonstrate the importance of understanding those traditions. For instance, a number of contradictions between readings of the oral tradition by critics and the presentation of that tradition within the texts themselves plant the written collections of tales firmly in both generic domains. Concerning the oral tradition specifically, Des Périers recounts a number of tales which have oral precedents, though he does not overtly acknowledge such precedents except to tell his readers not to think too much about where they might have heard any of the stories he includes.³¹ On the contrary, Noël Du Fail relies on the idea of storytelling as a pastime in his introduction to the *Propos Rustiques* as he claims to recount tales he overheard (50).³² Some scholars, like John McNamara, suggest that “This formula became perhaps the commonest device for acknowledging oral transmission” (23). While McNamara is discussing the medieval hagiographic tradition, he examines a number of precedents that might be applied across the spectrum of written traditions heavily influenced by folklore. Applying this “formula” to Du Fail’s example, it is possible to accept a simple acknowledgement of the stories as having an origin in orality.³³ While this reading of the text is possible, such an assessment

may be too simplistic to accept at face value. Philippe Walter notes in his discussion of folkloric sources of literary works that “the discrediting of oral sources for poetry was already common in the Middle Ages” (62). Walter’s commentary leads one to believe that oral sources could not support the validity of written texts, and so any author who would cite folklore as source discredits his own work. Also, readers can assume that this type of self-effacement is done intentionally, as authors would be aware of the stigma applied to oral transmission.

Why then would authors from the sixteenth century who were educated in a tradition that discredits oral sources make a point of acknowledging the oral “origins” of the very tales they tell? The authors of such tales were in fact highly educated. Marguerite de Navarre is well-known for her princely formation, and André Chenevière believes, because of circumstantial evidence, that Des Périers was educated at Saint Martin’s Abbey in Autun (12-13). In the examples of Des Périers and Du Fail, the placement of oral tradition at the heart of the texts serves different rhetorical functions. Des Périers claims that he did not seek his tales from far and wide (16), but only after acknowledging the diversity of sources and the problem of seeking out any story’s origin. He pleads with his reader:

Qu’on ne me vienne non plus faire des difficultez: Oh ce ne fut pas cestuy cy qui fit cela: Oh, cecy ne fut pas faict en ce cartier la: je l’avoys desja ouy compter: cela fut faict en nostre pays: Riez seulement, et ne vous chaille si ce fut Gaultier ou si ce fut Garguille. Ne vous souciez point si ce fut à Tours en Berry, ou à Bourges en Touraine. Vous vous tourmenteriez pour neant. (15)

Let no one give me a hard time by saying: “Oh, he’s not the one who did that,” “Oh, that didn’t happen there,” “I already heard this one,” “That happened in our area.” Just laugh, and don’t worry if it was Walter or Gargamel. Don’t worry if it happened in Tours, Berry or in Bourges, Touraine. You will stress yourself out for nothing.

In this moment, Des Périers acknowledges, however subtly, that his readers will likely have heard a number of the tales, but also claims explicitly that finding a story’s “true” origin or version is a hopeless task that, when pursued, renders any tale less enjoyable. Thus, Des Périers does acknowledge the oral tradition, as McNamara would suggest, but not in a way that gives it any authority. Des Périers thereby suggests that the tradition has begun and endured, not because of reasons that scholarly research could establish, but because tales, in whatever form they are found, have value in their ability to entertain. The goal of tale-telling, he argues throughout the first *nouvelle*, is to simply bring laughter to those who need it. One could counter that reducing the value of such tales to entertainment cheapens and marginalizes them, as Walter suggests, but Des Périers does not hesitate to place great value on laughter and entertainment when he advises extensively: “Le plus gentil enseignement pour la vie, c’est *Bene vivere et laeteri*” (“The nicest life skill is to *live well and enjoy it.*” 14). Thus, Des Périers both acknowledges the oral tradition and extols its virtues by assimilating the tale’s purpose to its very effect.

In contrast, Du Fail does not seek to entertain his audience through his written versions of tales, but to use universally accepted rhetorical means to serve an anthropological and cultural purpose: for example, he wishes to use nobility to better understand peasant culture.³⁴ Du Fail therefore uses the rhetorical concept of opposition,

or *a contrario*, to argue about what is truly noble. He claims also that oral stories are a reflection of culture and of reality, thus putting into play a representation, if not strictly speaking, the Aristotelian concept of *mimesis*.³⁵ In this way, Du Fail both acknowledges an oral tradition, and removes it from the generic realm of fiction. He subtly discredits the very idea of the entertaining, freely circulating tale by changing the status of the genre and what is generally accepted to be its basic purpose. Du Fail illustrates Walter's concept of the medieval "marginalization" of oral texts by not only changing the role of these texts in society, but by providing a written, elaborate *discours* (50) of the tales he, Du Fail, has overheard. This act indicates that he has had to refine and rework the stories to better suit the written medium and the purpose for which he is providing them to the reader. In both cases, the authors have acknowledged an oral tradition which preceded the written text, and defined a purpose for such a tradition. However, the purpose for which the tradition exists is quite different in each author's mind and it is the difference in purpose that defines or problematizes the role of short prose fiction in each collection. Therefore, the oral tradition is explicitly manipulated by the authors to satisfy their own rhetorical goals, which makes it impossible to clearly define the role of orality in all short prose fiction.

Additionally, the role of the oral storyteller is often incorporated into the very structure of these collections of tales. In some instances, one storyteller serves as both written and oral narrator. In other examples, several storytellers participate in the collection. The Italian term *cornice* refers specifically to a framework in which a group of people are assembled over an extended period of time, usually influenced by some external force, and storytelling becomes a means to passing the time in a pleasant

manner. The framed structure uses storytelling to bind the collection of otherwise seemingly disparate tales together and, of course, to layer further meaning into the individual stories. The seminal work of this type is Boccaccio's *Decameron*. The *Heptaméron* is the most notable French example of a collection framed in the Italian *cornice*-style structure, but the *Propos Rustiques* also have several narrators whose stories were supposedly recorded over a period of several days. In this instance, the narrator of the written version clearly distinguishes himself from the oral narrators by laying claim to his own contribution to the collection.³⁶

On the other hand, the *Nouvelles Recreations et Joyeux Devis*, *Baliverneries d'Eutrapel* and *Comptes du monde aventureux* bear no such pretense of narration, being confined to one single narrator/author with different degrees of presence or visibility. The *Comptes du monde aventureux* allude to the idea of a frame, as well as to the oral tradition that establishes such a collection, but seem to maintain an unusual position, as if to look at it from the outside. Du Fail takes the *Baliverneries d'Eutrapel* further by focusing the stories on a centralized title figure. In sharp contrast to these collections, the *Discours non plus melancoliques que divers* has no oral storyteller, though many of the narratives included acknowledge their derivation from oral history.³⁷ Within the context of structure, then, the narrator is, as previously noted, another variable in the whole. That is, the author chooses among the different possibilities to create a collection that produces a specific meaning, or set of meanings, in relation to literary history.

The myriad of structural possibilities for a narrator or storyteller then leads to different results within a collection and between collections. A number of ideas are dealt with via an author's structural choice. Different structures establish specific contracts

between the author and the reader; a collection's purpose may be revealed through more or less covert layering within the frame. The layering to which I refer here may be the relationship between orality and the written tale, or it may be the relationships between various storytellers and the narrator. Thus, it becomes difficult, if not impossible, to separate the notion of orality from that of the written tale, as each is so dramatically intertwined with the other, and the effects are as layered as the structural possibilities that create such effects. For example, the mysterious author of the *Comptes du monde adventureux*, A.D.S.D.,³⁸ addresses the "Sages et vertueuses dames de France" ("wise and virtuous ladies of France" 3) and offers his collection as a reprise of stories told and heard while traveling with a group of men and women. In a prefatory epistle, he writes that a beautiful, sick lady of high rank enjoyed his stories in particular and that "[. . .] tout le long du voyage me fut impossible d'avoir repos sans demeurer chargé par son commandement de tant de discours qu'atendu le petit moyen que j'avois d'y satisfaire me suis cent fois estonné comment elle y prenoit si grand plaisir [. . .]" ("during the whole trip it was impossible for me to get some rest without being ordered by her to tell so many stories that, given my poor ability to fulfill this request, I wondered how she could have taken so much pleasure in hearing them" 8). The emphasis here is on the great pleasure had by the auditors of the stories (by one in particular), irrespective of storytelling quality. Ultimately, the author aspires to give his readers a similar pleasure through this book he says he created from memory, by combining his own tales with those that he heard. In a case like this, several supposed storytellers are combined into one narrator, which eliminates a major component of the *cornice* tradition. The writer/narrator becomes a constant implied figure within the collection, distinct from the

ever-changing characters presented in the tales, which he “frames” by offering a few comments at the beginning and end of each story, for the benefit of the “Dames” he is addressing.³⁹

When the storytellers do change, this structure-type often adds a new depth to the tales being recounted and complicates the relationship of each tale to the whole because the storyteller’s identity within the frame can, and often does, affect a reader’s interpretation of a particular tale. Again, the *Heptaméron* serves as a commonly cited example of this, and a great number of studies have discussed the roles of the different storytellers in a reader’s understanding of individual tales and of the text as a whole.⁴⁰ The issue is by no means as simple as subdividing a text by its storytellers and assigning narrow characterizations to each of these *hyponarrators* in turn, but helping a reader to recognize the myriad of ways in which this material might add to the richness of the text she, the reader, is absorbing.

Additional choices in frame and structure affect each collection in the ways cited above. As we just saw, the storyteller in the *Comptes du monde aventureux* takes on the role of narrator. This conflation contrasts sharply with collections in which there are numerous storytellers and the narrator is essentially an outsider, sometimes invisible, who writes, we presume, for whichever reasons he specifies in the preface, if indeed there is one. The effect creates a contract with the reader that differs starkly with other models. Philippe de Lajarte identifies a theoretical division of narrative responsibility that includes a “hypernarrator” (the narrator of the frame-story) and a “hyponarrator” (the teller of an individual tale) (174). He goes on to postulate that in the case of the *Heptaméron*, the distinction is, at least on one level, semantic and that the *hypernarrator*

and *hyponarrators* often demonstrate a certain “ideological” agreement (182-183). Thus the framing of diverse approaches within a single, larger work may reveal an author’s intended purpose, sometimes more so than the narrative preface to a collection. Hence, the *hyponarrator* turned *hypernarrator* of the *Comptes du Monde Adventureux* focuses on tales that are intended to please the readers, just as they are supposed to have pleased the original listeners.

On the contrary, the unknown author(s) of the *Discours non plus melancoliques que divers* purposely introduce(s) a number of *hyponarrators*, but no clear *hypernarrator*. Only the preface written by the bookseller, Enguilbert de Marnef, may be said to serve that purpose, in which case, the drastically different types of tales and non-narrative discourses included in the collection are unified by the sole purpose of judging men of letters through their collective knowledge.⁴¹ In this example, the *libraire*, who is certainly a liaison agent in the material exchange of book to customer, takes on a higher level of responsibility by acting as an intellectually engaged mediator between the text and the reader.⁴² Such prefaces by the editor are not uncommon and often function as a marketing tool to attract the reader. Also, prefatory material by the editors further distances a text from the oral tradition and steps it further into the written domain.

To continue with the question of the narrator’s role, multiple storytellers and the important role of narrative orality in several collections studied here subsequently add far more meaning to each collection than simple entertainment value. Dialogical orality complicates the meaning and forces the reader to view the stories from various, shifting perspectives. In some instances, as in the case of the *Heptaméron*, we have just seen that the varied discourses of the *hyponarrators* lead to a form of agreement that Lajarte calls a

“paradoxical phenomenon” (184). He continues: “in spite of divergences, even radical oppositions, in the argumentative goals that grow from their respective ideological orientations, there is, on a more fundamental ideological level, a single, consistent voice (that of the storytellers/narrators) that speaks from within the *Heptameron*’s tales” (184-185). In this way, a multi-faceted set of readings all lead to the author’s meaning, even though the author is a separate and distinct entity who is often absent from the text we are reading.⁴³ Such complexity implies that short narrative collections have a deeper meaning and a more inherent literary value than is typically acknowledged by contemporaries. On the other hand, it remains true that complexity is also a matter of taste and serves to entertain the sophisticated reading audience of the time. Assessing the role of orality in these collections will certainly assist in our overall understanding of the material and of the ways its different uses are connected.

As we have already seen, the written dimension adds further meaning to collections of stories and to the role assigned to orality in the texts. As noted in the case of the *Comptes du monde aventureux*, the occasional conflation of oral storyteller, narrator and writer indelibly links the oral and written aspects of works, and demonstrates both the rhetorical role of orality in the written text and the carefully constructed manipulation to which such orality lends itself. In addition, while orality is still a frequently employed reference point within the written tale, it is important to note that writing creates its own tradition. Often, previously published stories are rewritten and several techniques may be used to explain a new collection’s purpose. Denial is one strategy, and authors often claim they are writing what belongs to an oral tradition, even though they have written sources as well. Thus Bonaventure Des Périers explicitly

renounces other written forms of the same tales, and claims to rely instead on regional oral versions. By doing so, however, Des Périers acknowledges the existence of other written versions of many of his tales. Second, authors frequently assign themselves the specific role of relating the stories to a reading audience, as in the cases of Du Fail, Des Périers and A.D.S.D. Often, the effective use of these techniques depends upon a reader's understanding of the intertextual connection between the version of a tale she⁴⁴ is currently reading and versions, both oral and written, with which she is already familiar. In this way, the author's control of the text and of its reception is limited by a number of outside factors, including a certain co-dependency; this, in turn, only encourages an author to remain focused on manipulating an established tradition, which is frequently already written.

Sources and models

The idea of rewriting previously written material, whether it is done implicitly or explicitly, raises the thorny question of the tales' sources. As mentioned earlier, Renaissance short stories were not immune to the rhetorical practice of *imitatio*, and it is possible to show that classical texts and forms influenced the collections I will focus on in this study. Other, more recent texts, such as the *Decameron*, also imposed themselves on the period and were models for this kind of imitation, just as Petrarch's example became a model for much of the Pléiade's work, but the influence of the medieval traditions remained strong enough that, unlike contemporary poets, authors of tales could not engage in a complete rupture with the recent past. The genre of the *nouvelle* was bound by certain traditions, despite its established flexibility.

The medieval period had developed short fictional narratives in various forms. At some point verse was clearly the preferred mode of narrative writing, especially fiction; conversely, narration found a place in all genres of writing, including many poetic forms. Even after tales and stories were no longer written in verse, and although some poets despised prose fiction, mutual influence persisted. Other forms influenced the later short prose fictions I will focus on in this study. Apuleius' *Asinus aureus* was read and known as an example of entertaining fictional prose, as shown by Jodelle's mention of it in his Preface to Claude Colet's novel.⁴⁵ Collections from the later medieval period, especially the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, were influenced by both the earlier *fabliaux* tradition, as well as the Italian *Decameron*: consider the *Quinze joies de mariage* and *Les Cent nouvelles nouvelles*, both of which served, in turn, to influence later collections. Other poetic and narrative genres, such as the *pastourelles*, developed into theatrical works, which also continued to influence sixteenth-century authors. Noël Du Fail, for example, still mentions the tradition of *Robin et Marion* in his salutary letter to the reader (40).⁴⁶

Other medieval genres, neither profane nor comic in origin, became established as outlets for short story-telling, and their influence continued into the Renaissance as well. A.J. Krailsheimer notes the likeness of Marguerite de Navarre's *Heptaméron* to the *exemplum*, stating, perhaps crudely, that "the point alone matters" (22). Pérouse's fundamental study clearly identifies a number of late-medieval works as major influences of the tales and stories that followed. He specifically names and examines the importance of the *Quinze Joies de Mariage* (early fifteenth century), *Jehan de Saintré* (1456), and "surtout" the *Evangelies des Quenouilles* (1480) in his book.⁴⁷ The *Cent nouvelles*

nouvelles was obviously also known by some, as early-century author Philippe de Vigneulles borrowed the title for his own c.1515 work. Simultaneously, another form of fictional prose was thriving in republication, the *roman*. The mid-century success of the Spanish *Amadis de Gaule* cycle, both in translation and imitation, demonstrated an ongoing, in fact, ever-growing interest in the medieval *romans de chevalerie*.⁴⁸ The long narrative and fanciful setting of the *roman* certainly contrasted with the self-contained brevity and frequent realism of the *contes* and *nouvelles*, but these forms shared a number of traits, starting with their entertainment purpose, and may well have influenced one another.

Alongside these many influences inherited from the French tradition, translation of foreign models played a large role. As happened with poetry and other genres, their number increased and their readership expanded. Pérouse again discusses a number of such cases at length in his study; I name only a few here. Guillaume Tardif's translation of Poggio Bracciolini's *Facetiae* (1470) was well-known and still published in 1549. Boccaccio's works, including the *Decameron* were translated numerous times though the 1545 edition of *Le Maçon* was the best known, and the German *Till Eulenspiegel* (1510/1515) was presented in part by Romain Morin's 1532 *Parangon de Nouvelles Honnestes et Delectables*. Morin's *Parangon*, coincidentally, also included excerpts from Boccaccio and Poggio.⁴⁹ Publications and re-editions continued following the rise and fall in popularity of each author's works, and according to their relationships with influential literature, and this called for further adaptations and transformations in the French vernacular.

Rewrites governed by the principles of *imitatio* often functioned not only to honor the work of preceding authors, but to create new, perhaps better ones, and to engage in a creative dialogue between the works. Such a dialogue might entail a reinterpretation of the original tale or collection, through new details or an updated context. Des Périers, for example, uses a large number of previous sources such as *Les Cent nouvelles nouvelles*, Poggio's *Facetiae*, and Charles de Bourdigné's *Légende de Pierre Faifeu* (1532), among others.⁵⁰ Despite the varying origins of his tales, Des Périers both acknowledges and refutes the geographic diaspora represented in the *nouvelle*, and claims his tales originated exclusively within French borders (16). In a blatantly disparaging comment, Des Périers also suggests that the *nouvelles* with which he works are a type of merchandise, which should not be subjected to a long journey, as often happens to precious goods, to their own detriment:

Les nouvelles qui viennent de si loingtain pays, avant qu'elles soient rendues sus le lieux, ou elles s'empirent comme le saffran : ou s'encherissent, commes les draps de soye: ou il s'en pert la moytié, comme d'espiceries: ou se buffetent, comme les vins: ou sont falsifiees, comme les pierreries: ou sont adultereas, comme tout. Bref, elle sont subgettes à mille inconveniens. (16)

Before they arrive here, tales that come from far-off countries either become stale like saffron, or grow more expensive like silk, or are half-lost like produce, or thinned like wine, or faked like jewels, or adulterated like everything. In short, they are subjected to a thousand mishaps.

Through these comments, Des Périers assigns a polysemic role to the written form of the tales he presents. First, he indicates that he seeks only tales which have local origins, not because he wants to give the collection a culturally pure foundation, but because it keeps the stories fresh. As we have seen, region of origin does not matter. This would appear to validate his work as authentic, at least from a written perspective, except that it does not, because he blends Berry, Touraine and other areas. By doing so, however, he subtly indicates that the stories he has collected may simply be so transformed from an “original” text that they become difficult to identify, for the better or for the worse. He thereby suggests facetiously that such a transformation may in fact lessen his collection’s importance if indeed source and origin are the right criteria for evaluating the worth of a literary work. That answer remains open-ended. Third, by identifying *nouvelles* as a form of “merchandise,” he qualifies their value in terms of cost and exchange.⁵¹ Tales, then, do not exist without geographic, cultural and commercial movement or transformation. They are as much a part of global culture as they are of local culture. The context in which Des Périers writes is culturally relevant for different groups across varying geographic spaces and social milieux, and this play between acknowledgement and denial redefines the *nouvelles* that come specifically from known written sources by placing them in a larger dialogue.

Other authors of *contes* and *nouvelles* follow suit, playing both within and against the humanistic protocol of *imitatio*. Marguerite de Navarre reinterpreted a number of tales from various authors, including several by Matteo Bandello, a contemporary, who exchanged manuscript drafts of his collection with Marguerite. In one example, she changes the focus from the telling of the “event” itself to the suffering of the story’s most

dishonorable character, while the basic plot does not change.⁵² In so doing, Marguerite transforms a *nouvelle* from a work of light-hearted, though perhaps offensive entertainment, into a more pointed moral tale. When studied together, the two versions of the tale engage the reader to see different perspectives, much in the same manner as multiple storytellers within a collection. An awareness of the origins of many tales from various collections, which are rewritten to suit a particular author's intentions then fulfills several functions: it enables the reader to understand a larger literary context; it demonstrates a knowledge of classically established rhetorical strategies; it adds more layers to the meaning of any given tale and thus, to any collection as a whole.

Overall, strategies of textual manipulation illustrate an author's understanding of the control he has over the text. His use of established texts and anecdotes lies at the very heart of his role as an author. It is this role that, to some extent, dictates the relative value of the collection in relation to other forms of literature. The medievalist Per Nykrog, in his study of "The Rise of Literary Fiction," narrows his definition of both author and fiction in a way that essentially eliminates collections of tales and their writers as valid because this work is dependent upon its intertextual relationships to a much greater extent than other genres. In Nykrog's definition of authorship and fiction, a refusal of source material is elemental and fiction may only be defined as such when new material is created and the work belongs to a "freely creating writer, unbound by any respect for his thematic model" (609). Des Périers' open refusal of the intertextuality of so many of his tales actually engages the text further into the tradition as a whole; Noël Du Fail's *cornice* clearly participates with the written tradition of the genre; Marguerite de Navarre's *Heptaméron* is directly fueled by the *Decameron*. In each of these cases,

however, the writer engages the familiar aspects of the tradition and refutes them almost universally by stating that his collection is unique in some crucial way and by inviting the comparison as evidence of a sort.

It seems, then, that many authors of these collections place them at the border of a number of forms and cultures, allowing them to exist for entertainment and education, fiction and non-fiction, shared oral history and written traditions. It is difficult to say if the short prose narratives existed in ambiguity to spite the well-established generic conventions, or if established generic and theoretical conventions ignored their existence to spite the ambiguities. Either way, the confusion seems strategic.

Rhetoric, poetry and fiction

One must understand the heady theoretical atmosphere of this mid-century period in which so many collections of tales were being published to appreciate just how strange their unacknowledged presence is. It is precisely their paradoxical status in the literary climate of this transition period that makes those collections published at that time so appealing to this study. While Henri II was far less interested in literature than his father and did not, like him, earn the title “Père des Lettres,” his reign certainly witnessed a flourishing art culture; architecture, music, painting and writing all benefited during the short period of relative political stability (1547-1559) before the religious wars began. In particular, the poets of the Pléiade sought explicitly to glorify their craft as well as the French language and nation to give their native “vulgaire” its rightful place as heir to the Greek and Latin traditions. In addition, and sometimes in opposition, to Du Bellays's *Deffence et illustration de la langue françoise* (1549), poets and critics such as Thomas

Sébillet (*Art poétique françois* 1548), Barthélemy Aneau (*Quintil Horatien* 1550), Jacques Peletier (*Art poétique* 1555) and Pierre de Ronsard (*Abrégé de l'art poétique françois* 1565) experimented with the various poetic genres in order to create a more perfect form of art in the French vernacular, and they defended their choices at length. Theorists such as Peletier discuss the distinctive roles of the Orator and the Poet, refusing to acknowledge any other type of rhetorician.⁵³ At the same time, theorists often incorporate Cicero's and Quintilian's rhetoric in their discussions of poetry. Thus much of Du Bellay's arguments to define poetry are taken almost directly from Cicero's rhetorical treatise *The Orator*. All of the classical models are studied by Renaissance writers and are very influential in the rhetorical debate of the period, which slowly shifted in the second half of the century from Horatian and Ciceronian to Aristotelian influences, often resulting in a conflation of the two. Aristotle's *Poetics* insisted upon the importance of *mimesis* and fiction, which rehabilitated interest in narrative poetry such as the epic, and in fable, or mythological narrative in general,⁵⁴ while other forms of narrative were placed in different categories.

Consequently, rhetorical categories were borrowed to define poetry, but at the same time, there was a heated debate about poetry's persuasive power, dependence on occasion, use of narration and the worthiness of certain subject matters. Du Bellay, for example, rejects poetry which includes certain kinds of short, humorous narratives, saying of the *épîtres*: "ce n'est un poème qui puisse grandement enrichir notre vulgaire, pource qu'elles sont volontiers des choses familières et domestiques" ("this is not a kind of poem that can largely enrich our vernacular, because it likes to treat familiar and domestic subjects." *Deffence et illustration* Book II, chapter iv, 239). This is a fairly clear

attack on Marot's epistles, which were not tales in a strict sense, but which often narrated short anecdotes with humor and familiarity. For Du Bellay, however, the lowly subject matter and jocular tone are beneath a poet and not fit for his fictional imagination. Other poeticians, however, defended these works: Peletier demonstrated a certain appreciation for Marot (*Art poétique*, Book I, chapter iii, 231), and Aneau defended the medieval and "marotique" French models against Du Bellay's accusations of inferiority (*Quintil Horatian*, note to *Deffence et illustration*, Book I, chapter iii, 185), though both ultimately admitted that the time for such works had passed. Interestingly, Aneau would later write *Alector*, a novel. Pléiade poets did use narrative, but they tended to limit themselves to mythological narrative, as influenced by Hesiod, Pindar, Ovid, and the great epics from antiquity in order to keep poetry in what they saw as its purest form. For them, poetic discourse must be neither too close to factual truth, as presented by historians, or to the kind of short-term questions addressed by orators; nor should it be too "low" or common. Thus, even without acknowledging it, this debate about poetry essentially goes to the heart of the existence of the short prose narrative, which often treats supposedly true events and real daily life in a plain or comic fashion.

In this debate on style and subject matter, the widening gap between history and poetry is brought to the fore-front by poets and critics, who argue at length (in treatises, prefaces or even the poems themselves) on the art of poetry and its various sub-genres, and discuss the "proper" rhetoric that should be reserved for a chronicler or historian. These critics use classical models to defend their positions. Peletier, for example, suggests that poets have the right to treat any subject, though he writes that "Histoire est le Sujet le moins propre pour le Poète" ("History is the least appropriate Subject for the

Poet”), because of its chronological nature and need for simple facts sans adornment (Book I, chapter iii, 232). According to Du Bellay, the Grands Rhétoriqueurs of the early part of the century are deemed unworthy because they frequently used poetic devices in their treatment of purely historical subjects, in prose as much as in verse.⁵⁵ History itself was also transforming under careful consideration at that time and, according to rhetorical models borrowed from Cicero and Quintilian, was to be truthful and measured in its rhetorical embellishment, consisting mainly of speeches used by historical characters. Narratives used as a rhetorical device in judicial proceedings, to retell a crime, for example, were supposed to be short and stick to facts. Prose narration thus conceived was not supposed to be bland, but it was supposed to reject fanciful description, poetic adornments and fictional subjects. Regardless of where long or short prose fiction fell in the debate, it demonstrated its hybrid nature and placed itself in direct albeit ambiguous competition with both history and poetry.

In the *Deffence et illustration*, Du Bellay states that narrative poetry must be reserved for the greatest glory, and that it must produce an epic worthy of such great classical predecessors as Homer and Virgil (though Du Bellay also admires Ariosto). As we have noted, the Rhétoriqueurs who considered themselves both historians and poets and could write, as Guillaume Cretin did, a whole history of France in decasyllables, were deemed unworthy of this classical model and its glorified status. True stories are supposed to be written in historical prose, while fictional narrative is given a place in epic poetry. Du Bellay discourages those who would use prose to offer fiction and entertainment, asking would-be authors of fanciful narratives not to write new *romans* in prose, but to become poets and transform the content of the existing novels into epics,

Iliad- or Aeneid-like works. For those who are unable to work skillfully in verse, Du Bellay encourages them to turn to history and work in prose as chroniclers for “leur immortelle gloire, honneur de la France, et grande illustration de notre langue” (“their immortal glory, the honor of France and the great illustration of our language” Book II, chapter v, 241). In other words, fiction is for poetry, and if only to dismiss it, the only form of fictional prose acknowledged in passing is the *roman*. Du Bellay was trying to circumvent the translations of the *Amadis de Gaule* novel series, which were the biggest book-selling success of the time. The *roman* had to be acknowledged, and even Rabelais, as we have seen, could be mentioned in passing, but shorter, entertaining forms of prose fiction, such as those produced by Du Fail, Marguerite de Navarre, Des Périers, and questionably, the *Discours*, were neither discussed nor supposed to exist.

Du Bellay was certainly not the only theorist to devalue fictional prose. Jodelle, another poet, insists upon the fact that he does not value his close friend Colet’s *roman*, the *Histoire Palladienne*, but only Colet himself:

[...] je ne voy point qu’il te faille ramentevoir ce que c’est, n’y la bonne volonté qu’il avoit de te faire quelquesfois jouïr de labeurs plus doctes & plus proffitables, que ne font pas les Romans, ou il s’adonnoit plustost pour le contentement des Damoyelles de nostre siecle, que pour une docte posterité.

I do not believe I need to remind you of what he was, nor of his determination to make you enjoy, at some point, more learned and beneficial works than novels, to which he dedicated himself more for the

sake of entertaining today's Ladies, than for the sake of a learned posterity.

Like Du Bellay, Jodelle only sees *romans* as a fruitless genre designed to entertain bored ladies, and insists that Colet had he lived, would have written much more valuable works. He later adds that he writes the preface for this roman en prose: “non pas pour le vanter [...] mais pour prier affectueusement toute la France, de le traiter le plus doucement qu'elle pourra” (“not to extol its virtues [...] but to kindly beg all of France to treat it as nicely as it can”). He clearly judges the work harshly. Oddly, though, Jodelle contradicts himself by noting that some fictional prose works had been well-written, such as Apuleius's *Golden Ass*. Yet, like Du Bellay, he prefers the epic poetry of Homer and Virgil. So, even when attempting to vindicate the *roman*, Jodelle rejects it. The problem is then compounded on a number of levels. Short prose narrative is not, however, addressed in any way and Du Bellay attempts to eliminate fictional prose altogether. Nonetheless it is present, flourishing at this moment, and quite often presents itself in sharp contrast to generally accepted literature.

If short prose tales have no place in this system it is essentially because fiction is considered noble and should be reserved for poets; yet it has already been noted that Marguerite de Navarre and Noël Du Fail claim to present truth in their entertaining narratives, and Des Périers, who was a “marotique” poet as well, seems to present some form of fictional entertainment in his prose. Des Périers insists that there is something for everyone in his collection, and that it is easy to digest. In his first *nouvelle*, which serves as his preface to the reader, he writes: “Ouvrez le livre: si ung compte ne vous plait, hay à l'aultre! Il y en ha de tous bois, de toutes tailles, de tous estocz, à tous pris et à toutes

mesures, fors que pour plorer” (“Open the book and if you do not enjoy one tale, go to the next !” 9). Apparently, not just something for everyone, but a little bit of everything is represented in this collection. As we have seen, Des Périers also insists that his collection is necessary and does pertain to the social climate, for laughter is necessary.⁵⁶ This collection is accordingly placed in direct opposition to the serious and grandiloquent theoretical world in which it is published, all while using Latin to project his opposition. Des Périers effectively benefits from his classical education to prove his point. The theorists are not the only ones capable of argument and Des Périers’s strongest ally, albeit a posthumous one, is the publication of his collection.

Invention and Imitation

Rhetorical debate was very much a part of sixteenth-century French culture, and it is necessary to insist that the authors of *contes* and *nouvelles* were not insulated from this culture, particularly since all were well-educated and some were in fact poets themselves. While the rhetorical discussions did not consider the existence of the short prose tales and stories, these narratives must have been constructed, consciously or unconsciously, with those ideals in mind. No specific treatises on short narrative attached them to the generic ideals of elegant writing and literary glory, yet the dialogue between collections of tales consisted of far more than translations and republications of collections. The resulting body of new work, as all artistic endeavors then, had to be exposed to the Greco-Roman rhetorical tradition. It naturally follows that there is in fact a “rhetoric” of short fiction; let us take a brief look at the role played in this respect by the concepts of *inventio* and *imitatio*. Cicero himself had dedicated two books of his first rhetorical treatise to the

concept of *inventio*, which he called the “prima ac maxima parte rhetoricae” (“the first and most important part of rhetoric” 233-4).⁵⁷ He defines it in Book I as this: “*Inventio est excogitatio rerum verarum aut veri similibus quae causam probabilem reddant*” (“Invention is the discovery of valid or seemingly valid arguments to render one’s cause plausible.” *De Inventione* 18-19).⁵⁸ The *De Inventione* had enormous influence on medieval literature; in the Renaissance, invention continued to be considered one of the most important aspects of rhetoric, and was studied after Cicero’s later treatises, especially *De oratore*, and Quintilian’s *Institutio oratoria*. Most critics agree that *inventio* is the preceding element to any text. According to this rhetorical view, invention consists of finding the best argument available to persuade an audience, but when Aristotelian poetics came into play later on, and various theorists (earlier in Italy than in France) transformed the concept of *inventio* by redefining it in terms of *mimesis* or representation. Accordingly, Ronsard writes: “L’invention n’est autre chose que le bon naturel d’une imagination concevant les Idées et formes de toutes choses qui se peuvent imaginer tant célestes que terrestres, animées ou inanimées, pour après les représenter, décrire et imiter” (“Invention is nothing more than the natural result of an imagination that conceives of Ideas and forms of all things possible to imagine, celestial as well as earthly, alive or inanimate, and to later represent, describe and imitate them” 435). Logical argument and mimetic representation, here ascribed to the poetic imagination, are thus two different related, if not conflated, interpretations of this central concept.

By contrast, short prose narrative frequently takes a seemingly humble position in defining its own invention. This was in fact, the character of the orator’s *narratio* (short, vivid but sober, credible and to the point) in judicial or political speech. Thus, Du Fail

claims to only recount tales he overheard, thereby diminishing the effect of his imagination and putting himself in the judicious position of advocate. As we have already seen, fiction and non-fiction remain open-ended categories in terms of generic rules. At the same time, the way the tales strike him, and his desire to present them in a public format lead to an elaborate strategy of *inventio*: he means at first to characterize peasantry by defining its supposed opposite, nobility. Du Fail opens the work with the following:

Les Philosophes et Jurisconsultes ont cela assez familier, de descrire l'un contraire par l'autre, en baillant par iceluy plus seure et solide congnoissance que s'ilz laissoyent l'ombre d'iceluy pour de prime face traiter leur supposé sujet: comme, quand ilz veulent proprement deschiffrer Vertu, ilz peignent Vice de toutes ses couleurs; ou Liberté, Santé, Froid, ilz discourent par leurs opposites, Servitude, Maladie, Chaud, qui donne au surmentionné contraire la grace plus naturelle et trop mieux disposée (*Propos Rustiques* 38).

Philosophers and Jurists are familiar with this strategy of describing one idea by opposition, providing in this way a more sure-footed understanding than they would by leaving its shadow to squarely tackle their actual subject. For example, when they want to correctly unpack Virtue, they paint Vice in all its colors; Liberty, Health, and Cold are discussed via their opposites of Servitude, Illness and Warmth, which gives a more natural and better constructed grace to the above-mentioned opposites.

The point is nothing if not rhetorical, and serves as a fascinating illustration of rhetorical argumentation. Let us remember Du Fail's judicial background, as he wrote this almost immediately upon finishing law school, and what he prompts here is a clear definition of an *a contrario* technique.

When characters insist that the stories they tell in the *Heptaméron* must be true, Marguerite is also using the structure of her work to present her *inventio*, at least in terms of *vraisemblance*. In this paradoxical approach, tales that are supposedly true – not “invented” – are put together to take an original position against the work's own acknowledged model, the *Decameron*. The story-tellers themselves in the text each have their own points to make about various subjects: love, men, women, morality, etc. The structure chosen for the collection can serve to prepare the reader for what is to come, that is, the argument being made, illustrated by each story in turn. The *Heptaméron* then proves both pleasant and useful, but in a manner that is quite different from a poet's interpretation of this Horatian concept.

Poets like Ronsard often write about the importance of what they are doing with poetry and of how skilled they are at doing it: they tout their own invention at every turn. Collectors of tales simply do not beat the drums of literary glory in the same type of public forum. They do, however, frequently represent themselves within their own medium. Often, the form each collection takes is meant to illustrate the author's argument. In some instances, as we have seen, there are a number of speakers who interact and tell their own tales in response to one another, or to satisfy a given theme, as happens in Du Fail's works and in the *Heptaméron*. Without putting herself at the forefront, Marguerite De Navarre presents a battle of “invention” based on truth and

arguments to follow by claiming to find ten new stories each day for ten days. She claims that this is simple “passe-temps” yet defies Boccaccio by using his framework and presenting a game of invention with a specific rhetorical purpose developed over and over in the ample *devis* that follow each story.

In other instances, no framework is given, as happens with Des Périers, who segues from one tale or story to another with the occasional: “Quant à moy, je passe outre” (“As for me, I move on” n.XXVII, 130), though in most instances, the reader is not given even that much. He often, however, chooses to group a number of short narratives together by theme or by a common character; in some instances the character is a type, while in others, it is a specifically named person, real or created. It is primarily his claim that these short narratives are “French” that give the collection some semblance of structure, and, one could argue, *vraisemblance*. Also, within the context of structure, one must analyze the role of the narrator or narrators themselves, as that will affect the nature of the argument being made. Some authors, such as Bonaventure Des Périers, were real, however elusive, and took on the role of *hypernarrator*. Others, such as Marguerite de Navarre’s and Noël Du Fail’s interlocutors, were fictional; many real writers used anagrams to pen their fictions. Those of the *Discours non plus mélancoliques que divers* are simply anonymous, leaving no clue as to the filter they are using. We may refer back to the concept of *hyponarrator*, and there are frequently a number of people presenting the various tales, all of whom might have different voices and opinions as well as different interpretations for similar tales. The *Discours non plus mélancoliques que divers*, the *Propos Rustiques* and the *Heptaméron* all illustrate one form or another of this complexity, which makes the matter of “invention” – the arguments being presented

more or less clearly by the tales and their dialogical set-up – far more intricate and difficult than it is supposed to be. In every instance, the reader is presented the series through a filter, the writer and sometimes narrator. Whether the tales are “true” or “truth-like,” the presentation of the narrator(s) works with the framing devices to illustrate an author’s use of this rhetorical base. Whenever the type of genre used do indicate some form of intertextuality with a predecessor’s work, *imitatio* and *inventio* tend to play off one another and the rhetorical devices become just as blended and ambiguous as the rules of generic convention.⁵⁹

In his *De Oratore*, Cicero espoused *imitatio* as a methodical approach to learning the skills necessary to an orator: “Let this then be my first counsel, that we show the student whom to copy, and to copy in such a way as to strive with all possible care to attain the most excellent qualities of his model” (*Book II* 265). Many sixteenth-century treatises discussed imitation as a means to improve the French language.⁶⁰ It was Du Bellay’s main recommendation in the *Deffence et illustration*, which held that poetry could not merely be translated. Jacques Peletier also wrote a lengthy commentary on the concept of *imitatio* in his *Art poétique* (237-243). He followed very much in Cicero’s footsteps, writing that nothing is more natural to man than to imitate what has been modeled for him, and that this is how civilization continues from one generation to the next. Such imitation is displayed in the obvious plays between collections of tales during this period. Du Fail’s claim to recount stories he overheard apparently shuns imitation, but is itself a form of imitation.⁶¹ The *Heptaméron*, of course, is modeled after the paragon of short prose narrative: the *Decameron*. Yet, Marguerite de Navarre defies this model by turning Boccaccio’s example of fiction into a model of supposedly non-fiction

narrative. She has taken what she and many other readers admire and added her own example of *inventio* to it by rejecting part of the *Decameron*'s very nature.

Des Périers admits to be re-telling stories that are already familiar to the general public; he states precisely that these are not foreign, but specifically French narratives (nouvelle I, 10). Here, his imitation takes on a somewhat nationalistic flavor, almost begging further analysis. His collection is openly in defiance of the many whose origins are foreign in nature, despite the fact that a number of the tales and stories included would have been familiar to the well-read public from foreign collections. Thus, Des Périers knowingly transforms some narratives that carry a long international tradition with them. While this approach seems detached from the high ideal of poetic *imitatio*, it involves techniques of appropriation that are in fact fairly similar, and results in (tongue-in-cheek) glorification of French story-telling by putting it out there as worthy of being told and by placing it competitively in the international arena.

These examples demonstrate the second most important aspect of imitation as a rhetorical concept: that copying must only take place when an author feels he can improve upon what he is imitating, and when what he is imitating is worthy of some repetition. An author must therefore, choose the "most excellent qualities of his model," as we noted above. Almost every treaty on imitation includes a long discussion on the importance of an author's additions or changes to the model. Peletier states: "par seule imitation rien ne se fait grand" ("nothing is made great through imitation alone" 238), indicating that more must be done for any work to have value. Not everyone agrees on the value of this concept. Barthélemy Aneau criticizes the mention of imitation in the *Deffence et illustration* by implying that Du Bellay called for poets to "Gréciser, et

Latiniser en Français” (“speak Greek and Latin in French” 187), completely discounting Du Bellay’s insistence that an author only tackle models he can successfully update and make his own.⁶² Without an author’s ability to modify the model to suit his own talent as well as a particular set of circumstances, “son imitation ressemblerait celle du singe” (“his imitation would be monkey-like” Du Bellay Book II, chapter iii, 237). Imitation, therefore, allows an author to draw on previous writings not only by honoring them, but by reshaping them in his own fashion. Again, short literary fictions were implicitly involved in this discussion, often in a polemical and paradoxical way. Thus, Des Périers implies that valid source material is available right in his own backyard, and that it is not necessary to imitate foreign authors to present interesting work, even though he may still be doing just that.

Various traditions, therefore, ended up fitting within the frame of the mid-century’s tales, providing in some instances the substance of the material, and in others, the structure or even the author’s main point. It is interesting, then, that a genre often considered too superfluous to mention should prove to be so popular in bourgeois culture and courtly society. Publication houses did place collections of tales on their catalogues and in some instances such collections were edited posthumously without any certainty as to the author’s intentions for publication, if any. These facts strongly indicate that these writings did bear a place of some importance in the culture. Jacques Peletier, whose *Art poétique* was clearly modeled on Horace’s *Ars poetica* and, via numerous Italian models, Aristotle’s *Poetics*, served as one of the editors for Bonaventure Des Périers’ posthumously published work. One must ask if this was merely out of loyalty to a friend,

as Étienne Jodelle claims for himself in his Preface to Colet's *Histoire Palladienne*,⁶³ or if respect for the work also played a role. Marguerite de Navarre was well-known for her spiritual poetry and plays. Noël Du Fail was a well-educated lawyer and later a judge. Bonaventure Des Périers was a well-known poet from Marguerite de Navarre's court and the Lyon school. Still, until recently, no one explicitly considered the rhetorical place and role of short prose tales or stories in literature; its structure, function, and popularity were wholly ignored, while a number of serious writers and poets did take it on as at least one of their projects.

Consequently, earlier critical studies of the French canon commonly downplayed the role *contes* and *nouvelles* had in society, relegating them, as their sixteenth-century colleagues did, to the ranks of frivolity. Some of the most well-known collections continued to be republished over the centuries, but not as critical editions. The tone has shifted, and recent scholarly works about these collections are naturally presented from the modern critical perspective, which validates their role as a part of the literary canon. More and more scholars are choosing to devote time and energy to their study. However, they also strive to identify an "authentic" version or edition of a text and proceed to focus their studies on that text. Editorial practices of the period in question nonetheless complicate this search for authenticity. The version most critics choose to work with may ultimately be deemed as being as close to the intended version as possible, but is not typically the edition with which the reading public was familiar during that period.⁶⁴ Subsequently, many contemporary studies of these collections, whether positive or negative, might have been based on a less authentic (or differently authentic) version. However, as we will see, all of these editions are valid, if not authentic, for the very

reasons that they are a product of a thriving sixteenth-century book culture and industry, which both exploited and amplified the success of the genre. Just as the tales themselves, and their authors, claim fluidity and mobility as key qualities, the collections as a whole become malleable products, subject to the manipulations and transformations of the *libraires* and editors that publish them.

PART I

**COLLECTIONS OF TALES AS A MATERIAL COMMODITY:
THE COMMANDING ROLE OF BOOKSELLERS AND EDITORS**

Introduction: the drive of a profit-based industry

The texts selected for this study are both exemplary and peculiar representatives of French sixteenth-century book culture. First, they are examples of (popular) literature that was being written, printed and enjoyed during the mid-century. They represent the kind of books *libraires* knew would sell and were therefore willing to finance amidst a fast-growing and diverse, yet competitive market. Collections of prose tales were, as we have already pointed out, both very popular and not respected as literature.⁶⁵ The collision of these two factors opens the genre to many forms of manipulation, including interpolation and counterfeit editing. Because these books were printed under the auspices of the same system as any other book, the booksellers were subject, at least in theory, to the same constraints as for other texts. The development and evolution of the book industry led to the formulation of a complicated set of centralized laws regarding the production and editing of books, but these laws were frequently in flux and those *libraires* most eager to seek a profit were astute in the art of working within the legal framework to maximize their returns on whichever investment they made.

The exponential growth of the newly developed book industry in sixteenth-century France was due in part to the growth of the expendable income of the nobility and the emergent merchant class. Also, due to the costs of manuscripts, well-stocked libraries had long been viewed as a status symbol to those who could afford them; still, the appeal of presenting such a symbol to one's society had only increased, even with the greater affordability of mass-produced books.⁶⁶ Legal issues of this new industry dealt with everything from the rights of authors (very few) versus those of the booksellers

(quite a lot) to issues of privilege and counterfeiting.⁶⁷ Power plays between the king and the Sorbonne often affected the action of such laws while the industry's merchants found themselves in the middle of the struggle. Nevertheless, many of the laws were put into place to protect the various investors and, sometimes, the artisans who executed the grunt work for the industry.⁶⁸ Publication represented a serious financial investment that was intended to produce a profit. *Libraires* often worked with established material that produced a small but consistent return, but the most successful members of this group also experimented with unproven literature. George Hoffmann points out that “[a]lthough official printing may have been the bread and butter of printers at the time, business with schools, the Church, and the government turns out upon closer inspection to have been less lucrative than one might have suspected” (“About being about the Renaissance” 84). Great success therefore depended on risk-taking. Sometimes, taking a chance paid off in a big way and these booksellers, and others, would milk out the maximum benefit by producing new printings and, quite often, new editions of successful texts.⁶⁹

Proven authors were also exploited whenever possible, and booksellers did not hesitate when collections of tales began to gain popular momentum in the mid-century period. Noël Du Fail was an unknown at the time the *Propos Rustiques* and the *Baliverneries d'Eutrapel* were initially published, but both texts would be popular in different respects and be edited no fewer than five times each during the remainder of the century. Bonaventure Des Périers' name was infamous for his earlier *Cymbalum mundi*, but his poetry and rapier rhetorical wit were still well-known even after his death; the *Nouvelles Recreations et Joyeux Devis* would become his most well-received work.⁷⁰ Marguerite de Navarre's unfinished *Heptaméron* is now considered a chef-d'oeuvre of

the genre, but not before being subjected to the most extensive editorial transformations imaginable. The most successful version, which was often reprinted from the sixteenth through the eighteenth centuries, is not the most commonly accepted version today, and the initial, vastly different edition sparked a volatile controversy that was quickly settled, at least for a while. In each of these cases, multiple variant editions were published during a short amount of time and each edition proclaimed itself to be the most authentic one available. Ultimately, questions of authenticity and authorship play a central role in the sixteenth-century book industry's marketing practices and in the marketing of each of the texts we will consider in this study. Claims of authenticity and authorship are used as ploys to appeal to buyers and, at least as far as a close study of the production practices seems to demonstrate, to sell as many copies of a text as possible. The modern reader's expectations of the author's role are often subverted by practices which exploit him as a source when it seems profitable. These same practices simultaneously exploit the text as a pliable commodity in order to produce repeated variant editions.

In the following pages, we will look at numerous practices in the book industry and in the reading/buying culture of the period. This examination will show that these practices and the exploitation of existing laws quite often resulted in variant editions that may or may not have been authentic, but could boldly claim to be the newest, most up-to-date edition of a text. Variant editions might have contained only some small changes, but, as we will see looking at the four primary objects in this study, they frequently bore significant alterations to the text initially published. The rhetorical value of those changes will be examined in Part II of the study; in this preliminary assessment, we will take note

of some of the more prominent practices in the book industry of this period, and demonstrate how profit-motives drove booksellers to change texts.

Chapter 1

Bonaventure Des Périers' *Nouvelles Recreations et Joyeux Devis*

The posthumous publication of Bonaventure Des Périers' works, specifically his collection of *nouvelles*, poses some particularly interesting questions that distinguish it from most other collections examined in this study. An analysis of the textual history of the *Nouvelles Recreations et Joyeux Devis* leads me to look at questions of textual interpretation through a very precise lens. First, unlike Noël Du Fail and Boaistuau⁷¹, the author could not have been involved in the printing and publication process of his later works, leaving final decisions about the collection to the *marchands-libraires* and any collaborators brought into the production process. As in the case with Marguerite de Navarre's collected tales, Des Périers' text was at risk for corruption and there remains no authoritative pre-publication manuscript.⁷² Such factors leave the definition of the term "corruption" open for debate as well, since readers cannot be certain how much the book to which they have access resembles the author's original work, and one must consider at what point an "original" text becomes a "corrupted" text.⁷³ Further, there has been a lengthy debate as to whether or not Des Périers actually penned the *Nouvelles Recreations*; the most current research tends to accept him as the author, and any anachronisms in the collection are today typically considered the product of simple interpolations. Because of the difficulties in determining the precise nature of the pre-printed text, the extent to which likely interpolations changed it from its "original" form has not been considered an important factor in any assessment of the work.⁷⁴ In fact, most of the acknowledged additions to the collection of ninety *nouvelles* are quite interestingly

seen as complementary to Des Périers' work and faithful to his original purpose.⁷⁵ Yet it may be possible to determine any effect these additions have on the collection by examining not only the interpolations, but the nature of some thirty-nine stories that were later appended to it.⁷⁶ It is also important to consider the reasons for which these stories were included in subsequent editions, as well as the reasons for which these *nouvelles* are often ignored in current criticism; considering all of these reasons will serve to further our rhetorical exploration, and illustrate the effects produced by editorial intervention. First, we must look at the facts and uncertainties involved in a comprehensive analysis of the textual history of the *Nouvelles Recreations*. We may then move to a precise study on the effect this knowledge has on a potential reading of the text, both in its own time and ours.

Most studies of the collection acknowledge that known facts surrounding the publication of Des Périers' famous work tend to be offset by a multitude of unknown elements. The first established fact is that Des Périers' text became a sort of best-seller in its own right. In 1558, the famed master seller-printer and type engraver Robert Granjon published *Les Nouvelles Recreations et Joyeux Devis du feu Bonaventure des Periers Valet de chambre de la Royne de Navarre*.⁷⁷ This was Granjon's only edition of the *Nouvelles Recreations*, but it was to be the first of no fewer than twenty-one subsequent editions printed by other booksellers until 1625, indicating an avid demand by the reading public, which endured for more than half a century.⁷⁸ This prolific history puts the *Nouvelles Recreations* in sharp contrast to the infamous fate of the well-known, and quickly suppressed, *Cymbalum mundi*, which was printed during Des Périers' lifetime (1537). Unfortunately, as happens with the other texts studied here, that demand cannot

be further substantiated by either personal inventories or contractual and/or sales records. First, the *Nouvelles Recreations* were not often considered a “respectable” investment and many owners hesitated to include such books among their assets.⁷⁹ Second, many contractual records from the early days of printing have been permanently lost to us.⁸⁰ However, as George Hoffmann points out, proven texts were often reprinted in the later sixteenth century, but only when a seller and printer could be sure of a profit (“About Being About” 83-84). Current knowledge of sixteenth-century book culture does tell us that such a profit was frequently dependent upon a growing readership, since it was most unlikely a contemporary buyer would purchase a second copy, even if updated, except under special circumstances (Hoffmann, *Montaigne’s Career* 110-111). Despite the numerous obstacles to our knowledge of the *Nouvelles Recreations*’ true provenance and contemporary cultural role, the mere number of editions, as cited above, is considered a fairly accurate indication of their popularity, and this assessment is accepted by recent criticism. Gabriel Pérouse, for example, deemed the *Nouvelles Recreations* an influential and exemplary text in his study on *nouvelles* in the sixteenth century, placing it alongside the *Heptaméron* as one of two “grandes oeuvres” from the period preceding the civil wars (*Nouvelles Françaises* 106). The fact that the *Nouvelles Recreations* ultimately became one of the most printed collections of the time exacerbates questions around the book’s physical birth under the names of two of the period’s most enigmatic and fascinating figures: Robert Granjon and Bonaventure Des Périers, respectively.

One must first ask whether or not Des Périers did produce an original manuscript in which he collected ninety stories. Later, I will examine the evidence and arguments as they have evolved over the centuries, but because the answer to the first question is never

certain, it becomes relevant to also look at several possibilities pertaining to the collection's publication and those who printed and sold Des Périers' work, Robert Granjon included. I would like to examine the overall editorial choices of those who did publish the *Nouvelles Recreations*, both initially and subsequently. As we will see, most of the names of the *Nouvelles Recreations*' sellers are well-established members of the industry, like Granjon. Publication by well-known industry members confirms the tales' popular status and adds an interesting element to the analysis of the context in which they were published. As a result of this knowledge, we may take note of where the *Nouvelles Recreations* fits into the overall account of these printers' and sellers' publications. The questions of who did *not* print the *Nouvelles Recreations* and the timing of the book's publication, particularly in contrast to the availability of other texts by the same author are also of interest here. Finally, I would like to note the expansion of the text in relation to the industry's influences. The changed text, as we have noted, may force a different reading of Des Périers' tales. However, to what extent do economic considerations dictate literary changes to the text? And which of these values: commercial or rhetorical, takes precedent at the time of publication? Placing the *Nouvelles Recreations* in the context of the industry under which they were repeatedly brought to light should provide us with new insight into the stories as a collection, as well as into the genre itself.

The early printers: De Tournes and Granjon

To begin, let us use both fact and speculation to turn to the initial printing of the *Nouvelles Recreations* and their printer. In all, two of Lyon's most influential *marchands-imprimeurs* were the first to posthumously produce Des Périers' works. Jean de Tournes

and Robert Granjon published his *Oeuvres* and *Nouvelles Recreations*, respectively. Notably, Nathalie Zemon Davis points out that these two printers belonged to only about one fifth of the total printers in Lyon who claimed rights as master sellers-printers. As their title would indicate, they not only printed the books in their inventories, but sold them for their own profit, rather than working with book dealers (262). This made their work more profitable overall and gave them a great deal more control over the work that was selected and completed, making them part of a very elite group within the industry.⁸¹ The book's publication in Lyon is first representative of a geographic prerogative claimed by both those who knew Des Périers and those who most likely had access to his material, but one might speculate that the Lyon precedent may also indicate a certain hesitation on the part of Parisian sellers to print something by the notorious author of the *Cymbalum mundi*. While such an argument could be plausible, we must note that Galliot Du Pré, a Parisian seller, received a transfer of rights in 1564, only eight years after the initial ten year privilege was granted to Robert Granjon. In addition, Du Pré's very active re-editing of the text with versions in 1564, 1565, 1567 and 1568 certainly does not indicate any hesitation to use Des Périers' name. However, Du Pré's adoption of the text occurred after a change of crown – Charles IX was now king in lieu of his father, Henri II, but the fact remains that a formal privilege was issued during Henri II's reign. Let us remember as well that were the author's name a concern, an anonymous printing would not have been out of the question, as many such texts were published in this period.⁸² Regardless of the reasons, the *Nouvelles Recreations* were printed initially in Lyon, with a later transfer of privilege to a Parisian seller. Also regarding all of those who were

involved in the publication of Des Périers' writings, it is perhaps most critical to bear in mind the fact that each of these booksellers were well-established in their fields.

There was, however, a gap of about fourteen years between De Tournes' printing of the *Recueil des Oeuvres de Feu Bonaventure Des Periers, valet de chambre de la Royne de Navarre* (1544) and Granjon's edition of the *Nouvelles Recreations*. Also, Des Périers, it is known, was friends with De Tournes.⁸³ Why, then, did De Tournes not print the *Nouvelles Recreations* as well alongside the *Oeuvres*? It would not have fallen outside of De Tournes' publication agenda, given that about one quarter of his business between 1542 and 1564 was dedicated to contemporary and medieval literature and that most of that business (eighty of one hundred thirteen texts) was printed in a vernacular language. Almost one-fourth of these texts related to general literature and fiction.⁸⁴ Moreover, in addition to Des Périers' *Oeuvres*, or the collected poetry, De Tournes published the principal edition of Noël Du Fail's *Propos Rustiques* (1547, reprinted 1549) and Claude Gruget's edition of the *Heptaméron des nouvelles* (1559). Perhaps De Tournes did not have access to the original manuscript, though it seems unlikely since his collaborator on the *Oeuvres* and the apparent recipient of Des Périers' papers after the author's death, Antoine Du Moulin, stated his intention to edit additional works by Des Périers,⁸⁵ supposedly meaning the *Nouvelles Recreations*.⁸⁶ It is possible that De Tournes and Du Moulin simply did not get around to printing the collection when Du Moulin died in 1551 and that the papers were then passed on to someone else, perhaps Jacques Peletier du Mans. It is also possible that De Tournes suggested Granjon to whoever was working on the edition, knowing that his own schedule was overextended. This was not unheard of, for, sometimes, *marchands-imprimeurs* and *imprimeurs* would make such

suggestions or sub-contract work out to meet the ever-increasing demand, while the *marchands-libraires* often worked with several different printers to ensure a timely production of multiple texts.⁸⁷ In any case, it is clear that, for one reason or another, De Tournes refused the opportunity to publish the work.

As a result of De Tournes' refusal, Granjon ultimately printed the first edition of the *Nouvelles Recreations*. In fact, Granjon's involvement is another factor that could have influenced the delay in publication, because Granjon moved from Paris to Lyon, during which time there did exist a period of non-publication.⁸⁸ Be that as it may, his retention of the first privilege is not wholly surprising, since the industry was structured in such a way that people from all ends of the business knew each other and frequently formed professional and personal relationships.⁸⁹ For example, De Tournes was a long-time client of Granjon, who toured the printers' fair markets as one of the most prestigious *fondeurs et graveurs de lettres d'imprimerie*, or engravers of movable-type characters, earlier in his career (Baudrier, v.2 49-53). This relationship does add to the possibility that De Tournes ensured that the text was passed to someone he knew and trusted. However, academics consider Jacques Peletier to have been the most likely candidate to have served as the editorial collaborator in the printing of the *Nouvelles Recreations*. Peletier was, after all, friends with both De Tournes and Des Périers, but this observation only further substantiates De Tournes' claim to the text and adds to the question: why Robert Granjon? It is likely, though, that Peletier was either introduced to Granjon with the text, or already knew Granjon, given that they moved in the same circles.⁹⁰ There appears to be no solid answer to this question. Also, Granjon's interest can be questioned further still since he signed privilege over to the *maître-libraire*

Guillaume Rouillé (or Roville) only a few months after the *editio princeps* of the *Nouvelles Recreations* came out: the privilege in Granjon's edition is dated 26 December 1557, while Rouillé's first edition contains a reader's notice and sonnet dated 25 January 1558.⁹¹ Despite the brief delay in Granjon's transfer of privilege to Rouillé, the latter's earliest edition of the *Nouvelles Recreations* did not appear until three years later, in 1561.⁹² Rouillé's version, however, bears no difference to the founding text.

In fact, the book bore no significant changes between editions, other than the correction of several apparent typos, until Galliot Du Pré's third printing of the collection in 1568.⁹³ One reason for the three-year delay after Rouillé's receipt of the privilege transfer is simply that he was one of the most prolific booksellers in Lyon and consistently had a busy schedule.⁹⁴ Also, Rouillé was known to work closely as a very attentive editor of all the books to which his name was tied (Davis, *Lyon* 259). While it remains unclear how Granjon obtained the text at all, these two factors support the notion that his 1558 edition was, at least in the earlier stages of the collection's printed existence, considered legitimate and properly established.

Satisfaction with the text does not, however, wholly support the initial delay between subsequent printings, nor does it explain Granjon's reasons for signing over privilege to Rouillé. It is possible that Granjon was himself satisfied with the edition and hoped to reprint, but either could not advance the capital needed for further printing or free up his own presses, and thereby went to a successful and erudite *maître-libraire* to ensure a high-quality second rendition. Rouillé would have been an optimal choice, since he was notoriously careful about producing good-quality works. In addition, he was

flexible in the types of contracts he signed and worked hard to be internationally known.

As Baudrier remarks:

Pendant sa longue carrière, on le voit s'associer régulièrement, chaque année, avec des libraires ou imprimeurs de Lyon, de Paris, de Venise, de Genève et de différentes villes d'Espagne, pour la vente ou l'impression d'ouvrages publiés à frais communs (vol. 9, 22)

During his long career, he contracted regularly, each year, with sellers or printers from Lyon, Paris, Venice, Geneva and various Spanish cities, for the sale or printing of works published at a shared cost.

The transfer to Rouillé, then, would have allowed the *Nouvelles Recreations* to reach a wider distribution and, therefore, a larger market. The delay itself between printings could be explained by Rouillé's regretful contract for illustrated texts with the less-talented Macé Bonhomme, which did not end until 1561, the year Rouillé first published the *Nouvelles Recreations* (Baudrier vol.9, 22-23). In fact, Baudrier's bibliography shows a number of texts for which Rouillé obtained privileges in 1558, but did not have printed until several years later.⁹⁵ Let us also note that Rouillé printed an edition of *L'heptameron de nouvelles de tres illustre princess Marguerite de Navarre* (280) and an edition of *Les œuvres de clement marot, de cahors, vallet de chambre du roy* (282) in 1561. Perhaps this is indicative of an alternative marketing strategy in which Rouillé sought to produce texts alongside one another that might interest a similar clientele. For example, placing an edition of the *Heptaméron* alongside the *Nouvelles Recreations* could attract those who were interested either in tales or in works by those associated with Marguerite de Navarre. On the other side, Des Périers was a disciple of Marot's and

both poets' names bore a certain infamy for religious reasons. In all, selling these books simultaneously certainly presented a number of marketing possibilities.

As for the theory that Granjon had run out of money, this outcome could be explained by the fact that starting in 1558, the year of the *Nouvelles Recreations*' first printing, he began to experiment as a printer of sheet music. In fact, of eight books printed in 1559, seven were musical texts, a choice which gave Granjon a new series of issues to deal with (Baudrier vol. 2, 54-64). Davis, for example, notes the high cost associated with printing music, and it does not appear that Granjon underwrote the publication of books of music through financial techniques established by le Grand Jacques (Jacques Moderne), a colleague who successfully specialized in music printing (*Lyon* 262-263). This experiment did not last long, and Granjon quickly reverted back to printing a relatively small selection of instructional prose and fictional works while focusing on his business of designing and engraving letters.⁹⁶ The number of texts that he printed is noticeably small compared to that of his fellow master seller-printers, but “[q]uant à Robert Granjon, c’est davantage par ses caractères que par ses livres qu’il se distingue” (“as for Robert Granjon, he is well-known more for his characters than for his books”) (Davis, *Lyon* 263). Because the Granjon selection was so severely reduced in the years after 1559, it is entirely plausible that a combination of several of these factors contributed to Granjon’s decision to sign over his rights of privilege for the *Nouvelles Recreations*. Yet, the early acceptance of Granjon’s edition and his early transfer of privilege do not answer the questions surrounding his receipt of and subsequent decision to publish the *Nouvelles Recreations*. Nor do these features resolve issues of proofreading and correction, since the text gives no indication as to who might have been involved in

the process. Thus, the fact that Robert Granjon acted as the initial master seller-printer of Des Périers' *Nouvelles Recreations* adds to the expanding mystery of the collection's equally expanding publication.

Additions and the Du Pré family

Even before we discuss the established editorial interpolations, it is important to take note of the commercial aspects involved in publishing different versions of a particular text. Such commercial considerations most certainly influenced Du Pré's initial decision to publish the extended editions of the *Nouvelles Recreations*. These same interests do appear to have influenced the reprinting of several of the other texts in question here, but to varying degrees. For example, later editions of Du Fail's *Propos Rustiques* do include substantial changes from the principal edition, and the *Baliverneries d'Eutrapel* do not, in so far as we can tell. Du Fail's approach to geography in his tales seems, at least upon initial review, to make the text accessible to a wider audience than the limited Angevin literate crowd. Also, editions published under the author's editorial interpretation varied most significantly from editions published under the auspices of another editor. Various editions of the *Heptaméron* were clearly printed with quantifiable changes, but this is traditionally considered a battleground between the editors, rather than a sales strategy for the printers and *libraires*. For Boaistuau, as we will see, we can infer that his choices in editing were related more to his own agenda than to any desire to publish the deceased queen's unfinished work. In contrast, Gruget's decisions were guided by his own editorial approach and the reasons for which he was selected to edit the next anew. None of these scenarios initially suits the presentation of the *Nouvelles*

Recreations. As we will see in a moment, the expansion of Des Périers' text may have had far less to do with any interest in presenting (and capitalizing on) an "authentic" text, than with profit, irrespective of authenticity. Earning a profit from a previously printed work of fiction was tricky business in the sixteenth century, particularly since many such works truly needed to appeal to as broad an audience as possible in order to sell, though the term "broad" must be somewhat narrowly applied to those who did in fact purchase books for pleasure.⁹⁷

Because they appealed primarily to a niche market, best-sellers and popular genres were especially susceptible to textual expansion from one edition to another. Also, laws governing the French privilege system actually contributed to such an expansion. First, as George Hoffmann points out in his discussion of *Montaigne's Career*, the privilege system allowed for unauthorized copies of books after the designated duration of the privilege, unless it was renewed.⁹⁸ A new privilege was most often granted under one of two circumstances, and Hoffmann gives specific examples of each: 1.) the addition of a new book in a series, as happened with Rabelais' publications of *Gargantua*, the *Tiers livre* and the *Quart livre*, respectively (118-121) or 2.) a significant expansion and/or reordering of the original text, of which Ronsard and Montaigne are clear examples (118-121 and 108, respectively). Also, the privilege system shifted from contracted lengths of as little as two to three years in the earlier part of the century, to durations of five to ten years by the 1550s (Hoffmann 112-113). In the case of Des Périers' *Nouvelles Recreations*, we remember that Granjon held the original privilege for ten years, but he almost immediately sold it to Guillaume Rouillé, who maintained the rights for a time and who printed one edition, but then passed them to Galliot II Du Pré,

who printed two editions of the text before making any significant changes to the next two. These four Du Pré editions were printed in rather quick succession in the years 1564, 1565, 1567 and 1568. Du Pré, a Parisian seller, did ultimately keep the rights until their date of expiration in 1567, and we see an overlap in the privilege's expiration and Du Pré's last printing.⁹⁹ Despite the Du Pré's re-rendering of the *Nouvelles Recreations*, they did not extend or renew the privilege, which appears somewhat surprising given the logic of the privilege system presented in Hoffmann's demonstration.

It is unclear, but would be interesting to see, if Du Pré had in fact printed the expanded editions with the intention of renewing privilege. However, such an intention seems to contradict the contemporary interpretation of the law. Most booksellers sought a new privilege towards the end of the designated period of time, claiming rights to the text because of an expansion. Printing a new version within the period did not, on the other hand, give the privilege holder any additional rights, nor did it lead to an automatic extension of the privilege. The result here is that other booksellers renewed the privilege for the *Nouvelles Recreations* or published unauthorized versions of the text, profiting from the changes that appeared in Du Pré's latter editions.¹⁰⁰ Most interpretations would claim that Galliot II Du Pré was simply not a good businessman; his father was in fact considered a prudent commercial trader, using various techniques available to expand his business, including purchasing books from other booksellers in order to enlarge the collection available within his own shop, and we know that Galliot II, along with his brothers Jean, Pierre and Denis took over the business upon their father's death in 1561 (Charon-Parent, *Galliot du Pré* 211-213, 219 note 2). Two explanations remain then, for

the Du Pré's delayed expansion of the text; however, as we shall see, only one is truly plausible.

The first explanation is the possibility, however unlikely, that Du Pré obtained access to as yet unknown and unused portions of the tales Des Périers wrote, but Du Pré's presentation structure for the additional tales contradicts this: the expanded portions in both editions come after the ninetieth tale and the closing poem which traditionally ended Des Périer's collection. As a result, the additional tales are clearly kept as distinct entities, albeit without any indication as to why they were included, and this separate presentation does not explain why Du Pré printed even more additional tales in the last edition (39 compared to 32 in the former). Referring back to Hoffmann's reasons for privilege renewal, one may consider the reality that Du Pré could not simply invent a new work by the author, since Des Périers' death twenty years earlier reduced the likelihood of such a surprise discovery, or at least prevented the reading public from believing such a claim. While many considered the order of the tales to be a superfluous aspect of the collection, which Des Périers himself claimed early on, it does not follow that Du Pré could consider simply inserting the tales into the original text: it appears that he needed to make sure the additions stood out somehow. Du Pré might have been aware that the additional tales were not of Des Périers' hand; if he knew this and assumed that his readers would as well, then inserting these additions would have amounted to an aggressive manipulation of the text, of the kind Gruget and especially Boaistuau were both accused in reference to Marguerite de Navarre's collection. Du Pré may therefore, have been simply avoiding trouble, knowing that the supplement did not belong to the author and having no credible claim to that effect. He may have found this particularly

important since no additional author is specifically named as being the edition's editor, as were Boaistuau and Gruget in the case of the *Heptaméron*.

This of course contradicts the theory that additional tales by Des Périers himself could have been seamlessly inserted into the original text, a key issue for any rhetorical interpretation of the *Nouvelles Recreations*. Moreover, rather than eliminating or replacing certain tales that might have been understood as dangerous for Des Périers or his memory, as was the case with the *Heptaméron* and the late queen of Navarre, here, we see extensive additions with an unclear provenance. It is therefore likely that Du Pré did not see his additions to the *Nouvelles Recreations* as akin to the changes to which the *Heptaméron* was subjected, and he felt he could get away with them. We must then consider the alternative, most likely reason for Du Pré's decision to include these thirty-nine tales.

Let us presume that Du Pré had had some success in printing two editions of the *Nouvelles Recreations* back to back (in 1564 and 1565) and wished to relive the same success, but suspected that a fifth edition of the same text (counting his predecessors' work) would not interest the existing public. We could see Du Pré demonstrating his business acumen by putting forth an attempt at what would later become standard practice among certain groups of booksellers in Paris. Updating a popular text, even without attributing the changes to the author, might entice interested consumers to purchase the new edition, rather than borrow from a friend or colleague who also owned the earlier version. Such practices went even further later in the century when the "boutiques de nouveautés" in the Ile-de-la-Cité proved eager to "cater[--] to the latest tastes, and the interest sparked by a new author often caused speculation which could

literally ‘give a price’ to books” (Hoffmann *About Being About* 83). Speculation, then, became an important marketing tool of which many of the *marchands-libraires* wished to take advantage. The concept could be manipulated to apply to familiar authors and their ever popular works. Du Pré probably suspected that an expansion of the *Nouvelles Recreations* would lead to further success in sales, and chose not to address the issue of authorial and editorial interpolations.

In sum, the *Nouvelles Recreations*’ somewhat ambiguous presentation left the newer version of the text open for theorizing about the provenance of the new tales. While we remember that book enthusiasts were unlikely to purchase a second edition of a book they already owned, those people who did not already have a personal copy might be inclined to obtain their own edition, but only if it was different from the version their friends and colleagues might have had. Time and again, examples of renewed texts demonstrate the importance of reprinting proven works on the part of the booksellers, while living authors frequently did the same to reinvigorate their own works. Hoffmann goes so far as to ask:

But in the age when authors could spend a lifetime rewriting the same book, did they do so by choice, or rather, did the ‘laws of business’ of their time encourage them to expand already successful works at the expense of creating new ones? (*Montaigne’s Career* 109)

This suggests that contemporary practices actually supported saturating the market with specific texts and that authors, if not editors as well, were at the mercy of the external influences by the industry. Du Pré therefore took advantage of several publication and marketing strategies in use at that time when he chose to print an expanded edition of the

Nouvelles Recreations and was thinking first and foremost like a prudent and somewhat scrupulous businessman. In short, the commercial interest of reinvigorating a popular book both outweighed the integrity of the author's work and, in this case, prevented the integrity from being too compromised. If Du Pré had no intentions of renewing the privilege, this was his last opportunity to make a relatively quick profit at minimum risk.

If this is the case, as I believe likely, Du Pré was not incorrect in his assessment. The expanded edition of 1568 then became the standard text in subsequent reprintings of the *Nouvelles Recreations*. I would add here that Du Pré's 1568 title page goes as follows:

Les Nouvelles recreations et joyeux devis. De Bon Aventure des Perriers, varlet de Chambre de la Royne de Navarre. **Reveuez & augmentées outre toutes les pre-cedentes impressions.** A Paris Par Galiot du Pre, en la grande Sal... de la rue S. Jaques a l'enseig...Galere d'Or. (Tchemerzine v.2 859 ; original spelling; emphasis mine.)

Les Nouvelles Recreations et joyeux devis of Bonaventure Des Périers, valet of the Queen of Navarre. **Reviewed and expanded beyond all earlier editions.** Paris : Galliot du Pré, of the large boutique... in Saint Jacques Street at the sign... Golden Galley.

Often, lines such as “revues et augmentées” were added to book title pages as a means to enhance the type of speculative marketing discussed above. Many subsequent editions of the *Nouvelles Recreations* bear similar pitches that include the words “revues et augmentées”.¹⁰¹ This strategy was likely common because of its effectiveness both in marketing and in privilege obtainment. Also as noted earlier, various editions of the

Nouvelles Recreations are printed with relative textual consistency until the early part of the next century, and under numerous *maîtres-libraires*. At this point in the text's publication history, many of the master-sellers are smaller names in the printing industry or have lesser reputations for quality than did the *Nouvelles Recreations*' early sellers, but the *Nouvelles Recreations* maintains enough appeal to be printed frequently. The Du Pré family takes advantage of their father's famous name by putting "Galiot du Pre" on the title page, rather than "Galliot II" or including all of their names. Their reputation is thus directly connected to their predecessor's, and they consider their place established. Other printers do not have the same advantage. Soon after Du Pré's last edition, for example, we see the privilege extend to Benoît Rigaud of Lyon, who received new rights to the *Nouvelles Recreations*, but with few changes from the most recent Du Pré edition.

Rigaud was unlike his predecessors in the type of reputation he developed: while he was a successful Lyonnais *libraire*, he was not known for high-quality renderings of the texts he funded, but for the development of Lyon's inexpensive book market.¹⁰² His primary concern, then, was not textual integrity, but profit, and he printed one edition of the *Nouvelles Recreations* in 1571, then waited over ten years before reprinting it. A Parisian colleague, Nicolas Bonfons, printed the *Nouvelles Recreations* once in 1572, just before the book was given a ten-year hiatus in the industry, at least under the rubric of a larger, extended collection. Evidently, then, even with the expanded text, the profit margin for this particular collection was beginning to shrink, at least temporarily.

The provenance of the thirty-nine tales that were added to the *Nouvelles Recreations* between 1567 and 1570 has remained a matter of some dispute.¹⁰³ For the most part, however, it has been understood that these tales were not posthumously

discovered additions of Des Périers' hand, but were added for commercial reasons in accordance with standard practices of the period. I have found no evidence of contemporary sixteenth-century attacks on the role or presence of these additions. It appears, then, that a relatively passive or tolerant attitude about variants dominated during the initial period of publication. Contemporary marketing strategies building on the legacy of the manuscript tradition, rather than breaking away from it, facilitated this type of passivity. In earlier periods, the role of the author had traditionally lacked sanctity and the scribe frequently acted as a sort of editor of the text, freely making any changes he saw fit.¹⁰⁴ Where cultured society maintained the prestige of books, in keeping with the manuscript tradition, antiquated attitudes about authors and their work did not prevail. Humanist philology fostered a great respect for authors and their texts, and this community took great care to scrupulously edit books. However, this respect did not forcibly extend to all genres; tales and *romans* seem to operate under a different set of rules, and interpolations and variant unauthorized editions abound. On the other hand, even the commercially savvy Du Pré appears to limit the extent to which he would allow variations. Among the most egregious examples of all-encompassing changes were the 1575 and 1577 editions by Nicolas Bonfons, which imposed extensive eliminations. Tchemerzine notes that the work, titled *Les Joyeuses Aventures, et nouvelles recreations*, contained the initial sonnet and only tales 1, 2, 3, 7, and 8 from the 1558 Granjon edition. The Rigaud 1582 version of the *Nouvelles Recreations* contained one hundred tales and the 1602 P. Menier edition bore a total of fifty-eight tales, according to Pierre Jacob (ix), while Tchemerzine notes that the Menier text had the same content as the 1575/77

Bonfons printing. It appears, then, that Du Pré's additions were only the first of many changes to the work over the *Nouvelles Recreations*' first half century of publication.

The text itself was far from sacred when it came to "reviewing and expanding" a book for commercialized publication. Kasprzyk notes in her recent edition of the *Nouvelles Recreations* that such practices were typical in the sixteenth century:

D'ailleurs, si l'on parle de l'unité d'inspiration d'un recueil narratif du XVIe siècle, il ne faut pas oublier qu'il s'agit là d'un équilibre instable, d'un système ouvert, où l'introduction ou la suppression d'un élément est toujours possible (Introduction, *Nouvelles Récréations et joyeux devis*, xx).¹⁰⁵

On the other hand, when talking about unity of inspiration for a narrative collection of the sixteenth century, one must not forget that we are dealing with an instable balance or an open system in which the introduction or suppression of a given element is always possible.

Unlike what happened in the *Heptaméron*'s case, in which editorial intervention led to a heated debate about the nature of Marguerite de Navarre's unfinished work, there came to be something of a free-for-all in the printing of the *Nouvelles Recreations*. Many booksellers seemed to take several of the above-mentioned marketing strategies to the extreme; as long as the text was reworked in some way, it was eligible for some form of updated status and promised new sales.

None of this is to say, however, that there was no dispute about the textual provenance itself. Questions surfaced early on about whether or not Des Périers actually wrote the *Nouvelles Recreations*.¹⁰⁶ In fact, I would suggest that these very questions

allowed for a great deal of the textual manipulation seen in the post-Du Pré printed editions. With such extensive additions and deletions, the *Nouvelles Recreations* by Des Périers might almost have been considered a generic title for collections of tales, ultimately effacing Des Périers' actual presence from his own text. Again, we will look more extensively at the potential interpretive variations that result from this type of textual manipulation in the next section of this study. Yet it is important to emphasize here the extent to which the *Nouvelles Recreations* were changed from the 1558 edition, and how it appears to have been done more for profit than for any true literary benefit or improvement of the collection.

One of the issues which compounded the questions surrounding the *Nouvelles Recreations*' true author is the presence of several anachronisms in both the interpolated tales and within the original series of tales. Frequently, both types of problems – internal anachronisms and additional tales – are grouped together and subsequently dismissed by critics, as we shall later see. Also, the precise roles of unknown collaborator(s) have been put into question, especially in relation to the various additions. For example, in his 1886 biography of Des Périers, Adolphe Chenevière suggests that the writer spent the last few years of his life reassembling his poetry and collected stories, after the disgrace and scandal caused by the publication of the *Cymbalum mundi* (1537). In his view, Des Périers definitely wrote the ninety *nouvelles* included in the first edition of the *Nouvelles Recreations et Joyeux Devis* (1558) and Robert Granjon's collaborator was no more than that, making the question of whether it was Nicolas Denisot or Jacques Peletier irrelevant in Chenevière's perspective (100-102, 105-109). Thus, in Chenevière's analysis of the *Oeuvres* and *Nouvelles Recreations*, both of which were published posthumously,

material production of the texts made no significant change to the original work. Then, as Sozzi did years later,¹⁰⁷ Chenevière concluded that the anachronisms found in the *Nouvelles Recreations* and any other potential additions/deletions to Des Périers' original text were mere interpolations.

However, the additional tales, which we have noted began to appear in Galliot du Pré's 1565 edition of the *Nouvelles Recreations*, were meant to render the book more "complete," but were printed as a distinctly separate section, after the principal collection. Chenevière says very little about the subsequent additions to the text, except to note that they did not derive from Des Périers' hand and that they were a symptom of the type of reverse plagiarism that was rampant during the period, and of which Des Périers was frequently a victim (109). His analysis then demonstrates no critical interest in the additions to the text, but only disdain for any changes to what he considers the original product. I find it interesting that Chenevière – and consequently, numerous other critics – therefore simply discounts much of what might have shaped a person's actual reading of the text after 1565, quite apart from the question about what does and does not derive from Des Périers's pen.

However, not all critics have grouped the anachronisms together with the additional tales. In the most recent edition of the *Nouvelles Recreations*, Krystyna Kasprzyk criticizes other editors for using the thirty-nine additional tales and for falsely attributing some of these additions to Des Périers. She makes it quite clear that her decision to present the 1558 Granjon edition is a deliberate attempt to restore the *Nouvelles Recreations* to their original, uncorrupted form.¹⁰⁸ Her scathing critique of these other editions, particularly those of the nineteenth century, does not go further than

to claim that the other texts were not authentic. Also, she demonstrates the central role the anachronisms have played in the debate about Des Périers as author of the *Nouvelles Recreations* as separate from the problem of the added tales (vii-xx). Her ultimate conclusion is that: “c’est en fin de compte DP qui doit être reconnu comme l’auteur des 90 contes du recueil édité par R. Granjon” (“in the final analysis Des Périers must be recognized as the author of the ninety tales in Robert Granjon’s collection” xx).

Kasprzyk’s reading then is far from passive and she draws very clear lines about what she considers acceptable and unacceptable changes to the *Nouvelles Recreations*. Her approach is exemplary of a modern perspective which, unlike that of the sixteenth-century reading public, invalidates and refutes, rather than accepts the changes brought to the text of the *Nouvelles Recreations* in later editions. We will see next that facing somewhat different problems, there has been a similar approach in modern criticism with respect to various editions of Marguerite de Navarre’s *Heptaméron*, particularly those which were edited by Boaistuau and Gruget. In both cases, clear lines must be drawn about what is and is not considered authentic or uncorrupted. Yet, in sixteenth-century culture, we see a stark contrast between what changes and variants the reading public would tolerate in the *Heptaméron* and what it would accept in the *Nouvelles Recreations*. Widespread acceptance of multiple editions and manipulations of the *Nouvelles Recreations* demonstrates a passivity in the reading public’s approach to the text that did not exist with respect to the *Heptaméron*. In both cases, however, modern critics eventually tend to lean towards an accepted version of a text; they then move to discount any interpretive shifts that may have resulted from an edition that is deemed inauthentic by virtue of not conforming to the other.¹⁰⁹ As a result, just as the text of the *Nouvelles*

Recreations was transformed dramatically to satisfy commercial interests in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, the resulting changes (and especially the additions, which may have their own literary interest) become dramatic casualties when placed under the modern critical academic microscope.

Looking at the textual history of the *Nouvelles Recreations* brings to light a number of issues that affected the collection as a whole, both in the sixteenth century and today. Commercial and academic interests do not fit into an easy relationship when it comes to dictating the final edited version of a collection. In the case of Des Périers' *Nouvelles Recreations*, not only did commercial interests far outweigh any dedication to the integrity of the original text, but it remains unclear exactly what, if any, portions of the *Nouvelles Recreations* Des Périers penned himself. While current criticism accepts the 1558 Granjon edition as being the most authentic, the rampant shifts and changes to the text that came about starting in 1565 demonstrate that when an author is not present to defend himself, as Noël Du Fail would have been, or when an author does not have powerful defenders to denounce unauthorized or inauthentic editions, as Marguerite de Navarre had, a popular text in a popular genre is open to whatever additions and deletions a given bookseller might deem necessary. The openly commercialized manipulations of the *Nouvelles Recreations* place the uneasy relationship between profit and message at the fore, particularly since this was occurring at a time when many authors were very careful about what they wrote and how they wrote it, even in the context of seemingly light-hearted fare.

We will soon see that these commercial shifts in the texts were in fact often aggressive corruptions of the author's intended message and that the editions different

readers might have had in hand could very well have different interpretive values. This conflict is particularly relevant, given that Des Périers' seemingly care-free message, assuming he was in fact the author, pertained very pointedly to interpretation and perception. Ultimately, the very meaning he may have intended for his collection was reinterpreted to serve personal interests by the members of the industry that supported the *Nouvelles Recreations*, just as he suggested would and, perhaps, should happen. We will see, then, that the realities of the book industry could and often did affect the very commodities it intended, at least in part, to preserve, but in the case of the *Nouvelles Recreations*, the text asked, at least in part, to receive that kind of treatment.

Chapter 2

Noël Du Fail's *Propos Rustiques* and *Balivernerries d'Eutrapel*

The early works of Noël Du Fail¹¹⁰ present a unique perspective on the French sixteenth-century book industry compared to the other works studied here because the author was alive during the time of the original and many subsequent publications.¹¹¹ Just as with the *Nouvelles Recreations*, critics perpetuate a desire to establish one authentic version. The modern critic's instinct is to presume that either the very first edition of each text or the final version Du Fail edited himself is definitive.¹¹² In both cases, difficulties surround the selection of any text as the most authentic. For the *Nouvelles Recreations*, a lack of evidence impedes certainty. In the case of the *Propos Rustiques* and the *Balivernerries d'Eutrapel*, presumptions are challenged by the interplay found between Du Fail's editions and interpolated ones, primarily those published by the Parisian *libraire* Etienne Groulleau. Studies of the *Balivernerries d'Eutrapel* are further complicated by the lack of extant copies of a first edition helmed by Du Fail.¹¹³ Modern criticism has relied on a later edition for comparison,¹¹⁴ but our ability to compare changes made by Du Fail between editions for this text as we do for the *Propos Rustiques* remains limited.¹¹⁵

Despite the logistical problems, existing studies suggest a very interesting dialogue between the author and his contemporary interpolator. Initially, this dialogic perspective might incite us to pay less attention to any for-profit motives the booksellers themselves may have had, but it is important to thoroughly examine all of the possibilities in order to fully understand the nature of these variants. Further study shows

that both approaches to creating different editions (the dialogue among authors and the booksellers' profit motive) might have actually fed into one another to create an environment that called for multiple editions of the same book.

The idea that the different editions of Noël Du Fail's first two books engaged in a larger intellectual debate might indicate the need to start with a textual or rhetorical analysis, but in order to understand the context of this idea, we must begin by examining the milieu in which both texts were published.¹¹⁶ First, a look at the precise timing of the two collections and their variants will reveal potential reasons for their existence. It will also help to place each collection in the overall period, which allows for comparison with the other collections studied here and their variants. The *Propos Rustiques* were more successful than the *Baliverneries d'Eutrapel*, but our study will demonstrate that, at least in this case, popularity did not dictate the number of different editions in the earliest manifestations. Paris and Lyon, the two most important cities in French publication at that time are the points of origin for both texts and their variants, and we will look at the reasons the book culture of each might have played a role in the way their production played out. We will also ask why several variant editions were printed in such a short time and examine the people involved in the production process. We must consider not only the author and his interpolating editor, but the Lyonnais and Parisian booksellers. Just as with the *Nouvelles Recreations*, the booksellers' role in the timing of the editions is a key element in our analysis. Finally, the author's own changes to the text will demonstrate a few points about the nature of each of these editions from a publication perspective. The focus here will remain on the production process and the results, rather than a rhetorical interpretation of the variant editions, but it will serve as the first step to

understanding the interplay between literary discourse and profit-driven production motives.

Of the primary texts in this study, Noël Du Fail's were the first to be published, though the others had been written earlier.¹¹⁷ Des Périers' *Nouvelles Recreations* and Marguerite de Navarre's *Heptaméron* had to have been prepared to some extent before the authors' deaths in the 1540s.¹¹⁸ We know that the *Propos Rustiques* were first published in Lyon by the renowned Jean de Tournes in 1547, during the last months of François I's reign. The following year, Estienne Groulleau, a known Parisian *libraire*, produced a smaller, less expensive edition of the text, but with the following inclusion on the title page: "*Discours d'aucuns Propos Rustiques facecieux & de singuliere recreation, de maistre Leon Ladulfi Champenois. Reveuz et amplifiez par l'un de ses amys*" (emphasis mine).¹¹⁹ This is, of course, an earlier example of the same strategy used by Galliot Du Pré in his 1568 edition of the *Nouvelles Recreations*. The editor of the *Discours d'aucuns Propos Rustiques* is unnamed, but he admits to changing the original. In a more severe example, Boaistuau later boasts of improving upon the original in his edition of the *Heptaméron* (published as *Les Histoires des Amans Fortunez*) and we see that the strategy is not unusual. In 1549, Noël Du Fail and Jean de Tournes strike back with a third edition (their second), also "improved", but by the author's hand. This time, the title page reads: "*Propos Rustiques de Maistre Leon Ladulfi Champenois. Reveuz, corrigez, & augmentez par luymesmes*" (emphasis mine).¹²⁰ The use of the terms "corrigez" and "par luymesmes" openly challenges the changes made by the unnamed editor of the Groulleau edition. Groulleau then waits until 1554 to publish the fourth

edition (his second) that would be the final one until a new burst of publications in the 1570s.

The case of the *Baliverneries* is similar, but there are a few significant differences. First, the earliest editions we have are from 1548 and are by Groulleau, Pierre Trepperel and Nicolas Buffet. All are Parisian booksellers, but all three editions are not the same. Second, the 1549 edition from Lyon comes from the publishing house of Pierre de Tours, not Jean de Tournes. There is another Parisian edition from that year by G. Nyverd that is supposed to be an exact duplicate of the Trepperel edition, but Philipot believes that edition could have been published in 1548 and was the principal edition Du Fail edited (*La Vie et l'oeuvre de Noël Du Fail* 242-263).¹²¹ Philipot claims with good reason that there was an earlier Lyonnais version of the text, but we do not know if that was from 1547 or 1548 or if it came from De Tournes' or De Tours' catalogues. Most references, such as Philipot's, suggest 1548 as the original date of publication, but again, we have no direct evidence to support this claim. Antoine Du Verdier's listing indicates that Guillaume Nyverd published the text in Paris in 1548, but the preceding listing by La Croix du Maine also claims that the first edition of the *Propos Rustiques* was published by Etienne Groulleau in 1554 (v. 2, 35-36). Milin's analysis supports the claim that a Nyverd published the *Baliverneries* (xli), but Philipot points out that Guillaume Nyverd began publishing works in 1557, while Jacques Nyverd, who died in 1548, might well have been the initial publisher (261-262). Milin's notes are more explicit, because a Guillaume I retired around 1519 or 1520 and it was Guillaume II who began his own house in 1557 (xxxv). We do know for certain that numerous, variant editions of Du Fail's early texts are published quickly, in several different locations and

by different houses. Ultimately, Estienne Groulleau published more editions of Du Fail's early works than the other *libraires*, even though his editions are what one would call counterfeit. Often, counterfeit book production was influenced by a work's popularity, and even known *libraires* like Groulleau would print such books when they thought they could get away with it.

Both texts arrive on the scene at an interesting moment. They both earn a very brief period of popularity, but the longevity of each differs. Unlike the *Propos Rustiques*, the *Baliverneries* would not be reedited later in the century and, like Du Fail's much later *Contes d'Eutrapel* (1585), are not as frequent topics for study as are the *Propos Rustiques*.¹²² Du Fail's works are considered by many to be Rabelaisian in nature and style and the *Propos* can boast of a frame-tale structure, while the *Baliverneries* certainly keep to their name (Pérouse 313). During this brief period, the popularity of these texts is not diminished by the addition and subsequent removal of certain chapters, or Du Fail would not have successfully found editors to reprint his reedited text. Jean de Tournes participated in both the first and second editions of the *Propos Rustiques* completed by Du Fail, and as we saw in the *Nouvelles Recreations* example, De Tournes was selective in his catalogue. Rabelais remained popular during this time, particularly with the release of the *Tiers Livre* (1546). While his books are not formally considered short narrative, they certainly influence the world of the French tale and especially Du Fail.¹²³ Only two years after the *Propos Rustiques*' debut, DuBellay and his colleagues of the future Pléiade would launch a linguistic call to arms, begging for the creation of a new French poetry based on imitation, while dismissing prose fiction (*La Deffence et Illustration de la langue françoise* 1549). At the same time, however, the French *Amadis de Gaule* cycle

is continuing its stride after eight years in the marketplace (Simonin, “La Disgrâce d’*Amadis*” 197-203). In short, Noël Du Fail seeks a *libraire* around the time when – to the chagrin of some – a thirst for new fictional works is quickly developing.

The book cultures of Lyon and Paris

This thirst appears to be strong in both Paris and Lyon, which opens doors for Du Fail’s work in both cities. While the book culture in each is very different and must be studied to compare the variant editions of both books, there is a very pragmatic explanation for the fact that Du Fail sought a bookseller in Lyon to publish his works. It appears that he left Bourges and went to Avignon by way of Lyon, where he would sell his manuscripts.¹²⁴ Bourges is close to 250 kilometers south of Paris, but Lyon is en route to Avignon and likely serves as a rest stop for the young student. Lyon is therefore the most convenient location for him to find a publisher. Differences between Lyon and Paris also make Lyon the ideal location for his project. While authors based in Paris tended to be dependent upon the court, as the authors of the *Pléiade* would soon demonstrate (see Hampton *Criticism in the city: Lyons and Paris*, 352-353), Lyonnais *libraires* and authors did not find themselves caught in the power war between the papal university system and the king, especially in the first half of the century. Timothy Hampton’s concisely written article shows that the “cosmopolitan reading public” found in Lyon allowed for a freedom of thought and expression that did not exist in Paris (348-350). The industry there was more heavily influenced by the rising merchant class than by royal politics, and the international commerce of the city also played an important role in the development of the Lyonnais book culture (Hirsch 117). Works of Maurice Scève, Clément Marot, and

later Louise Labé and the future Pléiade's own Jacques Peletier, all benefited from this cosmopolitan microcosm and worked closely with Lyonnais publishers; experimentation is a key element of their works. Du Fail's texts would also prove experimental in many ways.

His two works are consistent with the idea of a collection of tales, but neither entirely fits the template for such a collection as it had been understood thus far. The *Propos Rustiques* after claiming at first to treat rusticity by studying its counterpart (nobility), present the former through "propos" that involve as much conversation as story-telling. The *Baliverneries d'Eutrapel* are even more difficult to follow, with a conversational format that might read more like a modern screenplay than a sixteenth-century narrative.¹²⁵ This is essentially an experimental set of texts that suits the lively spirit of Lyon's book culture. It is only fitting that a *libraire* who was beginning to expand his catalogue would be the first to publish at least the *Propos Rustiques*, and perhaps the *Baliverneries d'Eutrapel*.

Jean de Tournes published the *Propos Rustiques* the same year as an Italian edition of Petrarch's works, and thereby created an interesting juxtaposition of texts. However, Noël Du Fail's works are more in line with De Tournes' as yet brief publication history than Petrarch at this point, as the well-reputed *libraire* was only just beginning to branch out beyond French-language texts.¹²⁶ In fact, he had only been a *maître-libraire* since 1542, having been a long-time *compagnon* for Simon Gryphe. Gryphe's catalogues listed primarily religious and classical texts, and De Tournes' initial choice of French-language texts assured that he would not compete with his old master. Gryphe's atelier ultimately served as a formative ground for numerous up-and-coming

printers, of whom De Tournes was the most successful.¹²⁷ Ultimately, De Tournes experimented by successfully producing books of all languages and genres and his catalogue expanded by Gryphe's death in 1554 to include a wide variety of books.

A contradiction in the Lyonnais book culture evolved as the relatively liberal practices found earlier in Lyon were now limited by the Sorbonne's mighty reach, and even the *libraires* found themselves constrained. Around this time, Lyon was no longer considered a safe haven for Reformation materials, and the publication of even slightly questionable works would transfer with many of the movement's exiles to Geneva.¹²⁸ De Tournes was careful enough in his selection to avoid any accusations of heresy; undoubtedly the death by pyre of his openly Protestant friend Etienne Dolet in 1546 weighed heavily in his choices for a long time to come.¹²⁹ However, he did print one theological text by Claude d'Espence that the Sorbonne would condemn and, at the end of his life in 1562-1563, several reform-based liturgical texts (Davis, *Lyon* 267-268). The majority of these selections were made shortly before De Tournes's death of the plague in 1564, and the effect of such publications on his career would never become manifest. On the other hand, the impact of Etienne Dolet's death on Lyonnais book culture and De Tournes' catalogue selection in the early era of the publishing house's existence provides further understanding for De Tournes' decision not to publish the infamous Des Périers' *Nouvelles Recreations*.

In the 1540s and 1550s, even the appearance of impropriety could be fatal. Des Périers' poetry was far more traditional and less easily (mis)interpreted than his prose. Careful selection during this phase of his career and an outstanding reputation eventually combined to earn De Tournes the title of *imprimeur du roi* in 1559, before the publication

of reformatory materials, and we see that the Parisian printers were not the only ones to align themselves with the crown.¹³⁰ De Tournes' choice of texts reflects both the radical expansion of vernacular language literature and its cultural importance during the mid-century alongside an acute awareness of the volatile politico-religious climate that was emerging. The climate in Lyon may have initially favored experimentation and reform-minded thought (in intellectual as well as religious practice), but around the time the *Propos Rustiques* and the *Baliverneries d'Eutrapel* were printed, it had become dangerous to challenge the Sorbonne even from that distance. Du Fail himself faced trouble later in his career in Rennes when he became openly Protestant, but at this point, he was merely a student finishing his degrees in the Catholic controlled university system (Philipot 74-94, 476-494). The two texts he writes at this stage of his career and education do not challenge the Church. In fact, they seem to embrace the current socio-economic structure (Pérouse 312-316), even if they do not conform to generic standards.¹³¹ De Tournes would have had no reason to refuse the publication of the *Propos Rustiques* by an as-yet untested young author and every reason to give the book (or books) a chance. The climate was risky, but De Tournes' prudent understanding of rising anti-Protestant sentiment in Paris and elsewhere allowed him to identify texts that would represent a low risk by that criterion, while still appealing to the freer intellectual milieu for which Lyon was known.

The uncertain provenance of the first publication of the *Baliverneries d'Eutrapel* makes it very difficult to place that text in a specific locale. It seems agreed that one of the Nyverds published an edition of this text before Groulleau, Trepperel and Buffet, and all three Nyverds were based in Paris. Two problems arise, however, if this were to be

considered the *princeps* edition. First, how and when did Noël Du Fail get the text sent to a Parisian *libraire* for publication? The travels that have been confirmed in various studies, most specifically those by Philipot, do not include side-trips by way of Paris. As demonstrated above, Lyon seems the most practical center for Du Fail to satisfy his aspirations for publication, and we know that the *Propos Rustiques* were printed around the same time in Lyon. Certainly, Du Fail might have had the manuscript sent to a *libraire* in another city, but we must ask how and why he ended up, potentially, working with Nyverd. Also, it is unclear why Du Fail would choose to have one manuscript published in Paris by one bookseller, while another was being published in Lyon by another well-known one. Of course, there is the possibility that De Tournes refused to publish the *Baliverneries d'Eutrapel*, just as he likely refused to publish the *Nouvelles Recreations*. Again, though, the question of how Du Fail might have been put into contact with Nyverd remains uncertain, even though we have noted that booksellers often recommended works to one another when the manuscripts did not suit their own editorial policies.

Perhaps De Tournes simply felt that the *Baliverneries d'Eutrapel* were too experimental and detached from the traditional genre of the short prose narrative, even for the Lyonnais culture. Jacques Nyverd was granted the status of *imprimeur du roi* and was indeed well-known, which would support a claim to the text (Charon-Parent, *Les métiers du livre à Paris* 50). He was however known primarily for special contracts with almanacs and premonitory texts, which makes his role as publisher even more surprising (114-115). To summarize, the circumstances surrounding the initial publication of Du Fail's second book remain enigmatic at best.¹³² It is most likely that speculation regarding

a Lyonnais-based *editio princeps* is justified, though it might well have been published by someone other than De Tournes. In this case, De Tours is the most likely candidate for *libraire* of the first edition. Nyverd's role in a second edition remains dubious, despite Du Verdier's claims. Regardless of where this text was first published, we do know that second editions were quickly produced in Paris, where book culture was evolving somewhat differently.

We saw that Lyon's ideological advantages became problematic around the time the *Propos Rustiques* and *Baliverneries d'Eutrapel* were published. The intellectual elites of the city still bore influence, but Paris' status as the country's capital opened it up to new marketing opportunities that Lyon did not have. Throughout France, Paris became the largest producer of books and the most metropolitan of French cities, despite Lyon's wealth and international merchant class. In Paris, Groulleau printed a re-edition of both texts. While Lyon was the best location for some controversial writings, however limited in scope, the *boutiques de nouveautés* were quickly developing in Paris and the more avant-garde *libraires*, using the same strategy as many artists, carefully aligned themselves with the court, while complying with certain standards set by the Sorbonne. They removed themselves as much as possible from the ongoing tension between the University and the government, while making their catalogues as available as possible for retail consumption. As Annie Charon-Parent notes about the Quartier Latin:

Ce quartier d'églises et de collèges est en marge de l'activité politique et économique. Les libraires, voulant se rapprocher du public des marchands, des gens du Roi et du Parlement, s'installent sur les ponts et dans la Cité: à mi-chemin entre la Ville et l'Université, ils gardent souvent une succursale

sur la rive gauche, où ils font imprimer leurs éditions, tout en disposant d'une clientèle nombreuse et variée au Palais et dans les environs (171).

This neighborhood filled with churches and boarding schools stands on the margins of political and economic activity. The booksellers, wishing to get closer to the merchant class, the King's people, and members of Parliament, establish their shops on the bridges and in the *Cité*. Halfway between the city and the university, they often maintain another location on the Left Bank, where they print their editions, while taking advantage of a numerous and varied clientele in the *Palais* and its surrounding areas.

Marketing and self-preservation competed amongst the needs of the Parisian booksellers, and these sellers found themselves holding commerce in the vicinity of two distinct threats. The fact remains that much of the clientele happened to be affiliated with the university, the court, or the Parliament and justice system, although well-to-do merchants and professionals were increasing their interest in books at this time.¹³³ This area, precisely where Etienne Groulleau had a shop, boasted an enormous variety of books from all over the world, and the trends from Lyon were as sought-after as the latest Parisian text (171-172). Jean de Tournes seems to have developed smaller printings of many of his first editions, and this choice left time on the presses for a wider variety of books, but it also meant that fewer copies were available for sale.¹³⁴ As for the possible Nyverd printing, it at least appears that any printing would have been small enough to remain virtually unknown even within the Parisian book industry. Groulleau and other Parisian sellers would not have been able to obtain many copies of either text to retail under their own roofs and they needed to employ a strategy if they wished to exploit the

newly expanding trends in collections of tales and *nouveautés*. Groulleau's boutique was located in the midst of the trendiest area and he worked frequently with many other booksellers.¹³⁵ His success did not preclude him from producing books that were, strictly speaking, illegal for him to produce. In order to obtain copies of the *Propos* and, likely, the *Baliverneries*, Groulleau had to engage in counterfeit production. For some booksellers, financial success was grounded in obtaining the *nouveautés* by any means necessary.

Counterfeit book culture

Neither Paris nor Lyon was exempt from the culture of counterfeit books that existed throughout Early Modern Europe during this period. Contemporary works were particularly vulnerable as demand for the *nouveautés* increased (Martin and Febvre 366). According to Henri-Jean Martin:

Entre les éditeurs, la concurrence devint plus âpre, les questions de prix intervenant, la tentation devint grande alors de réimprimer une œuvre qui venait de paraître et de vendre la réimpression à moindre prix, soit en réduisant la marge bénéficiaire, soit en exécutant un volume de moindre qualité. (*L'Apparition du livre*, 366)

The competition between publishers became sharper and it became increasingly important to sell at a lower price than one's competitors. There was a growing temptation to reprint a work that had just been brought out by someone else, especially since the pirate did not have to face any of the costs of 'justifying' the layout of the text on the page – he

simply copied an edition page for page – and since he escaped the need to pay anything to the author. Moreover he could sell his edition more cheaply than the original if he produced an edition of lower quality or accepted a lower margin of profit. (*The Coming of the Book*, 238)¹³⁶

There were times when the potential profits of a counterfeit edition would outweigh the risks. If charges were brought and the case adjudicated in favor of the privileged bookseller, the offender would, at the least, have to repay all of his profits to the wronged party.¹³⁷ This so rarely happened, though, that numerous *libraires* gave in to temptation by printing many counterfeit books, and expected a lawsuit from time to time.

Interestingly, the legal threat of corporal punishment and of losing one's license did not seem to deter even well-established *libraires*. The booksellers who engaged most often in this practice considered the occasional assessment of damages to be a part of the cost of doing business and profits from the whole catalogue more than made up for the losses.

Other booksellers primarily worked with legitimate, privileged texts and only occasionally engaged in counterfeit production. This practice tells us that they hoped the illegal productions would go unnoticed amid the rest. A sampling of the books Groulleau included in his catalogues indicates that he should be included in this second group, as many of the books he had printed bore documented privileges.¹³⁸ In the small sampling available on Gallica, 17 of the 23 books bear privileges, while the remaining six do not.

Groulleau might have risked his reputation to some extent with the production of counterfeit books, but just as it was for many other booksellers, the temptation proved too great to ignore. In some ways, Groulleau produced a typical counterfeit edition. His editions of both of Noël Du Fail's books were printed in-16, which was a cheaper and

more portable version than De Tournes' in-octavo first edition of the *Propos Rustiques*.¹³⁹ No privilege is listed because none was obtained. However, the Groulleau edition of the *Propos Rustiques* includes a number of small corrections, additions and deletions, and two new chapters: *Les propos de la secode [sic] journée par Thibaud Monsieur & Fiacre sire, neveux de maistre Hugues*, which also contains the *Chanson de Maistre Huguet du temps qu'il estoit amoureux*, and *La Délibération de Guillot sur l'ordre de la Hemée ou banquet de la dedicace de Borneu, feste annuelle de toute la chastelenie de Vaudeuire*.¹⁴⁰ The rhetorical effect of these chapters will be addressed later, but this is a bold change perpetrated on a text by a living author. The resulting costs of any interpolation, especially additions as extensive as these make the Groulleau editions quite different from the "traditional" counterfeit text.

This edition of the *Propos Rustiques* is still considered "counterfeit", but we can see that Groulleau had to complete the full process of production by hiring someone to lay out an entirely different work. Also, the title page claims to improve upon the original, as we have noted, and claims that a "friend" has made the changes.¹⁴¹ Spelling changes and other interpolations were made throughout the publishing history of the *Propos Rustiques*, as La Borderie's critical edition points out. Courbet's and Milin's critical editions of the *Baliverneries d'Eutrapel* note similar changes between the 1548 counterfeit editions and Du Fail's 1549 version of the text, which lead most critics to believe that Groulleau and the other counterfeiters committed similar interpolations to this text.¹⁴² In other words, it was not a simple case of copying the exact text and using an established layout. Groulleau of course, did not have the expense of a privilege, but it does appear he incurred all of the other traditional production costs. These are not solitary

examples, either. In all of the six counterfeit examples examined on Gallica (which do not include the *Baliverneries d'Eutrapel*, but do include the 1554 version of the *Propos Rustiques*), some form of the phrasing “nouvellement revu et corrigé” appears.¹⁴³ We saw other examples of this type of phrasing used in editions of the *Nouvelles Recreations*, but in that case it seemed to function primarily as a marketing strategy. For the *Nouvelles Recreations*, privilege passed from one *libraire* to another in a legal, standard way, and most later counterfeit productions also followed the more traditional strategy, providing cheaper copies of an existing edition. In the case of Groulleau’s counterfeit editions, his use of the common phrase also indicates clear changes that might have been made to raise the reader’s interest. More significantly, though, the terms act as a structure that exempts the texts from the loose copyright laws of the period. Just as Hoffmann points out that this phrasing was often used to obtain a renewed privilege, it is used here to stretch the meaning of a “new” text to substantiate the claim that Groulleau’s edition is not in fact the text that was originally granted privilege and is therefore exempt from accusations of counterfeit production.¹⁴⁴

Strictly speaking, Groulleau did produce counterfeit editions, because there was no privilege and at least some of the books he copied were still protected under current privilege laws, but he shielded his investment and his reputation by changing the texts and by including an acknowledgement of those changes in the title page. He was also able to avoid accusations of inaccuracy by openly changing and augmenting the text, for one of the major criticisms of print production, and especially counterfeit prints, was inaccuracies.¹⁴⁵ His edition was accepted enough and sufficient copies remained that La Croix du Maine’s reference for Noël Du Fail’s *Propos Rustiques*, listed initially under the

pen-name of Léon Ladulfi, credits Groulleau's 1554 edition at the expense of all others (vol. 2, 35-36, 194-195).¹⁴⁶ Most of the eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century editions are based on the Groulleau version, further indicating its canonical status (La Borderie, *Introduction* xvii-xxvii). At the time, for Groulleau, then, "revu et corrigé" was a phrase used as both marketing ploy and investment protection. Groulleau appears to have manipulated the system to his benefit, and as a result, his editions of the *Propos Rustiques* and, likely, the *Baliverneries d'Eutrapel* were significantly different from those published under the author's influence. The Trepperel and Buffet editions of the *Baliverneries* are themselves counterfeit versions of Groulleau's edition and their presence illustrates the pervasiveness of the counterfeit culture. It is interesting that these *libraires* chose only to offer editions of the *Baliverneries* and not the *Propos Rustiques*, but speculation on the reasons why would be too broad and of uncertain interest here. According to Milin and Philipot, the Trepperel and Buffet editions contain primarily error-based variants rather than text-based variants.¹⁴⁷ As such, they are examples of the cheaply, somewhat carelessly produced illegitimate editions one finds during this period. They also serve to highlight, by contrast, the unusual case of the Groulleau editions within this counterfeit culture.

Often, even with authorized second editions, a publisher would seek to keep production costs down: he would make changes necessary to establishing a "new" edition, but would rarely go beyond that. In many instances, production costs increased by minor changes to the text would be balanced out by a less-costly, smaller format.¹⁴⁸ This is the case with the Jean de Tournes re-edition of the *Propos Rustiques* which adopted an in-16 format, compared to its earlier in-octavo. However, the Pierre de Tours

edition of the *Baliverneries d'Eutrapel* went a step further in terms of production costs by including engraved images in the book.¹⁴⁹ This was an unusual example, as the precedent for the text and the genre did not include engravings. The images were stock engravings that bore no connection to the meaning of the tales, but would still have been considered a costly addition.¹⁵⁰ De Tours reprinted other books by De Tournes, including the *Suite des Marguerites de la Marguerite des princesses* in 1549, but this version did not include engravings. In light of the multiple counterfeit copies produced the previous year (Groulleau, Buffet, Trepperel), perhaps De Tours simply wanted to make this edition stand out. Another possibility is that he was experimenting with the genre to see if engraved editions attracted more buyers than text-only editions. In either case, the inclusion of engravings in collections of tales was not often repeated throughout the period in question. One other exception stands out in the 1554 Groulleau edition of the *Propos Rustiques*. In this instance as well, the engraved pictures are stock images and have nothing to do with the text. As it later became the base text for subsequent editions and was the most noted version, Groulleau's financial risk likely paid off. Not so for the Pierre de Tours 1549 edition of the *Baliverneries*, which remains the earliest example of images in print throughout our study.¹⁵¹ The text of this edition, however, appears to have been modified by the author himself, in response to the many counterfeit productions that preceded it.

Noël Du Fail and his *libraires*, Jean de Tournes and Pierre de Tours, responded to all of the counterfeit editions almost immediately with re-editions of both works in 1549. This means that less than two years passed between editions of the *Propos Rustiques* and that only one to two years passed between editions of the *Baliverneries d'Eutrapel*. The

turnaround time for these re-editions is impressive, and a cursory review of the timetable would indicate that Du Fail, De Tournes and De Tours were working on re-editions almost immediately after publication of the first.¹⁵² Critical editions of these texts that include variants do not look at the time frame involved in the production process. However, many of them point out certain similarities between Du Fail's second editions and Groulleau's counterfeit ones. While Du Fail's re-edition of the *Baliverneries* provides a different geographic setting than the various 1548 counterfeit editions,¹⁵³ the text of the *Propos Rustiques* shows a clear development in the changes made. This does not include spelling variants, as isolated in La Borderie's critical edition (114-133). It does include small interpolations that Du Fail himself incorporated in his 1549 edition (also indicated in La Borderie 134-179). La Borderie's conclusion is that Du Fail made certain inclusions from the Groulleau edition because he wanted the right to state that his text was "Revu, corrigé & augmenté" (135). Philipot believes most of the changes in the *Propos Rustiques* were simply examples of a modernized orthography (236-237). He does not agree with La Borderie's view that the 1573 edition was produced by Du Fail (236).

The 1573 edition certainly differs from that of 1549 because it does include more of the interpolated material found in the Groulleau editions. Much of Philipot's analysis looks at the literary effects of such changes, and he spends a great deal of time looking at the geographic interpolations in the *Baliverneries d'Eutrapel* (243-249). Courbet adds little to the discussion, as he depends upon La Borderie's and Felix Franck's conclusions for much of his introduction (xliii-li). Milin disagrees with Philipot's assessment of the importance of geographic localities found in the text; he believes the Groulleau and other

editions did a poor job of incorporating a different geography, and he does not believe that Du Fail himself changed the locales of the *Baliverneries d'Eutrapel* (xlii-xlvi). Milin also holds little interest in the spelling changes which occurred between editions, noting as so many others have that spelling was usually determined not by the author, but by the compositor (xlii).¹⁵⁴ None of these analyses examine the time-frame involved. The focus remains on the assumed “authentic” text as defined by the author and his intended purpose and places the variant editions in the position of “other” and “corrupted” texts. Pérouse and Dubuis, ironically, do not consider the interpolated editions in their discussion, nor do they, in general, present variants in their text, which is based on the 1549 De Tournes edition, except to make note of the Groulleau interpolations and to make it clear that these are not to be considered in the selection of an authentic text (11-12, 31). In their opinion, “pour l’essentiel, [Du Fail] est revenu à son texte de 1547, mais non sans conserver, pourtant, beaucoup des «interpolations» de 1548, qu’il aura jugées heureuses” (“essentially, [Du Fail] returned to his 1547 text, but not without maintaining, many of the 1548 ‘interpolations’, which he must have deemed judicious” 11). Thus, in their attempt to present the most authentic text, and by virtue of their own guidelines, Pérouse and Dubuis ultimately choose to present yet a version in which Du Fail adopted counterfeit elements for his own (literary and stylistic) reasons.¹⁵⁵

A potential collaboration

Looking again at the dates and the time-frame for each of the editions, whether by Groulleau, De Tournes, De Tours or others, we see that no more than a year passed between the publication of the previous edition and the latest. This fits well within the

accepted parameters of ten months to complete an edition, but it also indicates that rewrites and interpolations were completed within about two to four months of the completed, printed and bound previous edition. This observation does not seem unreasonable, but we must also consider travel and delivery time. For example, the Parisian Groulleau needed to obtain a copy of the Lyon-printed *Propos Rustiques* before he was able to enlist someone to “review and correct” the work. The Nyverd, Paris-based edition of the *Baliverneries d'Eutrapel* might have been easier to obtain, simply due to location, if it existed at all. Once Groulleau’s editions were complete, Du Fail, whose whereabouts are somewhat uncertain at this time, needed to receive a copy of the Groulleau variants in order to respond with his own editions of the two texts. It is possible he was travelling back from Avignon at the time, and so was able to access a copy through De Tournes, but in any case, the Parisian edition had to make its way back to Du Fail, wherever he was.¹⁵⁶ If Du Fail was no longer in Lyon, he would have had to get his changes delivered to De Tournes and De Tours, respectively, and other correspondence would likely have taken place. Also, the transfer of the second edition of the *Baliverneries* from Nyverd to De Tours poses yet another set of problems and further supports the idea that the first edition was probably published in Lyon. Either the author and his interpolator both worked very quickly or there was a certain amount of planning involved in the preparation of each of these editions, one right after the other. In other words, it is at least possible that Du Fail and his interpolator had copies of each other’s work before printing was complete. For this to be true, either the printers or the author and his interpolator would have had to work out a system of exchange in advance, which would suppose some form of previous acquaintance.

First, the interpolator must be identified to establish a connection between him and Du Fail or the printers. In this case, the identity of the interpolator theoretically remained anonymous during the author's lifetime. He is named the "Angevin" in the poem which precedes the text, and this poem also includes the motto "Probè et Tacitè". As Philipot points out in his own analysis, these two operations functioned as keys to any interested party, the author included. Jean Maugin is considered the most likely candidate, as he not only came from Anjou, but had already worked with Groulleau in 1546 when the *Histoire de Palmerin d'Olive* was published. As Philipot also points out, this book named the author as "Jean Maugin dit le Petit Angevin" and included the same motto (232-235). Pérouse and Dubuis agree with Philipot's assessment and no one has disputed this (11). Also according to Philipot, Noël Du Fail had spent some time in Paris between 1538-1544 (45-63) and in Angers sometime around 1545 (80-84). As for the interpolator, he uses Parisian university slang, indicating a recent sojourn in Paris, and it is entirely possible that the two did in fact know each other (232-233). The mere possibility of this acquaintance, coupled with the timing of the variant editions, suggests strongly that some level of coordination among the different parties may have occurred.

This type of coordination and planning in the production of multiple variant editions might occur for one of two reasons. First, it could be used as a marketing strategy, where variant editions vie for the attentions of the readers, thereby increasing interest in the text. Such a strategy might also appeal to the reader who does not yet have a copy, but who chooses to purchase the newer edition rather than borrow the older edition from a friend. This marketing strategy could have derived from the *libraires* or from the author and interpolator themselves. Alternately, it is possible that Du Fail and

Maugin knew each other and that Maugin wanted to present a different perspective on the text his acquaintance was preparing, thus engaging in a literary debate.¹⁵⁷ We may also consider that Du Fail adopted some of the smaller interpolations (though not the additional chapters) for one or two reasons. First, he might have been repaying Maugin for the counterfeiting slights by including some of these changes and, as the legitimate author of the text, stealing back his own work. Second, stealing Maugin's interpolations does, in some ways, authenticate the interpolator's interpretation of the text by legitimizing some of its choices. For now, we can conclude that a profit motive did drive the numerous editions to some extent, and that the existence of so many editions might have been fueled by both the popularity of the book and the evolving marketing strategies in the industry. The extent to which Noël Du Fail was behind any of these is unclear, but it is clear that he had access to the counterfeit editions of his work and that he decided to adopt some of their material.

When focusing our analysis on the publication side of the process over the literary, we see Noël Du Fail serve as a tool for the publisher to increase the market value of the product. The author gives the "official" version of the text and makes all "official" corrections in order to justify reprinting. In turn, the interpolator's "friendship" with the author is used by the counterfeit *libraire* to justify his own edition of the text. Whether or not the two men were truly friends is uncertain, but any possibility of friendship or acquaintance is exploited as yet another marketing strategy.

Ultimately, it is difficult for anyone to claim the most "authentic" version of either text, but even in this time, when the industry's contractual tendencies severely limited an author's rights, his name does appear to serve an important role. Whether or

not Du Fail and Maugin worked together to create the variant editions, Du Fail certainly appropriated some of the counterfeit words or phrases and re-published them under the auspices of his own authority. The effectiveness of this strategy is questionable, however, because later sixteenth-century editions of the *Propos Rustiques* appear to be based on the Groulleau editions and typically include at least portions of the additional chapters. As cited in La Borderie, the undated Eloi Gibier edition as well as the 1573 and 1576 editions under the auspices of the *Ruses de Ragot* all included the first section of the first additional chapter (*Les propos de la seconde journée* 165). Perhaps the Groulleau editions were simply the most available, as the *Bibliothèque française* references indicate, but they may also have been the most popular. The modified title of the later editions indicates an interest in renewing the work, and the partial inclusion of the most significant interpolations might in fact further alter the meaning for potential readers. It will be important to look at the role these additional chapters played in the outlook and interpretation of the overall text and to examine how and when they were included. Based on the frequent references to Groulleau's 1554 edition, we must in any case accept that during the sixteenth and subsequent centuries, it was the most well-known and therefore the most frequently read version of the *Propos Rustiques*.

As with the *Nouvelles Recreations et Joyeux Devis*, the exploitation of a text can and does result in major changes to its very fabric. The *Propos Rustiques* and the *Baliverneries d'Eutrapel* were initially published for their status as experimental *nouveautés* and were popular for a while because of that label. Within a brief period of time, the works are re-edited several times over in a seemingly planned sequence and different interpretations of authenticity take the stage in the promotion of each edition.

Du Fail's name, or at least his pen-name, Leon Ladulfi, is not erased from the material, but used to enhance and authenticate it whenever possible. The naturally competitive system pitting legal, privileged editions against those of a thriving counterfeit industry becomes the focal point for the entire set of editions of each of these books, and the booksellers all profit from this functional dichotomy. The question of authenticity that was effectively effaced from the variant editions of the *Nouvelles Recreations* is highlighted here, in different ways, as a marketing strategy, but in each of the cases thus far examined, the idea of a "new and improved" edition seems to be the key factor for exploitation and marketing. It appears at this point, that the booksellers' primary interest is not the text, but the profit and resale potential; yet it also appears that a writer like Du Fail could at least attempt to make this mechanism work to his own authorial and literary advantage. Let us next examine the effects of the industry on the most well-known work in this study: the *Heptaméron* by Marguerite de Navarre as edited by others.

Chapter 3

Marguerite de Navarre's *Heptaméron*

Like Des Périers' *Nouvelles Recreations et Joyeux Devis*, Marguerite de Navarre's collection of tales was published posthumously, and we have no extant manuscripts in either the queen's or a known secretary's hand.¹⁵⁸ As a result, a number of similarities occur in the production of various editions of the *Heptaméron* and the *Nouvelles Recreations*. For example, variant editions of the *Heptaméron* prosper, while questions of authenticity for each edition abound.¹⁵⁹ Despite those similarities, there are also some significant differences that highlight questions pitting commercial interests against textual integrity: the literary agendas of the best known editors of the collection, notably Pierre Boaistuau and Claude Gruget, and the interesting case of those granted privilege, the booksellers who dealt directly with material production. *Libraire* Vincent Sertenas' role in the process is intriguing, and the recipients of the dedications, Marguerite, the Duchess of Nevers and Jeanne de Navarre, may have held more passive roles than previously assumed. Also, while most of the scribes remain anonymous, numerous manuscripts of the *Heptaméron* do exist, and they point to several different aspects of production, genesis and treatment of the text.¹⁶⁰ This is simply not the case with the *Nouvelles Recreations*, nor is it with Noël Du Fail's works, and so with the publication of the *Heptaméron*, we see the introduction of new variables in which book production affects the text. Ultimately, questions about the author's intended final version cannot be answered definitively, but they do lend themselves to a hypothesis in favor of profit, as we shall see.

During her lifetime, Marguerite de Navarre was a popular figure and an established author whose spiritual poetry earned her a great deal of notoriety; there could be no doubt that any new writings of hers would be eagerly received by the reading public.¹⁶¹ However, an uneasy political and religious climate prevented several of her works from seeing the light of day during the sixteenth century.¹⁶² In addition, the queen of Navarre passed away before she could ensure the publication of several of her most recently finished or as yet incomplete works.¹⁶³ The most noted of those, the *Heptaméron*, provides only seventy-two of a proposed one hundred tales, but the set-up boasts a clearly defined Boccacian structure, and the last tale included follows the established arrangement of dialogue between the tellers and the announcement of the next tale-teller; there is no question here that the author intended for there to be more.

Manuscript tradition

Despite the incomplete nature of the text, Marguerite's collection became known amongst the elite fairly quickly, although not immediately. A manuscript version of the *Heptaméron* was prepared for publication early after her death in 1549, but it was not printed until over two hundred years later, at which time it was adopted by most critics at the primary base manuscript.¹⁶⁴ Another version of the text was prepared by Adrien de Thou in 1553 (BNF fr. 1524), and was adopted by Yves Le Hir in 1967, but we must note that there are twenty extant manuscripts in all, which do not all conform to the same standards.¹⁶⁵ Based on what is available to us, we see that unlike the *Nouvelles Recreations*, the *Heptaméron* held a strong manuscript tradition.¹⁶⁶ The initial implication of such a tradition is, of course, that someone intended to publish the collection as soon

as possible, as is often thought of De Thou's manuscript,¹⁶⁷ and a lack of original manuscripts does not forcibly indicate otherwise. As we have seen, Antoine Du Moulin announced the impending publication of the *Nouvelles Recreations* in his introduction to Des Périers' *Oeuvres*, which were published very shortly after the author's death. The reasons for the long delay in publication of both collections of tales are more of a mystery than the lack of manuscripts for one of them.

In the case of the *Heptaméron*, there is evidence of numerous scenarios explaining the different manuscripts, all plausible within the manuscript tradition and the sixteenth-century world of book production. First, the manuscripts do not correspond to any one definitive version. Several of them are working copies that contain marginal notes by De Thou (BNF fr. 1515; fr. 1514; Berlin, Hamilton 425, for example); others show the tales in very different order (BNF fr. 1513). Looking at the manuscripts together allows some purview into the evolution of the text. As Sylvie Lefèvre notes in her Gallimard edition:

[e]ntre les manuscrits de travail de la reine et ceux d'Adrien de Thou, une dizaine de copies sont concernées. Et du BNF fr. 1513 au BNF fr. 1524, on peut suivre les différentes métamorphoses de l'œuvre.¹⁶⁸

between the queen's working manuscripts and those of Adrien de Thou, about ten copies are involved. And from BNF fr. 1513 to BNF fr. 1524, one can follow the different metamorphoses of the work.

These "queen's working manuscripts" consist of a series of manuscripts that, as we saw, are not written by the hand of someone we know. This is surprising, since there are fairly accurate records of Marguerite's secretaries. It is suspected, as Cazauran and Lefèvre

suggest, that the queen was working, at least part of the time, with a scribe or secretary who is unknown to us (Preface, *H* (2013), Book 1, x). But this possibility, however problematic, still cannot account for all of the working manuscripts. It is also conceivable that at Marguerite's death, some of her unfinished papers were distributed as contraband, and that some copiers worked with whatever original drafts they had available. Lefèvre's observation tells us that manuscripts of the *Heptaméron* were prepared for various reasons and by numerous people. In such an instance, it is entirely plausible that one scribe would have had access to an early draft prepared or edited by the queen, while another scribe ended up with a later working draft of the text. Additional discrepancies appear to occur due to what Cazauran and Lefèvre call "la liberté habituelle des copistes" ("the customary liberty of copyists" Book 1, lxxvi). Furthermore, several of the working drafts (BNF fr. 22018; fr. 1516-19 and fr. 1513) appear to have been completed by the same copier, but the text still varied from manuscript to manuscript. There are yet others completed on the same paper but by different scribes (BNF fr. 1511; fr. 1515 and Berlin, Hamilton 425) (Lefèvre, "Notes sur les manuscrits et les éditions anciennes de l'*Heptaméron*" 608). Understanding this to be true, some critics believe that Marguerite's collection of tales was put together in several manuscripts so they might simply be shared amongst important members of the court who were interested in either tales or Marguerite de Navarre's works. Michel Simonin, for example, believes that De Thou's manuscript edition of the collection was prepared for "une diffusion restreinte en copies manuscrites." ("a restricted diffusion of manuscript copies," in "De la Prime Fortune" 706). This belief is supported by the appearance of coats of arms on several of the better bindings and covers. The manuscript BNF fr. 1525, for example, bears the coat of arms

of Just II de Tournon, an ambassador for Charles IX, and BNF fr. 1511 and fr. 1516-19 both bear the arms of Philippe de Béthune (Salminen xv-xviii). Generally speaking, manuscripts intended for distribution were bound with much greater care and more artistically than those prepared for transfer to composite.¹⁶⁹ For example, BNF fr. 1516-19 is finished with a cover in red leather and bound in four separate volumes. Yet, the manuscript most believed to have been prepared for publication by De Thou, BNF fr. 1524 is beyond elegant in its presentation:

C'est un manuscrit de grand luxe enfermé dans une somptueuse reliure en maroquin vert à compartiments de maroquin rouge avec entrelacs d'or; au centre un cartouche représentant une vigne qui s'enroule autour d'un tronc d'arbre avec la devise: "Sin'e doppo la morte"; et, en haut, le monogramme d'Adrien de Thou. (Salminen, xx)

It is a luxurious manuscript with a sumptuous green morocco binding, with red morocco components and gold interlacing. At the center, a cartouche representing a vine coiled around the trunk of a tree with the motto "Until and after death," and above it, Adrien de Thou's monogram.

These observations further support Simonin's theory that De Thou's script was meant for diffusion rather than publication. Looking at the manuscripts as a whole then, does not necessarily affirm the belief that the text was originally intended for publication by Marguerite's initial editors.

Regardless of the various manuscript editors' intentions, the *Heptaméron* may be placed, at least in some ways, alongside the *Nouvelles Recreations* as a collection that endured a long delay before publication. While none of these scenarios excludes the

others, it is entirely plausible that Marguerite de Navarre worked with an otherwise unknown scribe, that some of her papers were in fact collected upon her death, that several manuscripts were prepared for small distribution, and that the *Heptaméron* might have been intended for print publication. However, the only proposed scenario that is certainly true is that the text was distributed to a small group of courtly admirers. If this is the case, then, the queen's collection was treated differently than that of her disreputable former secretary, because the *Nouvelles Recreations* never received the honor of a manuscript distribution. Such a theory also places the *Heptaméron* within a long-standing tradition among educated circles.

A second conclusion results from observing the manuscripts, because there was a certain amount of variability in the collection early on. Several manuscripts present the tales in different orders and contain either more or less of the final debates and currently accepted Boccacian structure. The manuscript labeled BNF fr.1513, for example, shows a different order of the tales and lacks the debate structure for which the *Heptaméron* is now known. Further, this manuscript contains only twenty-eight tales, including one that is not included in the perceived "final" editions of the manuscript collection. Lefèvre identifies this as being one of the earlier manuscripts that helps to track the development of the text as a whole ("Notes" 607). It appears that the same scribe copied this manuscript and several other versions of the collection (BNF fr.1516-1519, and fr. 22018), each of which is different and appears to be a working "edition" of the text. It is unlikely, but possible, that some of Marguerite's employees remain unknown to us. As George Hoffmann observed in his study on Montaigne, the author of the *Essais* worked with a minimum of three secretaries on his travel journal alone (*Montaigne's Career* 43).

In addition, we should also consider the often strained relationship between secretaries and their employers, as Montaigne himself had a chapter of the *Essais* stolen (43). We must question then, the very nature of several of these manuscripts,¹⁷⁰ and the Montaigne example does serve to demonstrate that many contingencies, including theft, were at least possible. Let us also remember that several manuscripts such as Berlin, Hamilton 425 were beautifully bound and were successively owned by several high-ranking officials.¹⁷¹ Amongst those “high-end” manuscripts that were owned by various officials, we see a difference in the texts themselves. The splendidly bound BNF fr.1516-19 and BNF fr. 1525, owned respectively by Philippe de Béthune and Just II, contain early or intermediary forms of the collection (Lefèvre, *Heptaméron entre manuscrits et éditions* 457-458). So, the manuscript distribution of the text did not cling to any particular draft of the collection and just as we saw flexibility in the printed text of the *Nouvelles Recreations* we see that same flexibility in the *Heptaméron*'s manuscript tradition. It would appear that the various sixteenth-century editors and scribes of the *Heptaméron* encountered many of the the same issues as the modern ones. However, much of the fluidity in the manuscripts of the *Heptaméron* is likely more related to the lack of a definitive finished draft than to profit-driven motives since the manuscripts were not for sale per se.

It is also rare to find so many working manuscripts of a given text. Most often, such manuscripts were destroyed once the book was printed. In the case of the *Heptaméron*, two reasons for their existence and survival in such large quantity seem plausible. First, there was a fairly long delay between the author's death in 1549 and the first printing of the book in 1558, and neither Boaistuau's nor Gruget's editions entirely

match any of these manuscripts. So, while these editors likely had access to at least one of the manuscript editions, our extant copies were not necessarily their working drafts. Boaistuau was known for a more radical editorial policy, as we will see. In his case, he might have worked from one of the more advanced manuscripts and simply changed the text to suit his own needs.¹⁷² There is also the possibility that someone else was hoping to expand the book's availability and prepare it for publication, thereby saving a draft or two of the text. In addition, Marguerite de Navarre had become an evocative personality, not only in France, but in Europe as a whole, and several people likely saved whatever drafts they had of the text for either posterity or profit. The fact that there were numerous working drafts initially is not surprising; an author would have had to rework such a collection in multiple drafts. Also, when it came to printing the book after Marguerite's death, there were several different *libraires* involved in the same various editions. We do not know exactly how many people intended to publish the book, and only Adrien de Thou's name is left to us as an unprinted editor, if that is what he intended: sixteenth-century scribes satisfied several needs in the sixteenth century for which official "editors" were not needed. It was not uncommon to have manuscripts prepared for printing by professional scribes to ensure that the printer received a legible copy of the text, but this practice did not preclude spelling changes such as those found in several of the extant manuscripts of the *Heptaméron*.¹⁷³ Regardless, none of the manuscripts, professionally prepared or otherwise, proposes a collection that could be called "complete" with one hundred tales, and we have at most only seventy-two tales within the expanded Boccacian framework for which the *Heptaméron* is so well known. Ultimately, the large number of extant manuscripts of the *Heptaméron* suggests several things: the text as we

know it today went through several major overhauls, there was a limited but prestigious distribution in the manuscript tradition, and several people might have been working on getting the text printed during the sixteenth century.

Printed formats

Because Marguerite de Navarre's collection has ties to both the manuscript tradition and the newly evolving print industry, it behooves us now to look at one of the primary connections between the two: format. The manuscript tradition did not simply die out with the invention of the printing press and the growth of the book industry. In fact, manuscripts became, to some extent, even more reputed because they were necessarily produced on a smaller scale and inherently more valuable. The prestige of manuscripts spilled over into the types of books that were printed, because the most valuable books were prepared in larger formats, in-folio being the largest and least commonly used.¹⁷⁴ This tradition's continued influence over the sixteenth-century print industry allows us to infer a *maître-libraire*'s marketing intentions for many of our given texts. Generally, in-quarto was considered an elegant format that was more affordable than in-folio and still resembled traditional manuscripts. During the course of the century, smaller formats such as the in-16 became standard for portable, less expensive, mass-market editions such as the Estienne Groulleau's 1549 editions of the *Propos Rustiques* and *Baliverneries d'Eutrapel*. By the mid-century, however, the in-octavo became something of a standard for good-quality editions that were still relatively portable, though somewhat more valuable than their in-16 and in-32 counterparts. Noting the format of a printed edition, then, could give the modern observer a good idea of the

bookseller's intentions for a particular printing of a text. In the case of the *Heptaméron* and the *Nouvelles Recreations*, all of the early editions were published in-quarto. As such, the editions bordered on being what one could call "library books", as Henri-Jean Martin notes:

Dressés dans l'intention d'évaluer une fortune, les documents examinés tendent à privilégier les "livres de bibliothèque", de grand format, qu'on se transmettait de génération en génération, tandis que les petits volumes, témoins des modes et des centres d'intérêt les plus actuels des lecteurs, sont le plus souvent mentionnés par paquets. ("Culture écrite et culture orale, culture savante et culture populaire dans la France d'Ancien Régime." 225)

Prepared with the intention of evaluating a fortune, the documents we have examined tend to favor large format "library books," of the sort that one passed down from generation to generation, whereas the smaller volumes, which attest to trends and to the readers' most current interests, are often listed in clusters.

Such documentation, of course, supports the idea that books printed to look like manuscripts were given a higher status than the afore-mentioned mass-market style books. However, none of the texts in question were printed in-folio, an indication that the booksellers intended to reach a larger readership than a standard manuscript distribution would have allowed. The manuscript distribution of the *Heptaméron* would of course play a role in the formatting decisions for the text, but the other collections of tales do not have such a presence. Even the 1547 edition of Du Fail's *Propos Rustiques* was in-

octavo, which would again create an appeal for the larger reading public and simultaneously afford a slightly higher price.¹⁷⁵ Later editions of the *Nouvelles Recreations* ranged in format from the 1561 Rouillé in-quarto format to the Galliot du Pré in-16 variants and everything in between.¹⁷⁶ The earliest presentations were then typically in the more prestigious formats and this is certainly the case with Marguerite de Navarre's collection of tales.

The apparent earlier manuscript tradition of the *Heptaméron* enabled the text to earn a prestige not allotted to many other collections of tales printed during the same period, but that does not mean that books of this genre were immediately considered invaluable popular literature. There was a profit to be made: the in-quarto was undoubtedly more prestigious, but it was also costly, and it was much more common during that period to produce an in-octavo first edition before shifting to the in-16. An initial review of texts from that period would indicate that the in-octavo was so common for a first edition that it lacked prestige altogether. However, even Marguerite de Navarre's *Marguerites de la Marguerite des princesses* (1549) edited by Jean de la Haye and published by Jean de Tournes during the queen's lifetime was printed in-octavo and was considered by many to be a luxury edition (Salminen xxxvii). In fact, most of the works published during her lifetime were printed in-octavo.¹⁷⁷ Only the *Dialogue en forme de vision nocturne* appears to have been printed in-quarto like the *Heptaméron*. Interestingly, the Gruget version of the *Heptaméron* was reprinted in-quarto in 1560 under the auspices of the Sertenas, Robinot, Caveiller and Benoist group. Of the collections of tales observed here, only the *Heptaméron*, the *Nouvelles Recreations* and the *Discours non plus melancoliques que divers* could boast of in-quarto editions. All of

these, we may add, were by the best-known authors: Marguerite de Navarre and Bonaventure Des Périers, whose name, while somewhat infamous for having authored the *Cymbalum mundi*, appears in anthologies of sixteenth-century poetry for years to come; as for the *Discours*, Des Périers' and Jacques Peletier's names have been attached to the them since their inception, though the text was published anonymously. This would indicate that a level of prestige was attributed to the authors themselves, which was then extended to their books. Noël Du Fail's work became incredibly popular, but at the time of publication, as we saw in the previous chapter, he was a relative unknown. Yet, his work and other collections of tales, such as the *Contes du monde aventureux*, were not automatically put into an in-16 format. Most began in-octavo as less prestigious but still respectable books. So, the overall range of formats for all of these collections tells us something else: the fact that these texts were originally printed in-quarto or in-octavo contradicts assumptions about the genre's respectability during the period.¹⁷⁸ Thus, not only were these books popular, as the many editions of numerous collections tend to prove, but there was a public interested in spending more on better quality productions of tales.

Despite evidence that first editions of many collections including the *Heptaméron* were typically published in either in-quarto or in-octavo formats, any conclusions derived from this knowledge must also be tempered with a look at later editions. Many subsequent editions were printed in smaller formats such as in-12 and especially in-16. Twenty of the known twenty-five editions of the *Nouvelles Recreations* were published in these two formats, as were fifteen editions of the *Heptaméron*.¹⁷⁹ The 1547 in-octavo edition of Noël Du Fail's *Propos Rustiques* stands out among the early editions of his

tales, which were printed almost exclusively in-12 and in-16. We do not, unfortunately, have an extant first edition of the *Baliverneries d'Eutrapel* (1548) from its Lyon publisher, but we can observe that the three subsequent editions were printed in-16 and this case is repeated with the *Contes du monde aventureux* by A.D.S.D. Only the first edition is typically given an in-quarto or an in-octavo format. After that, the collections are put into more portable and less expensive formats. This approach to multiple editions does not seem unique to collections of tales and there are many examples of the same pattern throughout the period. The 1552, 1554 and 1558 editions of Marguerite de Navarre's *Marguerites de la Marguerite des princesses* were all in-16. The 1554, 1558 and 1561 editions of Bonaventure Des Périers' *Deploration de Vénus* were also in-16. Here, even though Jean de Tournes printed the first three editions (1545, 1547, 1548) in-octavo, he shifted to the in-16 format in 1558, perhaps to compete with Salenson's 1554 edition. Re-editions of Claude Gruget's 1554 translation of the *Diverses leçons de Pierre Messie* (1557, 1569) were also printed in-16, though a deluxe two-volume edition was printed in-octavo in 1592. In this instance, a twenty-three year span between editions seems to have earned the text an introduction to a new generation of erudite buyers.¹⁸⁰

The overall pattern of issuing a nicer first edition before a less expensive subsequent edition works, to a large extent, in favor of the *maître-libraire* because he would first exploit the buyers interested in so-called "library books" before expanding to the larger public looking for portable, inexpensive editions.¹⁸¹ Again, profit motives seem to drive the format of a book and generic considerations do not appear to dictate the profitability of a given text.¹⁸² Buyers and therefore publishing houses were most willing to spend a

little more on texts by familiar authors, and there was a large market of buyers who were simply interested in collections of tales for enjoyment.

Boaistuau's edition

Perhaps one of the most sought-after collections was the one by Marguerite de Navarre. In its earliest manifestation as a book, two major editions of the *Heptaméron* were printed. The first version was released in 1558 and was edited by Pierre Boaistuau, an increasingly well-received scientist and author (he was particularly interested in the natural sciences and alchemy).¹⁸³ The second followed suit almost immediately in 1559 and was edited by Claude Gruget, with the support of Marguerite de Navarre's daughter, Jeanne de Navarre. The Gruget edition overtook that of Boaistuau upon its release, partly because of its auspicious backer, and was the premier model for subsequent printed editions until Leroux de Lincy's 1853-1854 publication using BNF manuscript fr. 1512.¹⁸⁴ This publishing history is significantly different from that of the *Nouvelles Recreations*, because the editor is given full credit in each case and offers an introduction in which he puts forth his own intentions.¹⁸⁵ Thus, the reader has an additional layer to consider in his reading that is defined by the framework of the editors' own publishing histories. We know for a fact that both editions of the *Heptaméron* featured numerous deletions, additions and reordering, and even documentable flaws. In both cases, many of the flaws we see in these editions are the fault of the editors, rather than of the author herself.¹⁸⁶ Sometimes, however, the flaws are tied to the incomplete nature of the text (Cazauran and Lefèvre, Preface, *H* (2013), Book 1, xvi-xix). Both editors claimed to improve the text in their own ways, and we can judge the nature of those improvements

by comparing their products. Also, the combined presence of numerous extant manuscripts gives us additional material from whence to draw our conclusions about both editions. Now we can at least be reasonably sure where the two editors imposed their will upon the original text, most significantly perhaps in terms of deletions.¹⁸⁷ Also unlike the *Nouvelles Recreations*, no subsequent editions with additional tales were ever published; in each edition, the collection remains unfinished. So, while several tales were eliminated, even replaced, it can be said that the text was afforded enough respect, at least superficially, to discourage explicit corruption of this collection. On the other hand, the two premier editions did contain some significant differences, including the replacement of a couple of tales in each with selections by the editor. Boaistuau's suppressions were more obvious and extreme, and as a result his respect for the author's work was questioned. There is also a reordering of the tales, a question which will become significant later on, and we must note that the Boaistuau edition was quickly supplanted,¹⁸⁸ at least in so far as its redistribution in later editions is concerned. According to Annie Charon-Parent and William Kemp, the eight surviving copies suggest that this edition might have enjoyed "une certaine diffusion" ("a certain diffusion" "L'Histoire des premières éditions," cli) before being suppressed by Gruget's more popular version. The ultimate fate of Boaistuau's edition further suggests that Marguerite de Navarre's work was granted ample respect among contemporaries, and we must therefore examine the circumstances surrounding the publication of this edition to understand the nature of its treatment.

Pierre Boaistuau titled his edition of the work *Histoires des Amans Fortunez, dediees a Madame Marguerite de Bourbon, duchesse de Nivernois*; he did not directly

mention Marguerite de Navarre on either the title page or in his introduction to the text. The anonymous presentation of the collection brings up questions of ethics and legality and will have ramifications on Boaistuau as the editor, on Vincent Sertenas and the group as publishers, and certainly on the collection as a whole. There are several reasons for which Boaistuau might not have directly mentioned Marguerite de Navarre's name, but for centuries this will become one of the most criticized points of his edition. The book was printed under his name as editor, though his name is also absent on the title page. Even though the author is never officially named, everyone at the time was well aware that it was in fact one of Marguerite de Navarre's unfinished works, and Boaistuau makes the author's identity obvious in his dedication to Marguerite de Bourbon. He indicates that the author was a highly ranked woman with deep religious conviction who was a "miracle of nature," a phrase used by Charles de Sainte-Marthe in his well-known published eulogy of the queen.¹⁸⁹ Also, the manuscript distribution had already given the collection some publicity throughout the court. Finally, those who were close to the queen were aware of the various texts she had been working on. It is suspected that she and Bandello discussed tales during their stays in Brassens, she as a guest of the Comtesse and he as a protected author and secretary. Brantôme suggests in his *Dames galantes* that Marguerite de Navarre did a great deal of writing while traveling; his basis for support is hearsay from his grandmother and mother, who were both ladies-in-waiting to the queen.¹⁹⁰ So, despite the formal anonymity of the *Histoires des Amans Fortunez*, the book was not, in fact, considered anonymous.

Evidence of a rhetorical strategy begins to develop, but the legal and ethical implications of such a strategy are not easy to figure out. In the presentation, only

Boaistuau is named as editor; yet, as we noted, his name does not appear on the title page, where only the bookseller Gilles Gilles is mentioned. It is only in the superscription of the long dedicatory epistle to the Duchess of Nevers that the name “Boaistuau” is finally given.¹⁹¹ First, he identifies the Duchess of Nevers with all of her titles. Then, he identifies himself as her servant: “Pierre Boaistuau, surnommé Launay treshumble salut, & perpetuelle obeissance” (f. iv r^o). Finally, he moves into the body of the epistle, where he refers at great length to the author’s literary and moral merits, but makes no further mention here of his own role.¹⁹² Specific references to himself as an editor remain limited and formulaic; they also happen to correspond with the crypted yet obvious references to the actual author. In this way, the anonymity of the text does appear to be a rhetorical strategy, rather than a question of legality or even, perhaps, a lack of respect for the author.

This is the background against which, in the subsequent and very brief letter to the reader, Boaistuau explains that he was first asked, when the work was presented to him, to clean up and edit “dix huit ou vingt histoires des plus notables” (“eighteen or twenty tales among the most noteworthy” f. x r^o), and then was urged to include more, then more still, which he had to do lest he would appear disobedient, “desobeissant.” Hence his famous declaration that “il [lui] auroit esté moins penible de bastir l’oeuvre tout de neuf, que de l’avoir tronqué en plusieurs endroits, changé, innové, adjousté, et supprimé en d’autres, ayant esté quasi contraint luy donner nouvelle forme” (“it would have been less difficult to build the work entirely from scratch than to have truncated it in several places, changed, altered, augmented, and deleted in others, having thus been almost forced to give it a new form”). Confronted with such disclaimers, an informed

reader of the time might have wondered if the editor had not choice in the matter, or if this was only an example of the rhetorical games for which he was widely known.¹⁹³

Boaistuau knew, in any case, that readers would understand who the author was and much of what he does in the book's introductory sections is typical of the period. In this way, then, Boaistuau treated the text much as he did any other work he was writing or editing. In legal terms, the text was posthumous and had never been printed; it was then fair game for the market, and privilege was assigned to the bookseller, making him responsible for marketing strategies. However, editor and *libraire* technically broke the law by not explicitly naming the author on the title page, according to a 1551 declaration.¹⁹⁴ The loop-hole that allowed them to escape any direct legal consequences is contained primarily in the privilege, assigned to Vincent Sertenas, in which the bookseller is credited with having “recouvert un livre non encores imprimé, intitulé les histoires des amans fortunez” (“uncovered an as yet unpublished book, titled *Stories of Fortunate Lovers*”¹⁹⁵ f. iii v^o).¹⁹⁶ This is a new title that does not appear in any of the manuscripts, which were mostly untitled; since the book had not yet been published, the bookseller maintained his right to publish based on possession and obtention of privilege. Let us not forget that authors and, typically, editors held few legal rights to their texts and that when authors passed away, new editions of their works could be considered fair game in the market.¹⁹⁷ Furthermore, Boaistuau's insistence on the dramatic nature of the changes enacted to the text would have provided additional protections for him, and specifically, the bookseller, but the author's name is clearly left absent by choice. Ethically, this anonymity becomes something of a wink and a nod to the reader. In this case, however, the editor may have underestimated the public's esteem for the famous

mécène and princess. In any case, Boaistuau's personal publication history and commentary offers additional light into the *raison d'être* of this particular edition of Marguerite de Navarre's unfinished *Heptaméron*.

Two very startling facts stand out in this respect. First is the remarkable variety in the texts he published – Boaistuau acted as an author, an editor and a translator, yet everything printed under his name bore his unique influence. Second, Boaistuau's career was very short-lived and he furiously published a series of books, most of which were highly successful, from 1556 to 1560. He was so successful, in fact, that he was received in England by Queen Elizabeth herself, to whom Boaistuau was able to present three texts, an illuminated manuscript edition of the as yet unpublished *Histoires Prodigieuses* among them.¹⁹⁸ Beyond this period, however, we have no record of his life until his death during the summer of 1566.¹⁹⁹ Ten years earlier, in 1556, Pierre Boaistuau had begun his brief but brilliant literary career with the supposed translation of *L'Histoire de Chelidonium Tigurinus*, also known as the *Institution des Princes Chrestiens*, dedicated to the Duke of Nevers. The book was very well received and the Boaistuau/Sertenas collaboration began on a high note.²⁰⁰ While working on a translation of St. Augustine's *De civitate Dei*, which was ultimately neither finished nor published, he prepared several other texts for publication:

Chez Sertenas, 1558 est en quelque sorte l'année Boaistuau avec le *Théâtre du Monde*, le *Bref Discours de l'excellence de l'homme*, et sous le titre d'*Histoires des Amans fortunés*, son édition des nouvelles de Marguerite de Navarre. (Simonin, "Peut-on parler de politique éditoriale au XVIe siècle?" 772)

At Sertenas' boutique, 1558 is, as it were, the year of Boaistuau with the *Théâtre du Monde*, the *Bref Discours de l'excellence de l'homme*, and under the title of *Histoires des Amans fortunés*, his edition of the tales of Marguerite de Navarre.²⁰¹

It is significant for any *libraire* to print three books in one year by the same editor/author and the collaboration between the two men truly comes to the fore here.²⁰² In 1559, Boaistuau put his name on the first translation of the *Histoires Tragiques*, containing only six of Mateo Bandello's tales,²⁰³ and a new edition of his *Chelidonium*.²⁰⁴ Finally, the *Histoires Prodigieuses* were published shortly after Boaistuau's trip to England in 1560, and his meteoric career came to an end. The *Histoires des Amans Fortunez*, to put it mildly, were not as well received as his other works, but if we look at his overall production, we see that he was extraordinarily prolific during this time as a compiler and editor and that he had a habit of working on numerous texts simultaneously. Marguerite de Navarre's collection of tales takes its place as one amongst many in this context, and it is not surprising that Boaistuau would have treated this text much as he did any other.

The author of the *Théâtre du Monde* bowdlerized each of the texts he treated in some way or another, but the *Histoires des Amans Fortunez* stand out because obvious mistakes were made in the process. First, however, a couple of examples will help to illustrate similarities in Boaistuau's editorial approach to this text and others. In his role as editor, Boaistuau claims the *Chelidonium* is a translation of an ancient text, but we know that the so-called "Chelidonium Tigurinus" is a fictitious figure, and Henry Tudor has shown that the work did translate and adapt parts of Josse Clichtove's *De regis officio opusculum*, to which Boaistuau added a large amount of material, borrowed from other

sources or created by himself.²⁰⁵ The *Histoires Tragiques* contain only six of almost two hundred potential tales and the “translations” bear some significant differences from the original Italian version.²⁰⁶ In addition, the selections are taken from both volumes of Bandello’s work and are not in their original order.²⁰⁷ The *Théâtre du Monde* and the *Histoires Prodigieuses* assembled a wide variety of borrowed elements ranging from scientific and alchemical studies to Ancient mythologies, from chronicles and scientific inquiries to Biblical references. The *Histoires des Amans Fortunez* is therefore a perfect example of Boaistuau’s work in that it is laden with changes, adjustments and deletions of the editor’s choosing.

Several significant alterations immediately distinguish this edition from the manuscripts available to us. First, Boaistuau includes only sixty-seven tales; they are not arranged in an order than we find in any of the known manuscripts, and they omit the rigorous time structure that allotted ten tales per day in the original, although, as Nicole Cazauran points out, traces of it remain.²⁰⁸ He suppresses tales 44, 46, 63, 66 and 72 and he reorders the tales so that, for example, tales 14 to 24 become tales 6 to 16, tales 33 to 36 are now 20 to 23 and 41 to 45 become 26 to 29. Cazauran notes Boaistuau’s apparent indifference to thematic couplings as well, such as 37-38 which become 47 and 24, respectively, and 60-61 which are 53 and 34 under Boaistuau’s reordering (“Boaistuau et Gruget éditeurs de *L’Heptaméron*” 154-155).²⁰⁹ None of this is surprising in and of itself, but the problem is that these changes are often made without deference to the content or logic of the debates or to the cast of *devisants*. Cazauran notes several examples where one storyteller gives voice to another, only to have a third recount the tale, since Boaistuau neglects to adjust the text according to his new order (155). As a result, many

of the changes he makes become awkward and perturb the flow of the narrative when read carefully.

It is important to realize, however, that this kind of oversight, which contradicts the role of “correcteur” Boaistuau assigns himself in the letter to the readers, is not typical of his work as evidenced by the subtle but significant changes made in the *Histoires Tragiques* and in the thematic development of the *Histoires Prodigieuses* and especially the *Théâtre du Monde*. We must then respect that this edition was hastily prepared, and there are two reasons for which Boaistuau might have rushed. First, we have seen that he was rather prolific during this period and he might very well have been distracted by several other projects. The *Histoires des Amans Fortunez* might not have been his primary interest and may have served more as a source of income than as a source of inspiration. The second possible reason is that Sertenas and others simply gave Boaistuau a publication deadline, while shifting their expectations throughout his manuscript preparation. Gruget’s edition arrived on the shelves shortly after Boaistuau’s and the parties involved were all well aware of these rival editions. Further evidence will bolster the likelihood that both scenarios contributed to the publication’s timing and content.

From a legal standpoint, the Boaistuau edition was granted a privilege dated 31 August 1558 to renowned *maître-libraire* Vincent Sertenas. At the same time, Boaistuau and Sertenas were taking a chance because this was no ordinary author’s work. Ernest Courbet suggests that the privilege was granted without the explicit understanding that Marguerite de Navarre was the original author (“Jeanne d’Albret et *L’Heptaméron*” 282). Of course, this suggestion assumes that Sertenas and Boaistuau were aware of the

potential criticisms directed at anyone editing the queen's work, and I would concede that likely. On the other hand, while Boaistuau's editing strategies tended toward the drastic, they were not exceptional in the sixteenth-century. In addition, Courbet's suggestion could only be true had the officer signing off on the privilege not read the dedication and introduction. The privilege excerpt itself does not name Marguerite de Navarre as the author; nor is Boaistuau named for that matter. Regardless of the manner in which privilege was obtained, Vincent Sertenas, the bookseller and owner of the privilege, was the sole person authorized to benefit directly from such a printing. Boaistuau's economic profits are unclear, but editors like him frequently suffered the same fate as authors, and "[I]orsque le libraire a pris possession du manuscrit, l'auteur n'a plus aucun droit" ("once the bookseller has taken possession of a manuscript, the author no longer has any right" Charon-Parent *Les métiers du livre à Paris* 113). It is unlikely that Boaistuau earned nothing for his efforts, since he published frequently during this period, but in the mid-1500s the *libraire* tended to be the largest shareholder in the profits.

Cazauran suggests that Sertenas himself might have funded Boaistuau's production of the *Histoires des Amans Fortunez* instead of the Duchess of Nevers:

En éditant les nouvelles de Marguerite de Navarre, Boaistuau et Gruget ont tous deux, à coup sûr, travaillé sur commande, que ce soit à l'invitation de leurs dédicataires ou, ce qui est plus plausible, à celle des libraires. ("Boaistuau et Gruget" 150).

By editing the tales of Marguerite de Navarre, Boaistuau and Gruget most certainly both worked under contract, whether it was initiated by the dedicatees or, more plausibly, by the booksellers.

Cazauban suspects that booksellers were especially eager to ensure an edition of this text. This eagerness suggests in turn that booksellers played an important role in deciphering the tastes of the buyers' market and supports the ideas that anything written by Marguerite de Navarre and tales in general were desirable commodities.²¹⁰ Such a hypothesis is further supported by the relatively expensive and elegant in-quarto format of the Boaistuau and Gruget editions; the wording of the privilege of the *Histoires des Amans Fortunez* also indicates Sertenas' role in the process:

Nostre bien aimé Vincent Sertenas nous a fait remonstrer qu'à grands frais, il a recouvré un livre non encores imprimé, intitulé les histoires des amans fortunez, lesquelles pour estre utiles, agreables, & de grande recreacion aux lecteurs, il feroit volontiers imprimer & exposer en vente ce qu'il nous a treshumblement fait supplier lui octroyer & permettre. (f. iii v^o)

Our beloved Vincent Sertenas demonstrated that at great cost he recovered an as yet unpublished book, titled the *Histoires des Amans Fortunez*, which, because they are useful, pleasant and greatly entertaining to readers, he would gladly print and present for sale, which he very humbly beseeched us to grant and permit.

This phrasing is rather typical for the period, but it is also reflective of the bookseller's role in the finding, producing and financing of books.²¹¹ There is no way to know for certain the exact nature of the "grands frais" to which the privilege refers, as the cost of obtaining the privilege and the intention of paying for paper and printing was typically

sufficient to account for this term.²¹² It is clear, however, that Sertenas' role in the publication of the *Histoires des Amans Fortunez* was uniquely important.

Certain material aspects of the published collection give clues as to the intended purpose of the *Histoires des Amans Fortunez* as well. The physical production would not have been Boaistuau's, but the *libraire's* responsibility, and it seems that Sertenas and others were banking on the popularity of the author to make their edition profitable. The books were published in-quarto and without illustrations, other than the engraved first letter of each new day's prologue or tale. The bindings were well-fitted and of high quality but were not overly ornate. The only embossing present is on the spine and the front and back covers are plain, in contrast to some of the most striking editions printed at the time.²¹³ They were therefore somewhat affordable and without any of the ostentatious trappings one would expect in a dedicatory copy.²¹⁴ It appears that the title was adopted by Boaistuau himself, since none of the manuscripts bear this name.²¹⁵ Sertenas was a well-known and highly reputed *libraire* from Paris who worked frequently with Boaistuau, but it is Gilles Gilles, another bookseller from Paris, who is named on the title page of the BNF's extant copy. Other copies list Gilles Robinot and Jean Caveiller as the booksellers on the title pages (Simonin "De la Prime fortune éditoriale des nouvelles de Marguerite de Navarre" 711).²¹⁶ This means that Sertenas, the owner of the privilege, shared the "grands frais" of publication with a group of other well-known *marchands-libraires* and that he was not the only one gambling on its success. This group of book dealers was known for quality work and the text they present is a clean, highly legible edition with fairly wide margins. The ample margins and the dimensions of the book indicate that while this may not have been a *livre de bibliothèque*, or a library collectible

(which is also suggested by the lack of illustrations), it was certainly not intended as a portable version. In short, this edition of the *Histoires des Amans Fortunez* was meant to be read and enjoyed at home. Because of the reasonably high quality of the edition, one may conclude that Sertenas and his *libraire* collaborators were expecting a particularly good reception for the collection.

The Sertenas group, however, included neither editors nor writers, and the booksellers obviously needed someone else to handle that side of the production process. In addition, they were financially gambling by publishing a text by a popular yet controversial author, in a popular yet disrespected genre, and would need someone who was somewhat respectable to complete the task. Given that Sertenas was already working with Boaistuau on several projects, the reason for his choice seems clear enough. Still, while Sertenas evidently had the largest financial stake in the production process, he may not have provided the impetus for publication. He was not Boaistuau's only employer at the time, because the successful, hyperactive editor was also being supported by the Duke of Nevers, thereby linking him to the Duchess of Nevers, Marguerite de Navarre's niece, which makes his dedication to her unsurprising. It is therefore possible that the Duchess commissioned Boaistuau who then obtained Sertenas' involvement as *libraire*. While I do not wish to discount this possibility, other factors lead me to believe that Sertenas was in fact the driving force behind this edition, and that his selection of Boaistuau was more deliberate and calculated than previous critics would suggest.

The fact that Boaistuau made a number of untypical and sloppy errors when reordering the tales, indicating haste, also suggests that the writer was not leading this project, and that we may therefore take the above-mentioned disclaimers somewhat

seriously. The hypothesis that he was, instead, commissioned by the bookseller to complete this work as quickly as possible is further supported by complaints about his “labour precipité” in his letter to the reader: “que lors que cest oeuvre me fut presenté pour luy servir d’esponge [. . .] je fus sollicité avec tres instantes requestes de poursuivre ma pointe” (“that when this work was presented to me so that I serve as its sponge and clean it up of an infinity of obvious errors [. . .] I was very urgently solicited to pursue my effort” f. x r^o). Who would have made such a publication a matter of urgency? The Duchess of Nevers, to whom Boaistuau dedicated the collection, would have had to pay a sizable sum to push her own agenda through the very busy Sertenas group. As we will see, Sertenas’ involvement with the Gruget edition also supports the theory that Boaistuau worked at the *libraire*’s behest. Finally, this type of financial gamble was not new to Sertenas, who contracted in 1540 with Nicolas Herberay des Essarts on the first few books of the *Amadis de Gaule* cycle.²¹⁷ Of course, the result was an enormously successful franchise that filled the coffers for nearly two decades. Sertenas, therefore, demonstrates a proclivity for testing the tastes of his buyers, which would not preclude experimental editions. We can conclude that the editor was most likely paid by Sertenas, with whom he was already working, to prepare this edition of the text and that he was motivated at least in part by his own financial interest. However, while Sertenas would maintain the legal rights and responsibilities for this edition, it was Boaistuau who ultimately ended up being held morally responsible for its failings in the ensuing fallout.

Gruget's edition

It is likely that the *Histoires des Amans Fortunez*, at least initially, proved popular with the reading public, since it was, for a short while at the moment of its appearance, the only edition of Marguerite de Navarre's collection available. This success turned sour in a matter of a few months, however, when Claude Gruget's edition was released under the title of the *Heptaméron des Nouvelles*.²¹⁸ Several enigmas surround the publication of this second edition, not the least of which is the precise timing of the text's release and its relationship to Boaistuau's *Histoires des Amans Fortunez*. However, the great success of Gruget's work on the *Heptaméron* and the criticism Boaistuau had to withstand as a result are unquestionable. La Croix du Maine's comments later in the century, for example, clearly indicate the bibliographer's preference for Gruget's version when he writes under Boaistuau's heading: "les Amants fortunés, autrement intitulé l'Heptameron de la Royne de Navarre, lequel a été remis en son entier par Claude Gruget Parisien, comme nous avons dit ci-dessus" ("*Les Amants Fortunez*, otherwise titled the *Heptaméron of the Queen of Navarre*, which was wholly restored by Claude Gruget of Paris, as we stated above" vol. 2, 255-256). In fact, all of La Croix du Maine's references to the Marguerite de Navarre work underline his preference.²¹⁹ Furthermore, Boaistuau's edition would not be reprinted, while Gruget's version dominates until well into the nineteenth century.²²⁰ No fewer than thirteen further printings and/or editions of the Gruget text would be printed in the sixteenth century, of which at least two, appearing in 1559 and 1560, were counterfeit.²²¹

By contrast, few copies of the *Histoires des Amans Fortunez* remain extant, and Michel Simonin suspects that the *libraires* went as far as destroying any remaining

unsold copies (“De la Prime fortune” 712), although, as we saw, Charon-Parent and Kemp disagree with his assessment; regardless, the text has not since been reprinted. Thus, Boaistuau’s edition was quickly replaced, and the Nevers quickly distanced themselves from his notoriety. There is evidence that Boaistuau was dismissed from their service shortly after the scandal and later editions of his *Chelidonium* are no longer dedicated to the duke (Carr *Pierre Boaistuau’s Histoires Tragiques* 22-23). Boaistuau’s dishonor was not complete, though. Vincent Sertenas continued to publish his works and the *Histoires Tragiques* (1559) and the *Histoires Prodigieuses* (1560) would both be very well received. Re-editions of Boaistuau’s *Chelidonium* would likewise be successfully published. In addition, Sertenas himself would continue to play an important role in the publication history of Marguerite de Navarre’s collection. It is clear that involvement with the *Histoires des Amans Fortunez* was not cause for marginalization, let alone dismissal from the profession, though it certainly led to criticism.

Perhaps one of the most important elements in the *Heptaméron des nouvelles*’ reception is that Gruget’s edition is often perceived, during the sixteenth and subsequent centuries, as *the* approved version of a text,²²² which in fact lacks one and, as Donald Stone has argued, is virtually impossible to establish.²²³ This perception is played out in Gruget’s dedication, and it becomes an important overall sales strategy. Gruget reminds the reader that Marguerite de Navarre’s daughter ranks higher than her niece in power and relationship, and gives the impression that this re-edition was prepared to satisfy the new queen. While Jeanne de Navarre’s printed letters give no direct evidence to support this, Gruget himself paints just such a picture in his often-cited dedication to the young Queen of Navarre:

Je ne me fusse ingeré ma dame, vous presenter ce livre des nouvelles de la feuë Royne vostre mere, si la premiere edition n'eust obmis ou celé son nom, & quasi changé toute sa forme, tellement que plusieurs le mesconnoissoient: Cause, que pour le rendre digne de son auteur, aussi tost qu'il fut divulgué, je receuilly de toutes parts les exemplaires, que j'en peu recouvrer, escrits à la main, les verifiant sur ma copie: & feis en forte, que je le reduysy au vrai ordre qu'elle l'avoit dressé. Puis sous la permission du Roy, & vostre consentement, il a esté mis sur la presse, pour le publier telle qu'il doit estre. f. iii r^o 224

I would not have presumed, my Lady, to present you with this book of the late Queen your mother's collection of tales, if the first edition had not omitted or concealed her name, and changed its form almost entirely, so much so that many did not recognize it. Because of which, in order to make it worthy of its author, as soon as it came to light, I collected all the hand-written copies I could find from all over, verifying them against my own copy, and worked to restore the text to the true order in which it had been composed. Then, with the King's permission and your consent, it has been put to press for publication as it should be.

Gruget's dedication does not indicate that Jeanne de Navarre ordered the re-edition, but it does explicitly cite her "consentement," while blasting Boaistuau's rendering of the tales, and yet echoing Boaistuau's own words by claiming to give them a "new form". Gruget later comments that the previous edition "displeased the queen," and this statement has been taken by some critics as evidence that Jeanne herself ordered the re-edition and

sought vindication for her mother's work against Boaistuau.²²⁵ However, Jeanne's approval is not the only key element in this dedication, as Cazauran would point out centuries later, for Gruget is carefully presenting himself as a detail-oriented editor, faithful to the original text ("Boaistuau et Gruget" 161). Gruget carefully constructs the idea that his is a superior edition by the choice of expression used in various printings. The perception that Marguerite de Navarre's daughter approved of the text becomes more important than the reality, and we see the booksellers preying on that perception on the front page in which the title reads: *L'Heptameron des nouvelles de tresillustre et tres excellente princesse, Marguerite de Valois, Royne de Navarre, Remis en son vray ordre, confus auparavant en sa premiere impression: & dediee a tresillustre & tres vertueuse Princesse Jeanne, Royne de Navarre, par Claude Gruget Parisien* (emphasis mine). The connection between the dedication's recipient and the collection's author, both of whom served as "Royne de Navarre" is highlighted by repetition. The support of Marguerite's daughter could not be more explicitly suggested.

The nineteenth-century replacement of Gruget's text by various manuscripts, especially that of Adrien de Thou (BNF 1524), occurs for several reasons, but the question of Jeanne de Navarre's role was never one of them. We must keep in mind that the only formal evidence we have for Jeanne's approval of the text is that it was never repudiated. It is likely, then, that she did in fact approve of the text, for subsequent editions would not have continued to be dedicated to her were there a legal issue. Furthermore, while she was the Queen of Navarre, a small principality in the southwestern region of the country, Jeanne remained in negotiations with the Valois family, her cousins, throughout the remainder of her life.²²⁶ However, the assumption that she

was actively involved in the production of the Gruget variant presumes a great deal about her motives and availability. Jeanne was in Paris during the winter of 1558-1559, but she was, in many ways, otherwise occupied. First, she came to court to attend the marriage of Mary Stuart and Francis II, and she gave birth to her daughter Catherine that winter. Second, Jeanne's position at the court was at risk. Jean Calvin was openly courting her and her husband, Antoine de Bourbon, for the Protestant cause. While both remained officially Catholic at the time, they had attended Reformed services before and after this stay in Paris, and Antoine's continued aspirations for a larger monarchy led him to be played by both Henri II and Spain's Philip II during that same period.²²⁷ Jeanne's presence at the court was an important means of securing her position with the French; because she was openly Catholic and had agreed to uphold the king's 1552 ordinance against heresy when she became Queen of Navarre in 1555, she had managed to maintain some level of support from her cousins.²²⁸ Thus, Jeanne had sufficient status, however precarious, within the French court that continued and repeated printings in her name without her approval were not likely. An argument could be made for Jeanne's strategizing with an approved edition of her mother's collection, but certain aspects of the restored debates could be interpreted in a Reformed sense. We do not believe it likely that Jeanne would have wanted to place her own religious ambiguity at the forefront of her stay at court. We must concede that Jeanne would have known Gruget, for, as pointed out in Chavy's bibliography, he was one of her brother-in-law's (Louis de Bourbon) secretaries (vol.1 650). In all, we must remain skeptical of the idea that Jeanne played an active role in the selection of Gruget for the second edition, because we have little evidence to support it and because the queen had a great deal of other distractions during

this time. It is possible that she supported Gruget's edition, and even saw working manuscripts during its preparation, but there is no evidence that her role went even that far. Gruget's attentively phrased dedication plays on the idea of the queen's role, but officially assigns her no more than a passive one. Gruget also weaves the king's approval into the dedication, thus adding another layer of power to support his own self-portrait as a loyal subject to the text. While it is not uncommon to mention privilege in a dedication, the precise phrasing "sous la permission du Roy" sounds more personal and adds effect.

Recent scholarship on Gruget's edition of the *Heptaméron des nouvelles* tends to agree with the editor's claims to have "remis en son vray ordre" the original text. Yet, comparative studies of the manuscripts against the Gruget and Boaistuau editions demonstrate that Gruget also bowdlerized the text to a certain extent, which is in part the reason for the nineteenth- and twentieth-century preference for editions of manuscripts.²²⁹ Some of those changes are in line with Boaistuau's choices, while others are obviously of Gruget's own design.²³⁰ Certainly, his edits to the text are not as extensive as the previous version, and, for the most part, as he claims, he restores the order of the tales and the internal logic of the debates, although we have to note that he maintains a couple of Boaistuau's suppressions (44 and 46) and chooses to replace the misadventure of Madame de Roncex (11) with that of the Friar of Amboise. The reasons for the majority of these suppressions and for a few others found within the body of the debates are often dismissed as a curiosity; most critics seem to agree that Gruget's suppressions were acts of prudence in a highly volatile religious climate and that he was preserving the reputations of all affiliated with the collection (Cazauran, "Boaistuau et Gruget" 163 and Preface, *L'Heptaméron* 51). Let us not forget that Marguerite's evangelical tendencies,

while tolerated during the earlier part of the century, came to be considered unabashedly protestant as the century progressed and the religious conflict evolved into a civil war.²³¹

However, the suppression of tale 11 does remain something of a mystery. Some have made the argument that such a tale was entirely too scatological for someone of the queen's standing, but this reasoning falls apart when we consider the shocking stories such as tale 52, that of the frozen packet of feces.²³² At the moment, we must simply note that three tales found in the most complete manuscripts are suppressed by Gruget, and that several of the debates have been shortened. In addition, certain names are suppressed, which is again considered a prudent tactic as the politico-religious climate heats up and the mere act of mentioning some names in a radical context can be perceived as a call to war (Cazauban, Préface, *L'Heptaméron* 51). These suppressions are maintained throughout the collection's history under Gruget's name.²³³ Overall, Gruget's subtle shifts in the text pale in comparison to Boaistuau's drastic adaptations, but he does change at least portions of the text of the *Heptaméron des nouvelles*. The subtleties mentioned here are all important to understand the rhetoric of the text thus edited, but they also reveal intricacies of the marketing side of the printed collection. Billed as the "superior" edition, Gruget's version of the *Heptaméron* appears to truly make the queen's work available to the reading public for the first time. So, while Gruget's claim to have "remis en son vray ordre" the collection bears a great degree of validity, we have to ask whether the claim is a marketing strategy as much as an honestly intended statement.

The translator as editor

Claude Gruget is not a master of marketing, nor is he a giant literary figure in his time. He does, however, have a good reputation as an author, resulting primarily from his translation of Pierre Messie's *Diverses Leçons* (1552) (Simonin, *La Disgrâce d'Amadis* 209). This *grande réussite* leads to other translation jobs, some of which are affiliated with Vincent Sertenas, with whom he has been working since they published a translation of the *Epistres de Phalaris* in 1550 (Simonin, "Politique éditoriale" 767, 769-771).

Translation work was not uncommon for the period, since the market for translated works grew exponentially with the industry.²³⁴ Sertenas himself was known to act as bookseller for numerous translations, perhaps the most celebrated of which was the *Amadis de Gaule* cycle.²³⁵ Two points can be inferred from these facts. First, someone who served primarily as a translator was selected to edit what would become the *Heptaméron*. Second, Sertenas was affiliated with Gruget. A brief discussion of the role of the translator in the sixteenth century will clarify the reasoning for the first point. For the second, we will look briefly at Sertenas' business practices to better understand his connections and affiliations. Neither observation is surprising, but the joint consideration of these facts will help us understand why both editions of the *Heptaméron* were produced.

Gruget is not the only writer during the period who makes a name for himself doing translation work. Let us not forget that Boaistuau's *Chelidonium Tigurinus*, and *Théâtre du Monde* are considered by contemporaries to be genuine translations.²³⁶ The author announced his intention to work on Saint Augustine's *De Civitate Dei*, and is therefore also considered a translator.²³⁷ Gruget and Boaistuau exemplify different ideals

of this role in each of their writings, and we know now that Boaistuau's *Chelidonium* was a composite, partly original work. The role of the translator varies greatly in the sixteenth century, while many consider it to be first a means to make the most significant texts, classical and otherwise, available to those not well versed in foreign languages, translating is also a roundabout means to fame. Herberay Des Essarts will forever be linked to the French *Amadis de Gaule* cycle.²³⁸ Gruget makes a name for himself with the *Diverses leçons*. However, some critics of the period, following Du Bellay's *Deffence et illustration de la langue françoise* (1549), vehemently deny dignity to translation as a literary function. According to Du Bellay, high oratory and poetry should not be translated at all, and call instead for "imitators" who are able to digest inspirational source material to feed their own invention.²³⁹ According to this view, translation takes away from the natural eloquence of a text in its original language, and only second-rate writers waste their time reproducing others' work instead of creating significant new texts of their own.

Jacques Peletier, although less extreme than Du Bellay in this respect, sums up the quandary in his 1555 *Art poétique*: "Somme, un Traducteur n'a jamais le nom d'Auteur. [. . .] Et même il leur demeure un avantage, que s'ils traduisent bien et choses bonnes: le nom de leur Auteur fera vivre le leur" ("In short, a translator is never given the name of author. [. . .] There remains a benefit to them, for if they translate good things well, the author's name will bring fame to their own.") (*Traîtés de poétique et de rhétorique de la Renaissance* 243-244). Considered in this light, then, translation work is viewed as a means to an end rather than an end in itself. Editing pre-existing texts in their original language is not yet considered a career, and even most translators, like most

writers, work in a variety of different areas of the literary field. As we have noted earlier, Bonaventure Des Périers was an author, a secretary and a tutor. Jacques Peletier worked as an editor, a secretary and a writer, as well as a mathematician and tutor. Noël Du Fail was primarily a lawyer and politician. Using a translator to edit a text such as the *Heptaméron* would not appear strange in the sixteenth century. In fact, engaging someone with translation experience might be considered prudent, since, as Peletier stated earlier in his treatise:

[...] le Traducteur [...] s'asservit non seulement à l'Invention d'autrui, mais aussi à la Disposition: et encore à l'Élocution tant qu'il peut, et tant que lui permet le naturel de la Langue translative: parce que l'efficace d'un Écrit, bien souvent consiste en la propriété des mots et locutions: laquelle omise, ôte la grâce, et défraude le sens de l'Auteur (263).

[...] the translator is constrained not only by other peoples' invention, but also by disposition, and even, as best he can, by elocution, as much as the nature of the translating language allows it, because the force of a text most often consists in the propriety of words and phrases, which, when omitted, suppresses the grace and defrauds the author's meaning.

Certain aspects of a translator's focus are useful and even essential to editing: both crafts require respect for the author's intended purpose as well as for the finer details of the text in question, as defined by the categories of rhetoric. Both of the men hired to produce editions of the *Heptaméron* supposedly had this experience, but each had a very different style and only one could have been said to respect Peletier's suggested guidelines. Generally, Gruget takes a different approach to texts than Boaistuau, and he is

known, as a translator and an editor, to work hard to maintain the integrity of originals. According to Courbet, “Pour Gruget, le vœu du maître, la tâche ordonnée, doivent être accomplis d’une manière scrupuleusement désintéressée” (“For Gruget, the contractor’s wishes and the assigned task must be accomplished in a scrupulously disinterested manner,” “Jeanne d’Albret et *L’Heptaméron*” 278).²⁴⁰

The diversity inherent in literary production creates other complexities and many contemporary theorists warn that different writers have different aptitudes. Often, writers strive to take on work that is beyond their skill level, or does not fit their temperament; conversely, some people only translate because they are or feel limited by their own “nature” from creating unique works of art. By contrast, Gruget’s work as a translator and editor accepts its own limitations, and earns respect because it is said to honor the original text. So, while he may not achieve the *Deffence*’s ideal, his approach is closer to that of Du Bellay’s immediate predecessor, Thomas Sébillet, whose *Art poétique français* (1548) argued the following: “Et vraiment celui et son oeuvre méritent grande louange, qui a pu proprement et naïvement exprimer en son langage, ce qu’un autre avait mieux écrit au sien, après l’avoir bien conçu en son esprit.” (“And he truly deserves praise, along with his work, he who was able to properly and naturally express in his own language that which another had better written in his after having well conceived it in his mind.” 140). Sébillet’s idea of praiseworthy translation, which would soon be dismissed by Du Bellay, then only partially restored by Peletier, is well illustrated by Gruget’s *Diverses leçons*. In contrast, Boaistuau’s translations are typically well-received, but his own interpretive stamp becomes a hallmark of his work and a strong challenge to the side of the debate that values a faithfully transposed text over a transformed one. Yet,

Boaistuau's use of source material as inspiration for unique works in his native language does have its own supporters at the time, and some critics see this as one of the means of expanding the quantity and the quality of works in French, as per Du Bellay's call to arms.

In sum, the role of the translator, as well as that of an editor, are subject to fluid interpretations during this period and the primary reason for such fluidity appears to be the prioritizing of goals: those who see translations as a means of transmission tend to appreciate Gruget's style, while those who seek inspiration for unique literary works are apt to praise Boaistuau's approach. Ultimately, each of the editors had established careers within the realm of literary translation, and Marguerite de Navarre's *nouvelles* gave each of them an opportunity to implement and demonstrate his own personal approach to such tasks. Boaistuau may have worked too fast, which led to sloppy execution mistakes, but his attempt to select and rearrange the tales was nevertheless deliberate and purposeful. The Sertenas group likely selected Gruget for the second edition of the *Heptaméron* for the very reason of his style. He had the skills set and the preferred approach for a more traditional edition, but why, then, was Boaistuau chosen for the first one?

We must ask ourselves if the Sertenas group suspected that there was a market for both extremes as far as this kind of collection was concerned. Did they not suspect that Boaistuau's approach would provoke backlash when dealing with the works of the late queen? Perhaps there was a less naïve and more calculated reasoning behind the two different editions. Sertenas' role in the various editions of the *Heptaméron* grows more interesting as we ponder this possibility. Sertenas had business ties with both Gruget and Boaistuau, but an overview of his editorial policies demonstrates that he worked

frequently with several different translators, authors and editors.²⁴¹ In light of this, the selection of Boaistuau, who was almost certain to bowdlerize the text, for the first edition of what would become the *Histoires des Amans Fortunez* has to give us pause, because the group could have chosen almost anyone to helm the work. Furthermore, Sertenas was selective in his choice of collaborators, and the other *libraires* with whom he worked on both editions of the *Heptaméron* were known and respected in their own right. Benoît Prévost was one of the foremost printers in Paris;²⁴² he was often hired to work for the licensed “king’s printers.”²⁴³ Gilles Robinot also had an edition of the *Comptes du monde aventureux*, like Sertenas, and was related by marriage to Nicolas Bonfons, who would become a successful bookseller later in the century.²⁴⁴ Robinot also happened to be Sertenas’ uncle and brother-in-law (Simonin, “Peut-on parler d’une politique éditoriale?” note 7, 762). However, Sertenas the *libraire* and Prévost the printer were easily the most well-known and financially stable members of this collaborative group. Sertenas would therefore have had more to risk on variant editions of the same text than his collaborators. Simonin’s study on Sertenas’ editorial policies reveals that the *libraire* was willing to take risks, and even occasionally allowed himself to be criticized by his own authors/editors in the texts he had published.²⁴⁵ In this way, Vincent Sertenas seems to have viewed his reputation as another tool for success, seeming to understand that a little controversy may justify a new edition and, perhaps, help sell more copies. Whether it was Sertenas’ intention or not, controversy over the Boaistuau edition did in fact bring the Gruget edition at least some celebrity. Our conclusion here is that Gruget and Boaistuau both served as tools in the production process, and that both were chosen within a very short time frame for a specific set of reasons.

The privileges of both editions reveal numerous facts which help to determine to some extent the nature of those reasons. The Gruget edition of the *Heptaméron des nouvelles* was not privileged to Vincent Sertenas, but to Gilles Gilles, one of the collaborators of the *Histoires des Amans Fortunez*. However, essentially the same group of *libraires* worked on both editions and Simonin suggests that Sertenas stepped aside out of deference for the controversy,²⁴⁶ although his name appears on the title page of some 1559 copies, in a neat reversal from the *Amans Fortunez*, where the privilege was granted to Sertenas and Gilles was named on the front page. Yet, the date for the privilege is 27 December 1558, barely four months after the 31 August privilege issued for the *Histoires des Amans Fortunez*, which stated that the book was, at that time, “non encores imprimé.” Considering the time it takes to complete printing and binding books during this period, we can see that the *Histoires des Amans Fortunez* were just becoming available in the *libraires*’ shops when privilege was obtained for the *Heptaméron des nouvelles* by the same group of booksellers.²⁴⁷ In fact, it is just as likely that the volume was not yet available for sale.

In addition, Gruget must have had a copy of Boaistuau's edition, because certain similarities in the suppressions and even in some vocabulary choices are too close to be mere coincidence.²⁴⁸ He could not have had access to a finished copy before privilege was obtained, and so he must have received a sample printer's manuscript or a privilege edition while working on his own. As we have seen, Gruget's dedication opens with a pointed reference to Boaistuau's work, which stands accused of having “concealed the name” of the queen and “quasi changé toute sa forme” (“essentially changed its structure” f. 3 r^o). The “achevé d'imprimé” for the *Heptaméron* being dated April 7,

1559, we may wonder how long, if at all, the *Histoires* had been available to readers at the time Gruget wrote this. In addition, we have no evidence that Jeanne de Navarre had access to an advance copy of the Boaistuau edition, though it is possible, given the connections between all of the parties involved. Finally, if we are to presume that Gruget had completed his work by the December date of privilege,²⁴⁹ he may well have produced at least portions of his edition, which does not betray the same haste as that of his predecessor, while Boistuau was working on his. Putting all of these facts together, it seems at least possible that the Sertenas / Gilles / Caveiller / Robinot plus Prevost group had most likely hired the two different editors in close succession, if not simultaneously, to produce their own versions in their own styles and alongside one another.

As we just saw, according to the colophon at the end of the privilege, the Gruget edition was completed at the printer's at the end of April 1559; even accounting for binding time and in the best possible scenario, the Boaistuau edition, which had yet to be printed at the end of August 1558, could therefore not have arrived on the shelves more than a few months (less than four at any rate) before the "approved" Gruget text.²⁵⁰ The *Amans Fortunez'* editing and printing were unquestionably rushed, and we saw that Boaistuau had used the stringent completion time as an excuse for the quality of his work. Perhaps the Sertenas group had scheduled the dates with Prévost, the printer, even before hiring the editors.²⁵¹ It is also possible that the Sertenas group had arranged for smaller printings of both editions in order to see how their strategy played out. As noted earlier, Boaistuau's edition may have been suppressed quickly, and in any case was not reprinted. The Gruget edition, on the other hand, was reprinted less than a year later to keep up with demand. Smaller printings obviously took less time to prepare and would have been

easier to fit into Prévost's busy schedule. Ultimately, we can assume that there was an unusually short time span between the release dates of two rival editions produced by the same team of booksellers. Interestingly, both books bore the same format, margins, binding and typeface. Except for the actual changes in textual content, and Gruget's captions preceding each tale (Boaistuau and Gruget each include a table of tales at the beginning of their books), the editions, from a material standpoint, are virtually indistinguishable.²⁵² It is unlikely that prudent, well-reputed businessmen such as Sertenas and Gilles would produce two collections from the same author in such a short period unless they had a good reason. The timeline seems to rule out the possibility that they explicitly hired Gruget to create an edition that would respond to attacks on Boaistuau's. Several possibilities become clear: they may have hoped the two editions would compete to favorable effect for both of them; perhaps they suspected that Boaistuau's editorial style, when used on a recently deceased and honored member of the royal family, would be put to task, particularly in light of a version that was more true to the existing manuscript tradition; they may have realized that another editorial choice was possible – and likely to be presented by a bookseller sooner rather than later – even after they hired Boaistuau and sought to expand his work, but decided to go ahead with both projects. Remember also that Boaistuau was likely rushed to complete his edition in a timely manner. Sertenas may have demanded speed of Boaistuau knowing that Gruget's edition was also being prepared. The conclusion I am drawn to is that the Sertenas / Gilles / Caveiller / Robinot group purposely hired two very different editors either because they knew from the start or realized later on that their individual styles would produce two very different editions of the same collection; they ended up producing both

books, one after the other, specifically to stimulate interest and boost sales, of the second one in particular. Boaistuau's edition, in this hypothesis, would heighten the readers' appetites for the previously unavailable collection by Marguerite de Navarre, but the Gruget edition would become the masterpiece, honoring the original and the author. That the whole operation was intentional remains speculative, but however the Sertenas group designed the set-up, it would be very effective. In this light, the controversy surrounding the publication of the two variant editions appears to be a carefully constructed sales strategy that pitted rival sixteenth century aesthetics against one another in an unusual context: the posthumous publication of a collection of tales by a late queen, who was also a major political, religious and literary figure.

Neither gambling on a new publication nor printing collections of tales were new territories for this group of *libraires*. Sertenas, as we have noted, achieved great success by taking a chance on texts that were unfamiliar to the public, the *Amadis de Gaule* being the most noteworthy gamble of his career. He had collaborated with Groulleau and Jean Longis in 1555 for an edition of the *Comptes du monde adventureux* by A.D.S.D. and so was familiar with tales as popular literature. Let us not forget that Groulleau had published somewhat controversial, yet seemingly successful editions of both the *Propos Rustiques* and the *Baliverneries d'Eutrapel* (both in-16 in 1548 and both inspired re-editions) and could also speak to the profitability of these collections. The inclusion of Caveiller and Gilles remains a bit more mysterious, particularly since the Gruget edition, as we have noted, bears a privilege in Gilles' name. It is perhaps simply circumstance that these other booksellers were included in the group; perhaps, the relationship Prevost had with each of them allowed the group to gel into a collaboration. In any case, the use of

two different names for the privileges merits some scrutiny. We may think, as Simonin did, that Sertenas, having been “burned” by the scandal, chose a more discreet role, but the presence of his name on the title page (of the copies that were sold in his shop) does not suggest a complete withdrawal. Perhaps Sertenas knew the Boaistuau edition was riskier and was more willing to gamble his reputation on the privilege in order to get it published. By the same token, he and the others felt that the Gruget version would be more secure and the *libraire*’s name less consequential, thereby allowing Gilles to take privilege.

The overall publication history of both editions, and the crucial role of the Sertenas / Gilles *et alii* collaboration suggest several possibilities. It is clear that Sertenas was at the helm of both editions, but the extent to which each element was planned out is unclear. Boaistuau, if he is to be believed, insists in his letter to the reader that he was first asked to produce some “eighteen or twenty” tales, then to expand the collection to which “depuis quelques autres en ont de rechef adjouté aux précédētes” (“several others have since been newly added to the preceding tales” f. x r^o). This indicates that an unclear course of action was undertaken, shifted and expanded, much as Boaistuau’s edition during the course of its production. Boaistuau also indicates that “les hommes sont curieux de novalitez” (“men are interested in *nouveautés*,” with a possible play on the notion of the newness of *nouvelles* f. x r^o), which further suggests that his production was rushed in order to get ahead of the market; we may hearken back to the privilege of Gruget’s edition, which makes reference to Boaistuau’s, without naming it, and claims authority by virtue of its restoration of the “ordre & disposition.” Both editions are presented in such a way that they play on two key markets of the period: new works in

general – and *nouvelles* in particular – and works by Marguerite de Navarre. The emphasis in both is, however, different and Boaistuau's edition appears to exploit the first market segment, while Gruget's edition seems to play more heavily on the second. The market for the *Heptaméron* had not yet been tapped, and given the various possible approaches to such collections, Sertenas' actions suggest an uncertainty about how to tackle this particular work. Either way, he dealt with the quandary by getting ahead of the game on all counts, although it remains unclear exactly when the group decided upon a second edition, or how to best sell both of them.

In all cases, placing different names on the privilege also gives the impression that the final products are rival editions, thereby acting as a teaser for any would-be buyers.

Charon-Parent points out that privileges and colophons commonly serve in this capacity:

Si le lecteur est venu flâner et feuilleter les nouveautés, il faut l'engager à délier sa bourse: colophons et privilèges sont l'occasion de glisser quelques formules percutantes, qui piquent la curiosité, le fassent réfléchir ou l'amuse. (*Les métiers du livre à Paris* 142)

If a reader comes wandering about to leaf through the newest productions, one had to incite him to untie his purse. Colophons and privileges give an opportunity to slip in some catchy formulas that whet his curiosity, make him think or amuse him.

We see examples of this practice throughout sixteenth-century literature and both editions bear phrasing in the privilege that is designed to stimulate a potential reader's interest.

The privilege in the Gruget edition does in fact refer to its predecessor, but under a different title: *Les nouvelles de la Royne de Navarre*. It also implies that these tales will

be a very hot commodity and expresses a deep concern for the likely counterfeit editions that were certain to surface:

Mais il doute, que, apres ce qu'il les aura achevé d'imprimer, aucun autre les vueille pareillement imprimer, ou faire imprimer, & par ce moyen estre frustré des fraiz et recompense de sesdictes peines et labeurs. 441

However, he fears that, after he has finished printing these tales, others will also want to print them, or have them printed, and in this way he will be denied the costs and rewards of his own hard work.

There is a fear that a second edition would be published quickly and that if those who put out the initial costs wanted a return on their investment, the consortium (Gilles later uses the “nous” to refer to the interested parties) should not waste any time. This rhetoric makes a case for urgency on behalf of the *libraires* and the readers who would be accessing the superior, most desirable edition were they to choose this book. Here, the privilege’s wording serves to not only excite the potential reader’s curiosity, but to give him a sense of being ahead of the game by acquiring the latest in the genre and in Marguerite de Navarre’s unfinished works.

It was reasonable to assume that the queen’s collection would do well in the marketplace, given her general notoriety, her reputation as a poet and the popularity of the genre as a whole. Any bookseller could theoretically have produced a successful edition of the collection without collaborating with others. Sertenas certainly could have considered this. The collaborative publication of such a collection would allow for more elegant (in this case, in-quarto) editions, because costs would be split between each of the *libraires*, and each seller would benefit with a little publicity through each book sold

under his name. When this kind of collaboration took place, each bookseller would receive a specified number of copies for sale in his shop. Each copy intended to be sold bore the name of the *libraire* and his personalized engraving on the title page, as we just saw with Sertenas. While this type of collaboration did force a printer to stop presses and change plates, this only affected one folio, that which contained the title page.²⁵³

Tchemerzine gives us numerous facsimiles of title pages throughout his bibliography, and we see that in addition to Sertenas, Caveiller, Gilles, and Robinot all had copies bearing their own individual mark.²⁵⁴ It was a very common practice, and one, as we have pointed out, to which Sertenas frequently availed himself. In all, this collaboration of Sertenas and others turns into a profitable production strategy. First, costs are diffused, allowing for a more elegant production of both editions. Second, Sertenas is able to keep his name absent from the privilege – and many printings – of the *Heptaméron des nouvelles*, putting the books into greater opposition, while masking his own role. Finally, the group is able to push for a turnaround of both editions that puts them on the shelves one right after the other, thereby heightening the rivalry and creating conditions that would ultimately favor the “definitive” one.

Examining the rival editions and editors of Marguerite de Navarre’s *Heptaméron* reveals a savvy marketing strategy by the *libraires* who collaborated on both. One must concede the possibility that the Duchess of Nevers and Jeanne de Navarre initiated the publication process, but any active involvement they might have had remains limited to, perhaps, producing a copy of an old manuscript. All evidence we have available to us indicates more strongly that Vincent Sertenas, a well-known *libraire* who had a habit of

gambling on new productions, put together a collaborative group and hired editors with whom he was working on numerous other projects. Sertenas knew how to maximize his profits with this kind of collusion. This particular collaboration went even further, because it took advantage of several key discourses and strategies of the mid-sixteenth-century period and ended up producing a set of editions that effectively rivaled and succeeded one another. Both editions bore the names and hallmarks of known translators (each of whom were employed at one time or another by relatives of the author) who interpreted the value of their work differently, and therefore produced vastly different texts.

Pierre Boaistuau, editor of the *Histoires des Amans Fortunez*, produced a result that had been rushed, haphazardly constructed and riddled with errors, but one that clearly expressed his tendency to bowdlerize and rearrange a work to his preference. The debates are disorganized, the order has been shifted and numerous other deletions occur, reducing the classic Boccacian frame-tale structure to its simplest form, just short of completely deconstructing the *cornice*. On the other end of the scale, Claude Gruget attempts to produce a version of the *Heptaméron des nouvelles* that acknowledges the author openly and remains faithful to the original manuscripts he was able to obtain. While copying Boaistuau quite often, he restores much of what had been eliminated by Boaistuau with a few notable exceptions. In both versions of the *Heptaméron*, the various elements that surround the texts play up the rivalry between the editions with each editor emphasizing the essential trait of his own style: one creating a new “forme,” and the other restoring the original one.

The privileges that are printed also play up this rivalry and the role of the *libraire* is pulled into the debate, as Sertenas' reputation is put on the line for the one, yet conspicuously absent in the second. Finally, the dates for the privileges and the known completion of the *Heptaméron des nouvelles* compared to the likely completion date for the *Histoires des Amans Fortunez* suggest a significant overlapping, if not a quasi-simultaneity, of the productions. When put together, all of these aspects of the productions suggest that much of the rivalry between the editions may have been the product of a marketing ploy, even though the level of advance planning may be difficult to assess. Such a commercial intention likely played a huge part in the selection of the editors who could be expected to contribute vastly different versions for publication. The resulting rivalry between editions extended to format, since the in-quarto books were almost identical physically. This would have dictated a similar price, although at 184 folios, Boaistuau's *Histoires des Amans Fortunez* would have cost slightly less than Gruget's *Heptaméron des nouvelles* at 213 folios. Ultimately, though, a buyer would not have chosen one edition over the other because of a cost differential. As we noted in our discussion of Bonaventure Des Périers, a reader did not frequently purchase multiple editions of the same book. He had to select the one that “whett[ed] his curiosity, [made] him think, or amuse[d] him,” in the words of Annie Charon-Parent (*Les métiers du livre à Paris* 142).

However the Sertenas consortium orchestrated the rivalry between these editions and expected it to play out, success would be theirs in one form or another. Either both editions would require reprints, or the newer one by Gruget would dominate, and then the status of this “better” version would be elevated in contrast to the other. Thus Marguerite

de Navarre's text would become known for several centuries under the auspices of one editor's conception, for which the other had proved and would keep proving a very effective foil.

Conclusion

Close analysis of some of the practical aspects of book publication can lead to some important findings about the profit-driven motives for publication. We must not forget that this is an industry, and that those involved from the technical side are seeking to make a living. In looking at the variant editions of four primary texts by three authors, we see that while printing certainly made books more available, and in far greater numbers than in the past, it was not yet able to keep pace with the ever-growing number of readers and buyers. As a result, counterfeit book production grew to fill the gap. Also, numerous editions and printings of editions were published of texts in the most popular genres. Once a *libraire* found his niche, he would exploit it to its fullest and would often print anything he could obtain that fit the mold. While collections of tales were not widely considered learned reading, they were popular, and this explains the six known editions of the *Comptes du monde aventureux* between 1555 and 1560.²⁵⁵ This collection is not widely studied today, and was not amongst the most popular of its period, as its prose is not nearly as sophisticated as that of Des Périers, Du Fail or Marguerite de Navarre, but Sertenas, Groulleau and others seized an opportunity that was available to them.

We remember that each of these men was also involved in the publication of at least one other collection of tales. Producing a profitable collection was frequently more important than selecting the most intellectually valuable work. Conversely, though not to the exclusion of the preceding idea, there was still enormous competition amongst *libraires* to produce the most popular version of a text, and so several marketing

strategies evolved to increase the popularity of various editions. We see in the additions and interpolations to all of the texts in question that *libraires* would strive to establish either the novelty or the authenticity of a text to increase the appeal of their own editions. Often, groups of *libraires* would work together to produce several variants and, as in the cases of the *Heptaméron* and perhaps the *Propos Rustiques* and *Baliverneries d'Eutrapel*, a larger intellectual or philological debate became yet another sales tool.

Ultimately, the edition selected by the larger public depended on numerous factors. With the *Heptaméron*, the public sided with the idea of an authentic edition, based strictly on the author's manuscripts. The public conclusion elevated the Gruget edition to an "authentic" status and left the Boaistuau edition aside as a cheap, even dishonest, knock-off, even though the same group had in fact published the competing editions of the collection, and, in that sense, "controlled," if not concocted, the resulting competition. In the case of Du Fail's texts, however, the later Groulleau editions came to be used most frequently throughout the remainder of the century and on into the 1800s.²⁵⁶ This is a fascinating contrast, since the Groulleau editions were not those finalized by the author, who was himself alive at the time of publication. This is most likely due to the fact that most of the re-editions following the initial burst of publications were printed by Parisian *libraires* and they most likely had access to the earlier Groulleau editions, but it does not explain the partial rather than complete inclusion of the larger interpolations in the *Propos Rustiques*, which potentially creates another important shift in the value of the text. As for the Des Périers' *Nouvelles Recreations*, the way in which the question of authorship established itself early in the collection's existence led the larger public to ignore the ideal of an authentic edition. This led to numerous, ever-changing variants in

the collection's history, further convoluting the question of authenticity. Amidst all of this, we see ultimately that if a *libraire* thought he could sell a text, he would either print it himself, or get it to someone else who could. Profitability is, not surprisingly, a driving, even defining factor in the existence of variant editions in the mid-sixteenth century. The next question we must address is that of the rhetorical import and effect of so many editions and variants on the texts themselves and on the genre as a whole.

PART II

RHETORICAL EFFECTS:

COLLATORAL DAMAGE OR DISCURSIVE STRATEGIES?

Introduction

Variant Editions and the Elasticity of a Genre

This second Part will evaluate the rhetorical intent and effect of each collection when considered through the prism of its variant editions. We will show how and to what extent the changes imposed by publication industry practices do in fact alter the meaning and purpose of the works they affect. As we saw in Part I, the industry engaged in numerous marketing maneuvers that resulted in, and in fact encouraged, the production of multiple, variant editions of our texts, which may have been more susceptible than other forms of discourse to this kind of cultural imposition, perhaps by virtue of being collections of tales – a less than worthy genre. It does not follow that all manipulations are similar, and with regard to the *nouvelles* that are the focus of our study, we encounter vastly different approaches to treatment of the genre by the authors and, in turn, by their editors and interpolators.

Des Périers deftly created a collection that both defied and upheld its own purported function, and, through several timely examples, exhibited an understanding of classical texts that focus on human perception. Most recent studies of Des Périers' *nouvelles* consider that the numerous tales haphazardly added to the end of the collection in later editions seem to respect only one aspect of Des Périers' intended approach, and that the ironic, playful notion that there is “no order” to the original is taken quite literally by later booksellers and editors. However, we will see that there may have been a specific purpose to the additions, and that it might actually pit the inheritors of different schools of thought against one another. Thus the storytelling concept proposed by Henri Estienne,

son of the famed *maître-libraire* Robert Estienne, subtly becomes as important to later editions as Des Périers' own design was to the original ones.

Meanwhile, Du Fail's texts, especially the *Propos Rustiques*, are treated numerous times in quick succession, twice each by Du Fail himself, we believe, and by Maugin, his interpolator, perhaps even his "amy." The latter makes numerous, at times subtle changes to the base text which affect the reader's perspective and pave the way for two additional chapters. Throughout, Maugin's approach is one of almost burlesque parody that underscores his own interpretation of the "rustiques" that Du Fail purports to treat with respect, albeit with a distinct sense of superiority. In the meantime, as we will see, Du Fail's refusal of many of these interpolations, especially the added chapters, counters Maugin's farcical tone with high-minded satire that upholds established social structures, particularly those of class, while simultaneously acknowledging their relative mobility in a shifting economic landscape.

Finally, Boaistuau's treatment of the *Heptaméron* was dismissed by both contemporaries and by critics of later centuries, but if we look at his version, which he titled *Histoires des Amans Fortunez*, we see that it is not so different, overall, from his more widely tolerated, even somewhat acclaimed, approach to other texts. Certain infelicities in the finished product may, to a large extent, be due to production pressures and frequent, even last-minute, changes to Boaistuau's employer's plan, which we now know may have evolved as a combination of marketing strategy and experimentation. In other words, Boaistuau may have amended the *Heptaméron* according to his own evolving art, but was unable to produce the text that he had intended, because he was forced to work too quickly and, in all likelihood, under someone else's shifting set of

constraints. Meanwhile, Gruget's edition, which follows Boaistuau's by only a few months, at most, approaches the work in the seemingly less invasive manner that reflects his editorial philosophy – and a different school of thought. This approach does not preclude the idea that Gruget would in fact make his own changes to the manuscripts he had on hand, and even copy Boaistuau in several instances; in fact, he goes so far as to include three tales not found in any of the manuscripts, and Gruget is perhaps, at least in some ways, no less radical in his treatment of the collection than his apparently less scrupulous competitor.

In all, as we saw in the previous Part, each of these collections and their variants help to illuminate answers to questions about the adolescent book industry and its approach to literary art as a commodity. It would seem through this perspective that book production is driven more by economic forces than by literary ideology, but ideology and theory, which are bound to include or assume views on the commerce of texts in any case, are frequently key aspects of the variant editions we find during this period. The booksellers themselves are often focused primarily on the profitability of a new edition, but are also interested in matters of genre and rhetorical purpose: the selection of one editor over another usually indicates a clear leaning in one direction or another on questions of what a text should be about and what audience it should target. The book industry is ultimately a fertile ground in which interpolators flourish and are allowed to practice their own poetics, often at the expense of – or at the very least in competition with – the same authors whose work they pretend to serve. Beyond what we tend to see as profit-driven manipulations, we have to examine the literary implications and

consequences of such widespread changes for these collections in particular and for the art of the *nouvelle* in general.

Chapter 1

The Pleasant and Useful *Nouvelles Recreations et Joyeux Devis*

The initial contract of Bonaventure Des Périers' *Nouvelles Recreations et Joyeux Devis* firmly establishes one function for the text with respect to its reader, and that is to make her laugh. This approach is vastly different from that held by Noël Du Fail and Marguerite de Navarre, and upon a cursory review, one could believe that Des Périers wrote his tales for this one purpose alone, and without consideration of the kind of rhetorical balancing act between pleasure and usefulness, according to Horace's famous dictum, that was predominant in most forms of Renaissance writing. Yet, Des Périers engages the reader immediately, in Ciceronian fashion, by presenting a strong, tangible argument. First, he upholds perceived sixteenth-century notions about what *nouvelles* should be; he then subverts their critical value by claiming that their worth lies in their very nature: laughter is necessary to human well-being, and tales are therefore justified in seeking to elicit that effect only. Usefulness, in this case, would reside in laughter alone, as opposed to any "higher" meaning. Further, Des Périers plays heavily on notions of subjectivity and interpretation, introduces arguments about gender and (specifically female) readership, and appears to exclude rhetoric from the genre, all while displaying his own mastery of rhetorical techniques.

The same game is perceptible to varying degrees throughout the collection; the first ninety tales in the *Nouvelles Recreations*, the original,²⁵⁷ supposedly "authentic" edition revisit several themes presented in the first few, and give the impression that Des Périers in fact had a message for his readers that went beyond pure pleasure. In later

editions, however, we see that additional tales stray from what we believe to be Des Périers' intended *dispositio*; many recent critics claim that the additions erode some aspects of the collection's complexity because they appear to be little more than a hap-hazard mélange of texts thrown in for commercial gain.²⁵⁸ The profitability of revised and augmented editions is an obvious factor in the decision to add thirty-two tales, then seven more, to the *Nouvelles Recreations*, but we will observe that the producers of these editions might well have been trying to make their own statement about the purpose and value of the work. The arrangement of these added stories is arguably more cohesive than most critics have suspected, and the final *nouvelles* that appear in each version derive, like many of Des Périers' tales, from other sources.²⁵⁹ However, each of these new stories has a clearly documented source, and the majority of them derive from Henri Estienne's *Apologie pour Herodote*. As a result, given the time frame between collections, the connection between Estienne's own views about storytelling, his commentary on Des Périers, and the overall arrangement of the additions presents an interesting series of questions, particularly when viewed in comparison to the rhetoric of the original *Nouvelles Recreations*.

We have noted as well that several aspects of the text suggest that it might not have been written by Des Périers himself, thus putting the authenticity of the original *Nouvelles Recreations* into question. As we have also seen, however, Sozzi's well-known study shows that many of the most discussed potential indicators are minor interpolations that do not change the text's overall structure and meaning, and we lean towards an agreement that Des Périers did in fact write the collection of ninety *nouvelles*.²⁶⁰ Kasprzyk sums up several centuries of speculation thus: "Mais il faut que le branle soit

donné et, malgré les restrictions imposées par l'évidence et dont il est impossible d'évaluer l'étendue, c'est en fin de compte D[es] P[ériers] qui doit être reconnu comme l'auteur des 90 contes du recueil édité par R[obert] Granjon" ("But one has to take a stand, and, despite the restrictions imposed by the evidence whose extent is impossible to evaluate, we must, in the end, recognize Des Périers as the author of the ninety tales of Robert Granjon's published collection" xx).²⁶¹ Let us note a few key points in the discussion.

First, Sozzi points out references to several events that occurred after Des Périers' death, including the passing of several people: Pierre Lizet (Tale 17), René Du Bellay (Tale 27), Jacques Colin (Tale 47), François I (Tale 48); many of these references could have been added with the simple addition of a few words, or by changing a verb tense (Sozzi 431-433). In this instance, an editor might simply have been trying to render Des Périers' text more contemporary, which is very much in keeping with the general tone of the text. Hassell believes, in looking at Des Périers' use of several literary sources, that "[i]t would appear that here [his] artistic objective was not so much to transform his model into something completely new as to modernize it, to retell the story with sixteenth-century characters moving in a sixteenth-century setting" (*Sources and Analogues*, vol. 2, 152). This setting (in the time of François I), of course, was still in the recent memory of most readers during the *Nouvelles Recreations*' initial publication.²⁶² For the author, who died during François' reign, nothing could have been more contemporary. The fact remains that Des Périers himself worked to modernize and transform familiar stories for his own purposes,²⁶³ and several examples are studied by Sozzi²⁶⁴ and Hassell.²⁶⁵

Yet another argument against the text's authenticity is that there are several similar passages between the *Nouvelles Recreations* and works that were printed after Des Périers' passing. In several cases, such as with several passages that evoke Rabelais' *Tiers livre*, the similarities point to either other, common written sources, or appear to be idiomatic in nature (Sozzi 433-435). Other analogies occur, such as that we find between the *Recreations*' Tales 19b and 89 and the *Comptes du Monde aventureux*'s Tale 43. Sozzi raises two possibilities about this, which may have worked together to some degree. First, the tales from both collections bear some resemblances to Bebel's *facéties*. Second, perhaps the author of the *Comptes* had access to a manuscript copy of the *Nouvelles Recreations*. As most critics agree that he, like Des Périers, was from Marguerite de Navarre's court, it seems entirely possible (435-437). Yet, Kasprzyk points out numerous, more significant references, such as a direct one in Tale 5 to Rabelais' *Tiers livre*, and she concedes that many of these references may simply be further evidence of posthumous editorial tampering (Introduction, *NR 1980* xvii-xviii). Finally, any analogies between the *Nouvelles Recreations* and Peletier's work are fairly subjective; they might well attest to the influence of Des Périers' collection, which Peletier could have been editing while doing some of his own writing, and are in many ways typical to the period (Sozzi 439-441).²⁶⁶ While none of these arguments in defense of the text's authenticity are definitive, it is clear, through Sozzi's analysis, that none of the arguments against Des Périers' authority are sufficiently compelling to warrant a change of attribution. More important, none of the passages that reveal clear interpolations change the style, the tone or the overall effect of the collection. If anything,

they serve to make the text more contemporary, so that the buyers from 1558 and later would sense the “newness” of the collection in their reading.

The appended tales are another matter. In 1567, we remember, Paris-based Galliot II Du Pré and his brothers published a new edition of the *Nouvelles Recreations*, which included thirty-two additional tales. With the exception of Nicolas Bonfons’ remarkably abridged 1575 and 1577 editions,²⁶⁷ other later editions, starting with Du Pré’s 1568 one, contained thirty-nine more. Des Périers exploited the genre’s traditions by using tales from multiple sources, and his interpolator(s) went further in the same direction. The special importance of Henri Etienne’s *Introduction au Traité de la Conformité des Merveilles Anciennes avec les Modernes ou, Traité Preparatif à l’Apologie pour Herodote* (1566)²⁶⁸ will be examined below. Five other tales come directly from the *Recueil des plaisantes et facétieuses nouvelles* (1555)²⁶⁹ and two are from the *Discours non plus melancholiques que divers*.²⁷⁰ Presumably, these tales were copied almost directly from their sources, rather than modified, as was typical of Des Périers’ style in the original collection.²⁷¹ Yet closer analysis will show how the appended texts might not have been added quite as haphazardly – or as uncritically – as has been assumed.

One case, as it happens, involves another of our primary texts: Tale 102²⁷² of the apocryphal version of the *Nouvelles Recreations* comes directly from the interpolated Groulleau editions of Du Fail’s *Propos Rustiques*, where it also served as an added chapter. However, the tale was not taken verbatim, and we see that at least some effort to transform the *nouvelle* was made. Its opening in the *Recreations*’ version actually comes from the first few lines of the *Propos*’ Chapter 6 (“La difference du coucher de ce temps et du passé, et du gouvernement de l’amour de Village”). The insert allows the editor to

situate the tale in the distant past “du temps qu’on portoit souliers à poulaine, que on mettoit potz sur table, et que pour prester argent on se cachoit, la foy des femmes vers les hommes estoit inviolable; et n’estoit aussi loisible aux hommes, fors de jour ou de nuict, vers leurs preudes femmes l’enfreindre [...]” (340) (“In the days when people wore shoes with long pointed toes, put pots on the table, and hid in order to lend money, the faithfulness of women towards men was inviolable, and nor was it permissible for men to cheat on their virtuous wives, whether by day or night” 217).²⁷³ That change alone seems a shift from Des Périers’ tendency to modernize, or at least to keep the text during François I’s reign, but it provides another service: it allows a context for what follows. The narrative core of Tale 102 is formed from Chapter 14 of the interpolated edition of the *Propos Rustiques*, where it follows Du Fail’s original frame and the end of the day’s story-telling with a brief introduction of one of the *devisants*’ two nephews. Were Tale 102 to begin with this introduction, exactly as the added chapter from the *Propos*, the reader would be left utterly confused.²⁷⁴ So, this shift and the insert from Du Fail’s Chapter 6 serve to orient and give context. However, it does not appear to suit Des Périers’ own strategy for temporal placement; an editor who wished to fully respect the spirit of the *Nouvelles Recreations* would have been conscious of this fact,²⁷⁵ and we do have some evidence that an attempt was made to respect that aspect of the *Recreations*, because most of the rest of the appended tales are set during François I’s reign.²⁷⁶ In this case, then, the temporal coherence was sacrificed for comprehensibility.

While the two portions of the tale were adopted word-for-word from different chapters – themselves deriving from different authors – in the *Propos Rustiques*, the melding of elements shows that the editor of the later editions of the *Nouvelles*

Recreations did allow for some changes and considered them with care. We might ask why the editor did not simply add a new beginning so as to update the *nouvelle*. He seems to be familiar with the text from which he is taking stories: in Chapter 6, Huguet is speaking of the past, albeit a distant past; in Chapter 14, Huguet's nephews are talking about Huguet himself, so a more recent past. The context is therefore not entirely consistent, since a different past is presented in each source, but within the frame of the *Nouvelles Recreations*, the anachronism is erased. In the interpolated edition of the *Propos*, the connection ran through Huguet and the theme of how love was treated in the past, but it is lost in this version of the tale, where Huguet is not mentioned. Only an attentive reader of a counterfeit edition of the *Propos Rustiques* would have noticed that.

Another possible reason for the use of the opening lines of Chapter 6 is pointed out by Pérouse and Dubuis: Henri Estienne refers to money lending in Chapter 37 of the *Apologie pour Herodote*.²⁷⁷ This chapter of the *Apologie* is not structured in the same way as most of the other chapters, and it contains, rather than a series of illustrative anecdotes and abbreviated narratives, a discussion about religious doctrine and hypocritical, syllogistic subtleties found therein. Given the large number of tales the editor incorporates from Estienne, and given that this chapter of Estienne's work does not include any easily copied tales, we might ask if this is not a cleverly disguised reference to the *Apologie*. Of course, it remains possible that this is a mere coincidence. However, the likelihood is that the editor made these specific changes to the *Propos Rustiques* for a reason, and this particular one seems as plausible as any other,²⁷⁸ although the need to re-contextualize mentioned above strikes me as more important.

As we saw in Part I, the additional tales are not incorporated into the body of the text, and are listed as “additions aux Nouvelles Recreations de Bonaventure Des Périers” on the title page. Sozzi is convinced that they are not from Des Périers’ pen: “Aucun doute n’est donc possible: les contes ajoutés aux *Nouvelles Récréations* à partir de 1568 ne constituent qu’un mélange désordonné et assez mal venu de récits disparates, rattachés aux précédents pour des raisons simplement commerciales” (“There is no possible doubt: the tales added to the *Nouvelles Recreations* after 1568 only constitute a disorganized and poorly selected mix-up of disparate stories, tagged onto the preceding ones for merely commercial reasons” 427). This assessment seems fair, even likely, given what we have seen in Part I, but the above example shows that at least some premeditation was involved in selecting and setting these additional tales, and we must examine them more thoroughly to reach a firmer conclusion about their presentation and reasons for being.

Henri Estienne: critic

Several interesting facts begin to appear as we look at the relationship between the *Apologie pour Herodote*, from which twenty of the thirty-nine appended tales derive directly.²⁷⁹ The latter work did not come out until 1566, when the *Nouvelles Recreations* had been on the shelves for several years. Also, Estienne was the first contemporary to discuss Des Périers’ apparent suicide in his collection of tales. Finally, we may add that Etienne himself borrowed copiously from the *Recreations* and performed manipulations in his own fashion in each of the cases treated.

The *Apologie* bears its own fascinating origin story, which we can only summarize here. It was printed in Geneva, but was quickly suppressed by the Genevan

Council, which deemed certain passages “trop vilains.”²⁸⁰ The initial suppression occurred in November, only six days after the printing was completed, and Estienne responded with a partial suppression of unwelcome passages, but the work was reprinted, again without the Council’s pre-approval, and Estienne was arrested in April 1567. He was interrogated in May and forced to track down and destroy as many copies of the original editions as possible, including those sent to Lyon. The censorship was not wholly successful and a counterfeit edition appeared in Lyon in 1567.²⁸¹ Let us note that Estienne was, himself, a *maître-imprimeur*, and, given the time-frame between corrected editions, we must assume he was able to adjust his own printing schedule to accommodate the reeditions, although he did not print all of his own texts and often outsourced to other printers to expand his own selection.²⁸²

The final, corrected editions which appeared included a new “Avertissement au Lecteur,” in which Estienne wrote the following:

Il est bien vray que j’ay moymesme usé d’aucuns mots nouveaux en ce livre, mais ç’a esté où les vieils défailloyent: et puis ils sont tels qu’on voit bien que je les ay forgez à plaisir, pour parler ridiculement des choses ridicules, qui néantmoins par les povres abusez sont estimees fort sérieuses. 130

It is true that I used several new words in this book, but that was where the old [ones] failed, and since they are such that one sees easily that I forged them at whim, to speak ridiculously of ridiculous things, which nevertheless are deemed very serious by poor, misused people.

The accommodation both indicates, then, a scathing critique of his censors, and downplays several aspects of his own program: Estienne was known for his extreme views in favor of the Reformation, and the text itself tends towards a moralizing perspective on storytelling, leading it to be treated most often under the rubrics “de la satire ou de la polémique religieuse” (“of satire or religious polemic,” Kasprzyk, “Henri Estienne conteur” 471).

The text is not structured as a series of short narratives clearly separated by numeric divisions, but as a series of long chapters which treat specific topics. Because of the division into topics, rather than an interest in the tales as separate entities,²⁸³ the story of Des Périers’s suicide (and a couple of other stories) is repeated in the collection. The first mention occurs in Chapter 18: “Des homicides de nostre temps,” and is repeated almost word for word in Chapter 26: “Comment, ainsi qu’il y a en nostre temps des meschancetez estranges que jamais, aussi Dieu les chastie par façons plus estranges”:²⁸⁴

Je n’oublieray pas Bonaventure Des periers [sic], l’auteur du detestable livre intitule *cymbalum mundi*, qui, nonobstant la peine qu’on prenoit à le garder (à cause qu’on le voyoit estre desesperé, et en deliberation de se deffaire) fut trouvé s’estant tellement enferré de son espee sur laquelle il s’estoit jetté, l’ayant appuyee le pommeau contre terre, que la pointe entrée par l’estomach sortoit par l’eschine. (507)²⁸⁵

I will not forget Bonaventure Des Périers, the author of the detestable book titled *Cymbalum Mundi*, who, despite the pains they took to watch him (because they saw that he was desperate and determined to take his own life), was found run through by his sword upon which he had thrown

himself, having placed the handle on the ground, so that the tip entered through the stomach and exited through the spine.

Estienne's comments on Des Périers leave out the *Nouvelles Recreations*, but his distaste for Des Périers and, we might add, Rabelais, has deeper roots. Estienne's father, Robert Estienne, was, like Henri, a bookseller and an advocate for the Reform movement. Forced into exile after François I's death, Robert held a profound influence on Henri, who received a thorough classical education,²⁸⁶ mastering Greek and traveling throughout Italy. After his father's death in 1558, Henri moved to Geneva, where he set up his own practice.²⁸⁷ In the *Apologie pour Herodote* itself, Rabelais and Des Périers are given a place among the "blasphemers" of the time, in part because they toed the line between Humanist and Reformist thought.²⁸⁸ Further, Estienne's own classical training occasionally conflicted with his religious beliefs, and he attempted to reconcile the two by making suicide "une affaire strictement privée" (Boudou, *Mars et les Muses* 290), but in the case of Des Périers, as in that of several suicide cases mentioned in the *Apologie*, death comes as a result of a justified sense of guilt for ungodly transgressions, which the notorious author of the *Cymbalum mundi* was said to have committed.²⁸⁹

There is no question that Estienne condemned Des Périers repeatedly in his work. The sentiment is so prevalent, in fact, that it compelled him to add a qualifier to the writer's name in the *Apologie's* adapted table of stories: "moqueur de Dieu" (vol. 2, 1002). According to Bénédicte Boudou, Estienne believed that Des Périers' and Rabelais' tendencies to rely on laughter as a moral goal for its own sake distanced the reader from God and deliberately encouraged the kind of superficial, inaccurate reading, which, as Estienne was quick to point out, the *Apologie* itself suffered at the hands of Ravot, the

Lyonnais printer who first counterfeited the text and equipped it with a series of tables.²⁹⁰ (Estienne's misgivings did not prevent him from adapting and correcting those tables in his own later editions of the text.) The same was supposedly true of the Geneva Council, or the "pauvres desabusez," as he had called them. Ironically, Boudou points out that Estienne himself frequently displayed evidence of a cursory reading of both Des Périers and Rabelais; his approach is that of a moralizer insisting upon what should be their works' religious purpose: "En tout état de cause, Estienne réagit ici en réformé indigné de voir que des esprits évangéliques ont cessé de soutenir la Réforme" ("In any event, Estienne reacts here as a Reformer, appalled to see that some evangelical minds stopped supporting the Reformation" 347),²⁹¹ to the point that they were now guilty, in his view, of pushing their readers towards atheism under the guise of treating their melancholy (348).

In his own *Avis au lecteur*, Estienne develops a lengthy discourse on the importance of reminding people about true stories, and how such stories might serve to improve a person's own judgement.²⁹² At the same time, he chose tales precisely to illustrate the evil (folly) of mankind, and did not accept – notwithstanding his own struggle to reconcile his Christian faith and classical culture – the notion that opinions on this issue might be more complex and layered than they would appear to be at first glance. The construction of thematic chapters is a key strategy in this respect, and one that breaks drastically from the variety favored by short stories: the lessons matter more than the stories. According to Kasprzyk, "il ressort nettement qu'Estienne ne trahit aucun souci de composer ses récits d'une manière cohérente et homogène, pour en faire une collection. Nous savons par ailleurs que telle n'était pas son intention" ("It becomes

evident that Estienne did not in the least care to compose his stories in a coherent, homogenous manner so as to make a collection. We know in any case that this was not his intention” 479). Estienne’s goal, then, was vastly different from Des Périers’, and his work sought its own form of originality.

With this apologetic goal in mind, the author of the *Apologie pour Herodote* intentionally adapted a great number of tales derived from other sources. This approach extended, naturally, to those that he adapted from Des Périers, and Estienne does not hesitate to shorten narratives, frequently reducing them to their most basic elements, much as we saw in his description of Des Périers’ suicide. On the other hand, whenever necessary, our Reformist author did not refrain from engaging in lengthy moralizing discourse, designed to explain exactly how the reader was supposed to understand a given chapter or series of tales (Boudou, *Mars et les Muses* 311). In fact, most of the *Apologie*’s chapters begin with copious exposés of the moral in question, even though, as Boudou notes, Estienne was occasionally distracted by the tales themselves: “Car le récit lui fait comme oublier en chemin sa condamnation, et remplacer le jugement moral par une appréciation esthétique de l’originalité ou de la singularité de l’acte raconté” (“Because the story acts as if to make him forget his condemnation along the way, and replace moral judgement by an aesthetic appreciation of the originality or singularity of the described action” 311).

Examples of this intent appear throughout, and Estienne borrowed especially from Italian and French collections, thereby extending his consideration of mores to a more universal study of man. He also made extensive use of the *Heptaméron*, but, counter to his view of Des Périers, seems to revere its author.²⁹³ She, like him, chose to tell

nouvelles as true stories, and sought to apply moral thought guided by religious conviction – specifically the Gospels of the Bible – to interpretation of the tales.²⁹⁴ Yet, his interest in Marguerite de Navarre and her work did not incite him to include any of the debates she wrote, and he did not hesitate to change the stories to suit his own needs, just as he did with the rest of his appropriated material (Cazauran, “Henri Estienne, lecteur de *L’Heptaméron*,” 395-399). In part, it is because Marguerite demonstrates the impossibility of the project, as attempted by humans and their unavoidable failings.²⁹⁵ “This is why the interlocutors must struggle to discover some way of mediating between news and the Good News in the first place, and why all their efforts to do so here in the world of news are doomed to go on indefinitely” (Duval, “Et puis, quelles nouvelles?” 254).²⁹⁶ Estienne’s attempts to subscribe precise moral lessons to the *nouvelles* that he included in his collection, even when failings of human understanding and conviction become apparent (as in the case of suicide) and counter this basic principle of the genre. Appropriation and adaptation, then, are part and parcel to Estienne’s technique, regardless of his personal feelings or ideological judgements about any given author. However, while his adaptations at least attempted to keep the focus on each chapter’s explicit theme, Estienne was not wholly successful in distancing the material from the narrative purpose that structured it originally; thus a tension appears between the borrower’s intended argument (*inventio*) and that of the tales he picks up, which he is capable of enjoying for their own sake, or for that of their style (*elocutio*).²⁹⁷

The later editors of the *Nouvelles Recreations*, in turn, seem to see Estienne’s convoluted appreciation for Des Périers’ tales, and for tales in general, as a separate entity, and when they appropriate his material to augment the material of the *Recreations*,

it is forcibly perceived and recast in a different manner. The added tales are not viewed in the context of the chapters, and therefore themes, within which they appear in the *Apologie pour Herodote*, and thus without the moral commentary that framed out each chapter; they now function again as distinct, individual tales. However, as we will see, several examples clearly retain the judgemental tone of Estienne's narration. Also, the abbreviated narrative form found in these *nouvelles* often distances itself from Des Périers' own style, and most readers would have been quick to pick up on this stylistic difference. That said, we might ask if the ulterior editor tried to underline the distinction between Des Périers' original approach and that was illustrated by the additions, or, on the contrary, if he tried to manipulate Estienne's work to make it conform more to Des Périers' style by erasing the *Apologie's* religious stance and by mitigating its attack on contemporary mores. Certain qualities of the appended tales suggest the first interpretation: the primarily condemnatory tone and the cynical focus on sardonic laughter, which leave out all pretense of objectivity or tolerance, create a sharp contrast to the original ninety tales. The second interpretation, for its part, should not prevent us from seeing an inherent tension within the tales, which a side-by-side comparison between the additions and the main corpus reveals.

We should remember, too, that Estienne's work appeared in 1566, after the collective Du Pré's 1564 and 1565 printings of the original *Nouvelles Recreations*. While a 1567 edition would have necessitated a quick, almost impossible turnaround, this might explain how the first appended edition only had thirty-two additional tales and the later (1568) edition included thirty-nine tales, although none of those additional seven come from the *Apologie pour Herodote*.²⁹⁸ The presses might have been available and there

was no time to add more. Also, the Du Pré's, like Estienne, inherited from their fathers' business; both Galliot Du Pré and Robert Estienne were Parisian. Both were renowned booksellers. Each held their own agendas: Estienne was known as a printer of the classics, which he later extended to vernacular printings of the Bible; Du Pré included greater variety in his more "Humanistic" inventory.²⁹⁹ In other words, the two men were business and philosophical rivals. One cannot help but find it interesting that the sons of each of these highly successful men chose to coopt and manipulate each other's work, each in his own fashion.

Reading the additional tales

Let us look now at how those tales might have engendered a different reading of the *Nouvelles Recreations*, especially since they become the last word for anyone who might have had that collection in hand. In the base text (that is, the original ninety *nouvelles* published under the title of *Nouvelles Recreations et Joyeux Devis*), we observe that the author establishes a seemingly simple contract with the reader. Des Périers' mantra for laughter is repeated throughout the opening pages of the original edition: in the author's sonnet, in the first *nouvelle*, which formalizes Des Périers' intentions, and in Granjon's *épître au lecteur*. His goal to entertain the reader rejects allegory and the quest for the kind of "higher meaning" that Rabelais had alluded to in the famous prologue to *Gargantua*. However, entertainment for its own sake is also a necessary service, sanctioned almost immediately by a Biblical reference. In the oft-quoted translation from the Book of Matthew, Des Périers gets straight to the point when he states: "c'est aux malades qu'il fault medecine" ("It is the ill who need medicine" 13).³⁰⁰ As Richard-

Thomine points out, “le ton léger n’exclut pas la présence d’une moralité et Des Périers s’affranchit nettement de la tradition médiévale en revendiquant sans scrupules la récréation et le rire pour eux-mêmes” (“the light-hearted tone does not exclude the presence of a morality and Des Périers frees himself from medieval tradition by valuing, without qualms, recreation and laughter for their own sake,” “Autour d’un titre: la nouvelle, le devis, la récréation et le rire,” 36). The text’s very invention, then, derives from a sense of mission that reinforces, rather than disavows the genre’s light-hearted essence, while remaining paradoxically faithful to his generation’s desire to write for a “purpose.”

Of course, in the sixteenth century as in much of the classical tradition, this kind of value could be seen as running counter to more “serious” subjects, linked to categorically important questions.³⁰¹ Let us remember, though, that rhetoricians and poetics dealt with this problem in different, often contradictory ways, as we can gather from the work of such theorists of poetry as Sébillet, Peletier and Du Bellay. Horace had put forth in two separate passages of the *Ars Poetica* that poems were to be not only “beautiful,” but also “moving” (99-100), and both “useful” and “pleasurable” (343-344) as well (using the same word, the adjective “*dulcis*,” to signify pleasure in the first passage, and emotion more generally in the second one).³⁰² Later authors, as we have noted, applied these statements to all forms of fictional writing, even when they excluded certain forms from the conversation.³⁰³ Tales that are “joyous” are meant only to be “pleasurable,” but, as we have just seen, Des Périers goes a step further in his transformation of Horatian poetics: not only is pleasure identified with laughter, but it is laughter as such that is “useful” to the reader. However, he also maintains the stance that

nouvelles are not an appropriate venue for rhetorical debate, and takes a notoriously nonchalant attitude vis-à-vis his reader by unequivocally asserting that there is no hidden meaning, no specific order to consider, nor any other rhetorical function to his endeavor:

Je vous prometz que je n’y songe ny mal ny malice: il n’y ha point de sens allegorique, mystique, fantastique. Vous n’aurez point de peine de demander comment s’entend cecy? comment s’entend celà? Il n’y fault ny vocabulaire ne commentaire. Telz les voyez, telz les prenez. Ouvrez le livre: si un compte ne vous plait, hay à l’aulture. [...] Et ne me venez point demander quelle ordonnance j’ay tenue. Car quel ordre fault il garder quand il est question de rire? (15)

I promise you I don’t intend evil or malice in them; there is no allegorical, mystical, or fantastical meaning in them. You won’t be troubled with having to ask what does this mean, what does that mean; you don’t need any glossary or commentary: take them as you see them. Open the book: if one tale doesn’t please you, rush to another! [...] And don’t come and ask me what order I’ve followed, for what order is necessary in matters of laughter? (36)

He begs the reader not to give in to any inclination to interpret the tales or to try to understand his perspective as the author. His argument is that there is no argument, because the tales cannot be truly enjoyed as intended without a simple, unadulterated acceptance. Later, by contrast, Estienne would make it clear that, for him, tales were meant to serve as examples of society’s depravation, and the occasional laughter that was to be had was allowable so long as the reader remained focused on the moral value each

story held.³⁰⁴ For Des Périers, though, tales are truly meant to be enjoyed without the weight of a morally-imposed understanding. The author's intrepid insistence on the entertaining nature of this collection makes it difficult to refute his sincerity, and the reader is inclined to take Des Périers at his word: the argument is convincing.

However, a close look at the original 1558 edition of the text suggests that Des Périers' strategy actually disarms the reader's presuppositions in a (perhaps not so) surprisingly clever use of rhetoric. After all, laughter has long been recognized by rhetorical theory as one of the emotions that a good speech can trigger.³⁰⁵ Recent criticism has begun to appreciate Des Périers' dexterity and acknowledges the complex undertones of his work,³⁰⁶ and the five parts of rhetoric as espoused by Cicero or Quintilian are enacted to the fullest.³⁰⁷ However, the text appears to rail against rhetoric for rhetoric's sake from the start; the very claim that laughter functions as a "medecine," which engages the entire physical being of the person laughing,³⁰⁸ is not far removed from Erasmus' claims in *Moria (The Praise of Folly 1522)*.³⁰⁹ Folly's opening remarks criticize rhetoric for what it fails to do, and points out her own natural aptitude. "Thus, what these eloquent orators can hardly accomplish in a long and carefully thought out speech – namely, to clear the mind of troubles and sorrows – that very goal I achieved in a flash simply by making an appearance (10)." Folly ironically, of course, then announces her intent to employ rhetoric to argue her own praise (10-11). The use of rhetoric cannot, by itself, heal the reader, but laughter can spontaneously perform this necessary function; yet it is particularly effective when laughter and rhetoric function together.

The relationship between Des Périers' laughter, or "resjouissances," and Erasmus' Folly is strengthened in the first *nouvelle* when he introduces "le plaisantin," whom

Hassell (in accord with Louis Lacour) suspects to be Triboulet, François I's court fool (*Sources and Analogues* vol. 1, 31; vol. 2, 166-167).³¹⁰ If this is the case, then we are reminded again of Folly herself, who appears in “unusual costume,” which Clarence Miller notes is “the cap and bells of the licensed fool, which both she and her followers wear in Holbein's marginal drawings” (see 10, note 7). The “fool” himself is a character type that recurs throughout the *Nouvelles Recreations*, and frequently takes on many of the personality traits that Erasmus' Folly claims as her handmaidens. In the first *nouvelle*, “le plaisantin” is presented as an example to the reader: upon his deathbed, the priest arrives to give last rites and when the plaisantin is told that he must confess so that he might go to God that day, he responds “Et bien disoit il, mais que j'y soys, je feray mes recommandacions moy mesmes” (19) (“Well then!” he said, ‘so long as I'm there, I'll make my own recommendations” 38). As Anne-Laure Metzger-Rambach reminds us, the plaisantin's folly in the face of death purports a different kind of wisdom that cannot be achieved through conventional knowledge, because it expresses a “liberation of [human] nature,” and a freedom from social constraints (“Figure du fol et réflexion sur le monde tel qu'il va dans *les Nouvelles Récréations et joyeux devis* de Bonaventure Des Périers,” 128-129). However, the fool, as seen in the *Nouvelles Recreations*, is not an Erasmian allegorical figure, but an evocation of the “réalisme grotesque” of men (123);³¹¹ he is not presented as a personified character, but as a human being, and the object of ridicule, susceptible to his own mortality. Even if, as Kasprzyk believes,³¹² the plaisantin is not a direct allusion to Triboulet, the latter and two other “folz” appear in the next tale, and we are to understand the connection immediately, by means of the table provided by Des Périers, which identifies tale 2 as “Des trois folz Caillette, Triboulet et Polite” (5, 19).

The “folz” and “Folly” are thus linked by both similarities and disparities in Des Périers’ presentation of the text’s *inventio*, and the subject of the tales is reinforced in all aspects of life: academic, social, religious, oral and written; it possesses a far greater rhetorical value than one would originally presume a work of “mere” entertainment to hold.

Des Périers would not be the only *conteur* to extoll the virtues of Erasmian thought; Estienne’s *Apologie pour Herodote* would be laden with references to Erasmus’ numerous works, including the *Eloge de la Folie* (Boudou, *Mars et les Muses*, 30-33). In addition, he and his father Robert were known for their 1558 edition of Erasmus’ *Adages*, the same year as the *Nouvelles Recreations* first appeared, and just before Robert’s death. Boudou views certain aspects of the *Apologie* as a “tombeau” for the author’s father, and argues that the evocation of Erasmus represented Estienne’s intellectual foundation, as it was passed from father to son (30).³¹³ But Henri takes his understanding of Erasmus a step further in his belief that the Lutheran developments of the Reformation owed a great deal to Erasmus, who paved the way. Estienne and Des Périers thus have a mutual appreciation for the Dutch humanist, and, in fact, for the first generation of reformers, but their collections end up offering vastly different arguments about the tales genre itself.

Des Périers employs the “Premiere Nouvelle en forme de preambule” to win the reader’s benevolence and open mindedness, further demonstrating his rhetorical use of the tales’ purported lack of rhetoric. Cicero makes it clear in *De Partitione Oratoria*, and elsewhere, that the orator’s first goal must be to engage the audience. The immediate application of style (*elocutio*) and tone (*actio*) are incredibly important for the *exordium* to work, and Cicero suggests that “[d]electat enim quidquid est admirabile, maximeque movet ea quae motum aliquem animi miscet oratio, quaeque significat oratoris ipsius

amabiles mores [...] alia existimari videntur, idque comitate fieri magis quam vanitate” (“anything that causes surprise gives pleasure, and the most effective style is one that stirs up some emotion in the mind, and that indicates amiability of character in the speaker himself; and [...] that he is doing this more out of good nature than insincerity” vol. 2, 328-329).³¹⁴ An orator, or in this case, an author, must adopt a voice that makes him believable, so that the listener, or reader, is inclined to accept the argument. Des Périers, in keeping with Cicero’s advice, presents the tone of a good-natured “amy” (as he addresses the reader) whose sole interest is to be helpful – “Et pour vous y aider, je vous donne ces plaisans comptes” (“And to help you do it [laugh], I offer you these pleasant tales” 14). Further, Des Périers floods the “préambule” with proverbs of many origins, all of which support his intended purpose,³¹⁵ and he works in numerous examples from oral sources.³¹⁶ He thus enters into a dialogue and an age-old exchange that prompt feelings of comfort with the audience. These techniques are repeated throughout the collection, in order to maintain the overall tone of a tongue-in-cheek friend whose presence is there to elicit laughter (Cicero, in *De Oratore* II, 218, uses the term *cavillatio* to designate this tone of “continuous merriment,” *perpetua festivitas*), and he transforms from an author to a narrator who is engaged with his audience, which Sozzi refers to as an “intimité, [une] privauté avec le lecteur” (“intimacy, a familiarity with the reader” 240).³¹⁷

In the second *nouvelle*, for example, Des Périers interjects light-hearted observations about the ambiguity of language – a theme that presents itself quite often – and he introduces the Triboulet anecdote thus: “A l’entrée de Rouan, je ne dy pas que Rouan entrast, mais l’entrée se faisoit à Rouan” (“At the entrance of Rouen: I’m not

saying that Rouen entered, but that the entrance took place in Rouen” 21). The narrator knows, certainly, that the reader understands the meaning of “l’entrée de Rouan,” and so the comment is not meant to dispel any linguistic ambiguity, but to make the reader laugh, because it is unexpected, and the reader almost certainly understands as well that the narrator is joking.³¹⁸ Des Périers as the narrator maintains the game-like tone, which continues at the end of the entire *nouvelle* (and the narration of all three anecdotes):

Or ça, les folz ont fait l’entrée. Mais quelz folz? Moy tout le premier à vous en compter: et vous le second à m’escouter: Et cestuy là le troisième: et l’autre le quatriesme. Oh qu’il y en ha: jamais ce ne seroit fait: Laissons les icy et allons chercher des sages. Esclairez pres, je n’y voy goutte. (23)

Now then, the fools have made their entrance, but what fools! I the very first for telling you these silly things, and you the second for listening to me, and that one the third, and the other the fourth. Oh! there are so many! I could never finish counting them. Let’s leave them here and go find the wise ones. Give me a good light, I can’t see a thing here. (40)³¹⁹

The definition of the fool is therefore expanded and includes everyone who is engaged in the exchange between narrator and reader. The vocabulary evokes a dialogue with terms such as “compter” and “escouter,” rather than their written counterparts “escrire” and “lire,” which further maintains the casual tone of the text, and reminds us of the oral origins of at least some of the tales.³²⁰ The passage also reinforces the suggestion made in the first *nouvelle* that the reader should be more like the plaisantin than Sophocles (17-19).³²¹ In this way, the narrator begins to create a network that advances narration “en

projetant au devant de la scène un conteur et un auditeur en plein devis” (“while projecting upfront a tale-teller and a listener in full conversation” Jean-Claude Arnould, “Le joyeux devis des *Nouvelles Récréations*,” 33).

Throughout the collection, Des Périers also plays on the understanding that the audience is educated: he often does not translate Latin, but frequently interprets *patois* words, “comme si le narrateur craignait que le lecteur ne les comprenne pas” (“as if the narrator was afraid that the reader would not understand them,” Amélie Blanckaert and Romain Weber, “*Nouvelles Récréations et Joyeux Devis*: Pour qui? Pourquoi?” 49). Again, Cicero had noted that “*Refert etiam qui audient, senatus an populus an iudices, frequentes an pauci an singuli, et quales; ipsique oratores qua sint aetate, honore, auctoritate [...]*” (“The audience is also important – whether it is the lords or the commons or the bench; a large audience or a small one or a single person, and their personal character; and consideration must be given to the age, station and office of the speakers themselves [...]” *De Oratore*, vol. 2, Book 3, 168-169). Des Périers’ acute awareness of tone and of audience is notable in several other *nouvelles*, which frequently focus on miscommunications between people from different classes who do not grasp this concept.

As we see in the tale of the fishwife and the schoolmaster (Tale 63), mastery of tone and argument often has as much to do with natural ability as with education, and sometimes more. The two figures engage in a debate of insults after the fishwife refuses to negotiate the price down for one of the Regent’s students. The debate does not go in the schoolmaster’s favor, despite his years of learning and experience, and the pains he takes to prepare (two long lists of insults are written, with consultation from his

colleagues, and he studies one in its entirety 234). Emily Thompson points out several errors on the Regent's part, including forgetting his audience, forgetting his words, and the excessive use of Latin in the exchange:

For the low nature of his subject (the vulgar disdain of a fishwife), he should have maintained a low style, appropriate to the subject and setting. To switch to an elevated style of speaking, to use the noble language of Latin and to make reference to mythology in a battle of insults displays his ignorance of the principles and nature of classical rhetoric. (5-6)

Des Périers establishes the tone of the text in keeping with its subject early on, and, while he does use some Latin, it is, in most cases, intended as part of the joke or spoken by a central figure in the narration – the Regent interjects a great deal of Latin into his thoughts and speech, furthering the idea that his rhetoric is limited to an academic, rather than a “real-life” context, but Des Périers seems to know that his audience would grasp at least most of the terms used. Further, the Regent has no sense of what is “apt” or appropriate to the situation, and appears to lack what Cicero referred to as “*prudentia*” (“practical sagacity” 168-169).³²² Other examples appear throughout: in Tale 14, a lawyer who often “latinisoit le François et francisoit le latin” (72) speaks to his servants in his bifurcated Latin. Already, his ability to communicate effectively is impaired by his lack of natural ability and, especially, by his inadequate understanding of the training he has received. Obviously, the servants do not understand his meaning, but the maid asks one of the clerks, her lover, to act as a translator for her. As expected, a series of miscommunications eventually occur, often in front of company, and the lawyer is laughed at by different sets of guests.³²³ In the first instance, the clerk purposely

mistranslates so that she gives him her master's pâté, which she was supposed to save for later. While the clerk bears a responsibility for the lie, it is the lawyer who created a scenario of which the clerk could take advantage. Because of his lack of fluency in both languages, and his inability to understand his audience, the lawyer defeats his own desire to appear erudite and becomes the butt of several jokes. A command of one's audience and of one's abilities is thus essential in Des Périers' world, and his educated readers are invited to laugh knowingly at their counterparts' misadventures among the less educated.

Another example occurs in Tale 76, in which a young lawyer becomes a lecturer; in his desire to prepare – and for fear of failure – he practices daily, for several weeks, in a cabbage field, envisioning the cabbages as students. When it is finally time to appear before the students, he feels prepared, but seeing them “en chaire,” he panics and “avant qu’il eust dict une douzaine de motz, il demeura tout court, qu’il ne sçavoit plus ou il en estoit” (270-271) (“before he could say a dozen words, he was so nonplussed that he was at a complete loss [in his speech]” 177). All that he can say is “*Domini, ego bene video quod non estis caules*” (271) (“Gentlemen, I see that you are not cabbages” 177). Like the Regent in Tale 63, the young lawyer has confused his audience and forgotten his speech, in a failure of *memoria*.³²⁴ Interestingly, Des Périers does translate this Latin sentence into French for his audience, perhaps he does not expect them to understand the lowly term “cabbages,” or perhaps it is another play on the unexpected and a means to emphasize the final joke. We can see that the author's engagement with his own audience appears conscious, pre-meditated and exemplary of his understanding of *aptum* in classical rhetoric.

The appended tales offer some awareness of the importance of audience as well. In Tale 126, for example, a young man gives in to luxury during his time at university to the detriment of his studies.³²⁵ When his father passes away, he is called home and asks his father's friends and relatives to support his retention of a counselor's position, to which they agree, because they are under the assumption that he has successfully completed his work. When the young man is turned down for the position and told to return to his studies, he takes offense, and, with further aid from friends and family, pursues the matter repeatedly, involves the king, and, from a pulpit "pour ce faict" insults the court several times, once in Latin: "*Lapidem quem reprobaverunt aedificantes, hic factus est in caput anguli*" (388) ("The stone rejected by those who / Have charge of the building and all / Has been set down and installed too / In the central part of the hall" 244). Here, he claims power over those who initially rejected him, and, trusting that his distant connections to the king will supplant any professional exigencies, is convinced that he will ultimately receive a position of greater importance than the council members themselves. The young man believes that he has outwitted his detractors, but one of the elderly members responds likewise: "*a domino factum est istud, et est mirabile in oculis nostris*" (389) ("That's a heavenly creation / Made by the God of gods, 'tis true, / And a marvelous formation / Who is presented to our view" 244), likening the young man's intelligence to that of the stone. The tale ends with a moralizing statement by the narrator about how the youth's arrogance was put in its right place. In this case, the young man was overtaken by conceit, but we must also note that he did not respect his audience on several levels, and, believing he could outwit experienced, learned men with his own small amount of education.

This last example shows that, perhaps on some level, the later editor might have understood and tried to prolong Des Périers' game with his audience (and the notion of audience) in his selection of tales. Triboulet reappears in a couple of the additions (92, 98) and serves to make the king laugh with his witty but simple observations and antics, as is his purpose. However, there do not appear to be many other examples in which consideration of one's audience is so central, so we cannot be certain that audience was thus a precise concern for the editor's selection. The fact that this particular tale does not have any identified literary origin also puts it in stark contrast with the other additions: the editor's intentions remain unclear. Yet, this tale is among those that were added after the first thirty-two, and could therefore reflect an interest in either reawakening certain aspects of Des Périers' original that were hastily ignored in the first expanded edition, or in underlining the contrast between Des Périers' work and the appended tales as a whole, or some combination thereof.

The audience, however, was also emphasized in Estienne's work, and in the appended tales, which derived from the *Apologie pour Herodote*. The *Apologie's* narrator engaged his audience by expecting them to fill in the blanks, so to speak, for some of the moral questions elicited by the examples. Of course, the frame of each chapter served as a means for guiding the reader, but logic and reason were still required (Boudou, *Mars et les Muses*, 126-128). In addition, Estienne chose to exploit Cicero's advice about laughter as a means of engaging the audience (*De Oratore II*, 129-132). In the appended tales, however, some of the little asides Estienne interjects are eliminated. Thus we note the removal of several dialogic elements from Chapter 21 ("De la lubricité et paillardise des gens de l'Eglise") to Tale 92, for example. In the portions that surround what became

Tale 92, Estienne poses questions: “Mais pour retourner à ces gentils prescheurs, de quel language pensons-nous qu’ils usoyent en leur privé, quand ils parloyent ainsi salement en public?” (“But to return to these noble preachers, what kind of language do we think they used in private when they spoke so inappropriately in public?” 545); “Mais dont vient cela (dira quelcun) que ces povres Cordeliers sont volontiers mis en jeu, plustost que nuls autres?” (“But where does this come from (one would say), that these poor friars are more easily made fun of than anyone else?” 546). Comments such as these abound in Estienne’s text, and we see him engage with the reader, but continually guiding his or her understanding of the story. Even when he encounters something that is funny, Estienne does not entirely forget his self-imposed role as a moral guide. One of Estienne’s primary criticisms of Des Périers – that he distanced the reader from God by extolling the virtues of laughter for its own sake – led to the development of the *Apologie pour Herodote* as a “correction” of these kinds of errors, but Estienne ultimately reverses some of his own argument by enjoying the tales and engaging the reader’s understanding in a less dogmatic manner.

To return to the main text, Des Périers’ convincing argument about the importance of laughter frames other elements in the “preamble.” In particular, his insistence that any one person’s interpretation may be invalid for another person becomes central to the collection as a whole, and again evokes Erasmian themes in which all interpretation is subjective and impossible to replicate exactly, except by false imitation. Cave explains that for Erasmus (in his *Ciceronianus*), “Ciceronian discourse is authentic, according to Bulephorus, only when understood as the property of the living person who was Cicero” (41): for another person to claim the same level of authenticity is simply a

form of insanity. By contrast, merry stories can be appropriated at will, replicated without undue concern for their textual authenticity and intended meaning; each reader's enjoyment of the text is unique and valid in its own right, but also carries a certain *inauthenticity*, as a result of successive appropriations and transformations - by the author-narrator, who shares these stories from various sources, and by the reader, who enjoys them. The genre lends itself to this treatment, as a form of social "marchandises," and while many tales evoke their intertextual relationships with other collections and traditions, they are enjoyed in this particular collection according to the ways the narrator manipulates them, as something that readers are - jokingly - invited to manipulate in turn.

The point is repeated in several ways and at different times. For example, it appears in a light-hearted instructional aside in the first *nouvelle*, as the narrator guides his presumably female readers in the best methods for selecting the most appropriate tales, including one suggestion to ask male relatives to censor the collection (17-18).³²⁶ The humorous, fictional exchange he creates does not actually include any censorship, "Mon frere, marquez moy ceulx qui ne sont pas bons, et y faictes une croix." "Mon cousin, cestuy cy est il bon?" "Ouy." "Et cestuy ci?" "Ouy" (17) ("Brother, check those that aren't proper and mark them with a cross." "Cousin, is this one suitable?" "Yes." "And this one?" "Yes." 37). All of the tales, as viewed through the narrator's suggested lens, are good. He warns the women not to trust men's opinions about what is or is not appropriate, and he effectively pokes fun at the exclusionary, yet inherently contradictory social ideals regarding stories and female readership: first, women are the primary readership for this genre; second, this genre is inappropriate for their delicate

sensibilities. All of these notions are challenged by virtue of the various interpretations possible and, in the preceding passage, the narrator jokes with the reader that many of the stories could be understood in a variety of ways:

Lisez hardiment, dames et damoyselles: il n'y ha rien qui ne soit honneste: Mais si d'aventure il y en ha quelques unes d'entres vous qui soyent trop tendrettes, et qui ayent peur de tomber en quelques passages trop gaillars: je leur conseille qu'elles se les facent eschansonner par leurs freres, ou par leurs cousins: afin qu'elles mangent peu de ce qui est trop appetissant. 17

Read confidently, ladies and maidens, there is nothing indecent here. But if perchance there are some among you who are too delicate, and are afraid of stumbling upon some overly bawdy passages, I suggest to them that they have their brothers or their cousins sample them first so that they consume little of what is too appetizing. (translation mine)

The tales are intended to be funny and are harmless, but they may not be, depending on any reader's individual sensibilities, and yet they should be, since any attempt to censor laughter evaporates in laughter. Let us note, also, how the narrator shifts from the second person to the third: "you" should read, but "those who are delicate" – he implies that such a person could not be the actual reader herself, and that, therefore, the subsequent suggestion is, at least in some ways, invalid. Even the passages that some might consider inappropriate carry another kind of appeal, and therefore, the exercise is pointless. For Des Périers, tales are intended for everyone and in whatever way each person finds pleasure in them. Many recent critics enjoy Des Périers' fluid approach to understanding and interpretation that actually demonstrates, in their view, a theoretical relationship, if

not a structural one, with the *Heptaméron*.³²⁷ Des Périers suggests throughout the collection that people see into things what they choose to see, and in accordance with their own character,³²⁸ and we can *all*, at least potentially, laugh at this perpetual divergence, if we care to become aware of it.

Des Périers' narrator often makes references to the different ways one might interpret any given story. The limitless, somehow indefinite voices of interpretation are incarnated here in the narrator's play on understanding. Cave shows how Erasmian and Humanist thought indulges in these kinds of open-ended readings:

Indeed, the perpetual deferment of sense encourages – even constitutes – *copia*, defined as the ability of language to generate detours and deflections. Textual abundance (the extension of the surface) opens up in its turn an indefinite plurality of possible senses. The intention (will, *sententia*) which was supposed to inform the origin of a text and to guarantee the ultimate resolution of its *sensus* remains for ever [sic] suspended, or submerged, in the flow of words. (111)

When meaning is assigned, it is still somehow left open as part of the interlocution between narrator and reader, and / or, in some readings of Des Périers, the fictional interlocutor.³²⁹ Several examples call for different kinds of interpretation. Some of the narrator's interjections derive from the play between truth and credibility: "Je ne sçay pas si m'en croyez, Mais il n'est pas damné qui ne le croit" (248) ("I don't know if you believe me, but you're not damned if you don't" 166); "Je vous laisse à penser s'il est vray" (276) ("I'll leave it up to you as to whether it's true" 180). Others suggest, as Arnould notes, "l'idée d'un recueil à options, recelant de multiples versions et aventures

possibles” (“the idea of a choose-your-own collection that harbors multiple possible versions and adventures” 32): “Car les uns disent [...]” (275) (“indeed, some say [...]” 179); “Les autres disent que [...]” (276) (“others say that [...]” 180); “Mais pourquoy dy je ceste là, quand il en faisoit un million de meilleures? Mais j’en puis bien dire encore une ou deux” (140) (“But why do I mention that one, when he did a million better ones? But I can still tell one or two more” 108).³³⁰ As we saw in the preamble, our narrator mocks the idea that one reader could potentially decide for another which tales are acceptable, because, we presume, his experience cannot be the same as hers, but at the same time, the narrator is acknowledging that the selection of tales presented here is already being defined, if not censored by his own choices. Yet, he seems to open up the idea that while his selection is limited, *de force*, by the written medium, the reader might take a step further and recall other tales, other collections, with which they are familiar as part of the tradition, or, perhaps, other versions of the same tales.

Further, the endings of the tales do not forcibly invite the reader to a definitive interpretation of the story per the author’s guided influence. It is true that some of the tales end with the traditional, almost formulaic, addition of a moral or proverb,³³¹ but others feature representations of a “mauvais lecteur” (Gaudin, 191-194), and still others provide further information, an introduction to the next tale, or even a simple invitation to laughter (189). Sozzi points out that such variety is, in many ways, unique to Des Périers’ approach to the genre, and a way for him to express his ironic tone and independence from tradition (251-254): “La ‘leçon’ morale, conçue selon le modèle traditionnel, n’est formulée dans les *Devis* que quatre ou cinq fois; de plus, elle est souvent assaisonnée d’un certain ton de parodie” (“The moral ‘lesson,’ conceived according to the traditional

model, is only formulated in the *Devis* four or five times; what is more, it is often seasoned with a certain tone of parody” 252).³³² This is true, to an extent, but the function of the moral at the end of a *conte* is not forcibly to reveal an actual understanding of the text, as in the *exemplum*, but to provide a structured ending to the narrative (Mary-Jane Stearns Schenck, “Narrative Structure in the Exemplum, Fabliau, and Nouvelle”); it is therefore interchangeable with other ending types, so long as the narrative is finished, and Des Périers exploits the genre’s flexibility within his collection. At the same time, however, Des Périers seems to take this variability much further by refusing to give in to one formula or another for the sake of consistency.³³³

Des Périers’ focus is not on a strict, generically dictated structure in the Proppian sense,³³⁴ but on his (narrator’s) relationship with the reader, and his ability to make her laugh. Several examples might illustrate this.³³⁵ In the very first tale, the narrator ends with a rhetorical question about wisdom and folly, specifically in relation to the *plaisantin*’s response to the priest: “Que voulez vous de plus naïf que cela? quelle plus grande félicité? Certes d’autant plus grande qu’elle est octroyée à si peu d’hommes” (19) (“What greater simplicity could you ask for? What greater bliss? Surely all the greater in that it is bestowed upon so few men” 38). Tale 14, on the contrary, merely finishes with the end of the narrative and a brief comment about how the lawyers’ friends and colleagues laughed at him for his foolishness: “Monsieur, ce sont des beufz et des moutons’ dont elle appresta à rire à toute la presence: principalement quand ilz eurent entendu qu’il apprenoit à sa chambriere à parler en pluriel nombre” (76) (“Sir, cows and lambs.’ Her reply made everyone present laugh, particularly when they heard he was teaching his chambermaid to speak in the pluries number” 71). Tale 76, similarly, ends

with an explanation of the young jurist's inability to communicate with his actual students, and thus highlights the ironic humor of the situation: "Estant au jardin, il prenoit bien le cas que les choulz fussent escolliers, mais estant en chaire il ne pouvoit prendre le cas que les escolliers fussent des choulz" (271) ("When he was in the garden, he could assume that the cabbages were students; but, when he was on the rostrum, he couldn't assume that the students were cabbages" 177). In each of these cases, a "moral" in the purest sense is left out, while added emphasis on a humorous aspect of the tale or anecdote remains confined within the narrative. In the first example, rather than extracting a generic moral meaning, the added comments emphasize the specific value of the story just told, and the narrator's relationship with the reader is reinforced by the rhetorical question, which evokes the conversational tone found throughout. We encountered the same type of rhetorical question in Estienne's later work, but to a very different effect, because while it may suggest a conversational tone, it is one in which the narrator serves as a moral guide. In the next example, *Des Périers* simply underlines the end of the anecdote and, by announcing how the witnesses laughed at the lawyer, implicitly invites the readers to do the same, thus forming a stronger sense of community.³³⁶ In the last case, the narrator again infuses narration itself with a conversational tone (of the "Get it?" variety) that is meant to make the reader laugh.

We can find a similar variety of endings in the appended tales. Some, as in the main corpus, end with a moralizing statement. Tale 126 summarizes the young man's rebuff: "Par ceste responce, il reprima tellement l'audace du jeune homme, que depuis il ne luy advint de haranguer de telle sorte en une si honneste compaignie" (389) ("With this answer, he put down the young man's audacity to such an extent that he never spoke

again in that manner in such an august assembly” 244). In this instance, the protagonist learns his lesson through embarrassment, and therein lies, for the reader, the lesson of the tale.³³⁷ Another example is Tale 93, where a thief who tricks people by selling their own cows and asses is caught: “Sur ce propos, il fut empoigné, et, toutes les susdictes choses averées par sa confession, fut executé par justice, comme il meritoit” (324) (“With these remarks, he was seized, and, all the above mentioned [sic] things having been confirmed by his confession, he was executed by law, as he deserved” 209).³³⁸ Other examples are more light-hearted, such as the tale of the man who, through a gross misunderstanding, is given an enema by a local doctor, and finds the donkey he was searching for (Tale 94): “[...] par les chemins publicoit le grand sçavoir et prudence de sondict medecin, et comment, par son moyen, il avoit retrouvé son asne: dont le medecin fut encores prisé advantage et plus estimé que jamais n’avoit esté” (288) (“[...] meanwhile, along the road he publicized the great learning and wisdom of his doctor, and how, with his help, he’d found his ass; consequently, the doctor was prized even more and esteemed more than he’d ever been” (210).³³⁹ The last sentence is ironic, but doesn’t spell out the irony: instead, it remains purely factual. Tale 98³⁴⁰ reminds us of the “plaisantin” of Tale 1 in its treatment of Triboulet: “Et ainsi vescu toujours folliant jusques à la mort, qui fut bien regrettée, car on dit qu’il estoit plus heureux que sage” (334) (“And thus he lived, constantly playing the fool until his death (which was greatly regretted), for it is said that he was happier than a wise man” 214). We must note, however, that this comment amounts to a clear reversal of the tongue-in-cheek “wisdom” that is presented in the first *nouvelle*.

In several other instances, the interpolative editor ends with hints of a community-forming effect similar to those found in Des Périers' collection. Thus, in Tale 101: "Il disoit cela de telle grace, qu'il provoquoit un chascun de la compagnie à rire, tant il estoit copieux en dits et faits" (339) ("He said it so wittingly that he made everyone in the group laugh because he was so amusing in word and deed" 217). Ironic emphasis is found in Tale 106:³⁴¹ "Par ce moyen, ce gentil medecin fut payé de son abbé, lequel il avoit, en peu de temps, deliberé faire vivre et mourir, ou mourir et vivre, en vray medecin" (350) ("By this means, this fine doctor was paid by his abbot, whom, in no time at all, he'd decided to let live and die, or die and live, just like a true doctor" 223) There is no lesson here beyond mild sarcasm, but as we can see, there is at least some continuity between Des Périers and his (second?) posthumous editor, in terms of seeking variable endings. We should add that this type of variability is not, per se, unusual to the genre;³⁴² what is unusual is the systemic way in which Des Périers plays on it within one collection.

It is hardly surprising, therefore, that the recycling of Estienne's work in this expanded collection, results in a loosening of the moral emphasis found in *Apologie pour Herodote*. Many stories do still contain moral notes to them, such as we found in the ending of Tale 93, but without Estienne's frame, the emphasis shifts to the tale itself; the appearance of any such moral becomes a part of the tale's structure, further removing the co-opted work from its own origins, and from Estienne's established goals. As we saw above with the transformation of Chapter 21 to Tale 92, only the narrative remains in the *Nouvelles Recreations*, and the elimination, or at least limitation, of Estienne's transitions and moral rhetoric creates a different product that conforms more easily to Des Périers'

work. In another example, the interjection noted above as the ending of Tale 106 is an editorial addition, and is not present in Estienne's Chapter 16, which deals specifically with "larrecins des marchands, et autres gens de divers estats." In the *Nouvelles Recreations*, the tale is introduced as "Des moyens dont usa un medecin, afin d'estre payé d'un abbé malade, lequel il avoit pansé" (349) ("Of the means which a doctor used, in order to be paid by a sick abbot, whom he had treated" 222). The frame for each alone realigns the same story for different purposes, and the ending added in the *Recreations* actually focuses on the humor of the doctor's ruse, rather than the thieving characteristics of doctors, abbots, and various other "estats," which is the focus of the *Apologie's* version. Just as Estienne obfuscates the work of his predecessors, and transforms it for his own purposes, his work is subjected to shifting principles in the *Nouvelles Recreations*.

In the main collection, then, the narrator's voice is governed by subject, tone and audience, rather than generic constraints, which are, in the case of tales, relatively malleable anyway. As a result, the endings are variable, and reflect the importance of tone – of the continuous "badinage" that Cicero calls *cavillatio*³⁴³ – whether they choose to emphasize "ruse," "gaieté," "justice immanente," and resort to "poncifs," and "clichés," all of which mitigate the irony of the situations and add an element of comic leniency to the text (Sozzi 371-374): none of these possibilities are truly intended as a lesson, and each tale may express several perspectives while inviting us to laugh at the foibles we all share.

Sometimes, the characters themselves seem to carry the last word; at the end of Tale 63, it is the fishwife, yelling at the Regent for having brought a written prompt to their insult contest: "Ha mercy Dieu dit elle, tu ne sçais plus ou tu en es. Parle bon

Françoys. Je te respondray bien: Grand niaiz, Parle bon Françoys, ha tu apportes un rollet, va estudier, maistre Jehan: Va, tu ne sçais pas ta leçon” (236) (““Ha! Merciful heavens!’ she said, ‘you no longer know what you’re doing; speak good French, I’ll answer you, you big ninny! speak good French. Ah! You carry a scroll! Go study it, you fathead! Go on, you don’t know your lesson!”” 159). The fishwife’s colleagues join in, and in the tale’s last words, the Regent leaves, “sans regarder derriere soy” (237) (“without looking behind him” 159), because he knows that he has been defeated, and is eager to return to his own comfort zone within the university (“au college de Montaigu”), where he can find success in a cloistered existence. The idea is that all his years of study did not give him a practical understanding of the world or a true mastery of his own vocabulary, but there are numerous ways to understand the finer points of this ending (and, as Kasprzyk notes, the Regent actually wins in another version of the tale). Thompson focuses on the fishwife’s victory in the debate, and on the tale’s social (as well as proto-feminist) dimension:

the exchange of insults implies an egalitarian relationship; a gentleman does not lower himself to argue with a peasant. Whereas [D]u Fail puts his angry peasant women on a par with other angry peasant women or with infuriated male criminals, Des Périers pits his fishwife against a representative of the Parisian university (“The Querelle in the Marketplace” 7).

The weight of satire obviously falls on the educated Regent, and on his failings. The loser is further degraded by having lost to a woman: her “vulgarity and [...] gender will humiliate him all the more” (8). Still, the “diablesse” (she-devil), whose foul language

doesn't need a "promptuaire," is not pictured in a positive light, and the tale also insists on the fact that the Regent was holding his ground as long as he relied on memory. The "rollet" did him in, along with an attempt to switch to a higher register ("Alecto, Megera, Thesiphone [...] 236): another example of rhetoric forgetting its first command – which is to speak in a manner that fits the situation. In this sense, the Regent's defeat contains a lesson about culture and speech that concerns all readers. Each level of understanding, therefore, is accurate in its own way, and the astute reader will be able to identify different interpretive perspectives.

None of this is to say that Des Périers never leads the reader with his own focus, or with his own set of interventions; those are an integral part of the collection, as Arnould has pointed out ("Le joyeux devis"). Thus, the narrator's transition from one anecdote to the other in Tale 14 insists on open interpretation and underlines his desire to help the reader appreciate it:

On ne sçauroit dire si la Pedisseque fut plus malmenee de son maistre, d'auoir laissé *famuler ce farcime*, Ou si ledit maistre fut mieulx gaudy de ceulx qu'il auoit conuiez, pour auoir parlé latin à sa chambriere en luy recommandant un pasté: ou si la chambriere fut plus marrie contre le clerc qui l'auoit trompee (74).

It would be hard to say whether Pedissèque was bawled out more by her master for having let that forcemeat be *famulied*, or whether the aforesaid master was laughed at more by those he had invited for having spoken Latin to his chambermaid when giving her charge of a delicious pâté, or

whether the chambermaid was put out the most with the clerk who had tricked her. (69)

He follows with a bit more detail about how the maid made up with the clerk the following Sunday, not being able to stay angry for long, and then he shifts into the second anecdote of the lawyer's story. In this instance, there are multiple jokes, even though the whole of the tale seems to center around the lawyer's pedantry, as explained from the beginning. Each joke is supported by the text, and the narrator points out the validity of the competing interpretations. This leads Emily Thompson to argue that narrative interventions in the *Recreations*, including the morals and proverbs, reveal less about the narrator's own view of the material than they do about his engagement with the reader and the tone of the text. "The frequency of the narrators' interventions and their obvious attempts to manipulate the narratees suggest a shift towards emphasizing the relationship between author and reader and the act of narration itself over traditional plots and exemplary historical accounts" ("'Une merveilleuse espece d'animal': Fable and Verisimilitude in Bonaventure des Périer's *Nouvelle récréations et joyeux devis*," 21). That is not to say, however, that any reading one wishes to give is wholly acceptable, or that no lesson at all is contained therein, but that there is, perhaps, a new way of reading such a collection (32-33): one that invites a community to laugh at (and reflect on) itself rather than at the expense of designated targets.

In this case, for example, the maid's behavior could be seen in two different lights. First, she appears to be a clever strategist: as an uneducated peasant, she finds a way to negotiate her master's incomprehensible demands. While her social status is static, her ability to function within the confines of that status is not. However, she is still

limited by the confines of her class and gender (more so than the fearless fishwife), and further restrained by her dependency on the clerk who betrays her. She punishes him briefly for his transgression, but it does not last:

Mais quand elle se fut bien ravisée qu'elle ne se pouvoit passer de luy, elle fut contraincte d'appoincter le dimanche matin que tout le monde estoit à la grande messe fors qu'eulx deux: et mangerent ensemble ce qui estoit demeuré du jeudi et raccorderent leurs vielles comme bons amys. (74)

But when she thought better of it and realized that she couldn't do without him, she was forced to come to terms on Sunday morning when everyone, except the two of them, was attending high mass, and they ate together what was left over from Thursday and went back to fiddling together like good friends. (69-70)

Ultimately, her rational calculation and irrational appetites converge to impose a settlement. So, while the bulk of Tale 14 does not focus on the maid, the interjection of this aside in between the two anecdotes serves partly to transition (so that the reader knows the maid will still use the clerk as her translator and lover), and partly to show how, in a situation like this, strategic thinking and lascivious nature are one and the same. The reader's pity for the chambermaid who was tricked by one party and abused by another diminishes as she shows herself to be both resourceful and unrestrained. Yet we see again that multiple types are present in this tale, and that the joke changes its colors, depending on which type the reader focuses on, while appreciating how they are all coming together.

Interventions are not unheard of in the appended tales, either, and several examples may demonstrate this. Often, such narrative plays come at the end of this set of the tales, and, as in the first ninety, remind the reader of the narrator's presence: for example, "Plusieurs autres petits devis faisoit le gentil fallot, lesquels seroient trop longs à reciter" (338) ("The affable fellow told several other jokes, but they'd be too long to relate" 216). In other cases, such comments open the tale up to multiple interpretations: "Or, si cela estoit bien faict ou non, j'en laisse la decision à leurs sçavans juges" (362) ("Now, as to whether that was well done or not, I leave the decision up to their learned judges" 230); "On dit que" (399) ("They say" 250). However, we have to note that comments of this kind are much rarer than in the main corpus of the *Nouvelles Recreations*, and the relationship between the narrator and his audience is loosened by their infrequency. Like so many of the aspects we are noting, though, perhaps this has more to do with the genre's apparent lack of structure (one can always add tales to a collection like this) than with any conscious editorial decision regarding the interpolations; it appears most likely that both factors played a part in the development of the appended collection.

The order of the tales

Let us return, finally, to Des Périers' claim that there is no order to the tales: this claim appears to be more tongue-in-cheek than authentic. While, as we have pointed out, a piece-meal reading of whichever tales one chooses would not be unheard of in the sixteenth century, it is not the only possible approach. John Harris has shown that Des

Périers uses numerous connecting devices to guide the reader from one tale to the next in a continuous, extensive reading:

It [the disparity between the implied author's statements and the structure of the work] is, indeed, quite a different picture which comes to light as a result of this activity: it shows a work held together, beneath its apparent incoherence, not only by the attitude of the implied author to his audience, but also by carefully constructed sequences of stories. The structure created by the author contributes perhaps more to the unity and continuity of the collection than the frequent comments of his second self, either as the implied creator of the collection or as the witty narrator of the stories. (131-132)

Such an approach would indicate that Des Périers' primary argument about laughter, as well as the underlying arguments about laughter's universality and the authenticity of each reader's enjoyment of the text, were in fact elaborated upon in a developed, disposition-conscious fashion. Three of the tales we have looked at do not seem linked to others by such a connective structure, but we do find it within Tale 14, where the narrator moves from one anecdote to the other, each of which is connected by the central figures of the pedantic lawyer, the maid, and the clerk. However, the narrator could easily have separated the anecdotes, as the first ends on a clear note with the reprisal of the maid's affair with the clerk, and the second begins with a simple, "Advint un autre jour" (75). Here, structuring multiple anecdotes under one tale, and under one title ("De l'advocat qui parloit latin à sa chambriere: et du clerc qui estoit le truchement" 72), encourages the flow from one to the next, and discourages the reader from skipping the second narrative.

There are quite simply many examples of this type of joined anecdotes and narratives in the collection.³⁴⁴ Harris also points out that the location (Le Mans) and contrasting theme of Tale 15 (“where an educated person is not so far removed from an uneducated one as to make their dialogue mutually incomprehensible” 138) tie the two *nouvelles* together.

Connected series of tales are the primary focus of Harris’ study, and examples such as the link between the final tales (88, 89 and 90) elucidate his point. In Tales 88 and 89, there is a monkey (“who is taught to speak” and “who drinks medicine”). Tales 89 and 90 each deal with the motif of drinking and thirst (“monkey who drinks” and “thirsty mule who in drinking is the instrument of the husband’s vengeance on his unfaithful wife” 139). Harris thus demonstrates that Tales 88 and 90, which have no apparent connection on their own, are tied together through the intermediary Tale 89.³⁴⁵ We have already seen that the “preamble” includes a brief anecdote about “le plaisantin,” which is tied, at least through the appearance of the “folz,” to the second, and that loosely, or directly, as the case may be, Erasmus’ Folly is also tied to the plaisantin example. In addition, narrative interjections are a means of framing the collection, and thereby guide the reader through a pre-conceived development of the text. As we have seen above, several themes of Des Périers’ central arguments are elaborated upon within the structure of the tales themselves. The collusion of each of these elements leads one to agree with Harris about the order of tales in the *Nouvelles Recreations*, whose author demonstrates his clever mastery of classical rhetoric within a genre that defies it, and seems, more often than not, to make fun of it.

Should we concede that Des Périers intentionally created an order to the tales, or at least, provided the impetus to keep the reader moving forward, rather than skipping

around, we must ask to what extent that same approach might apply in the thirty-nine appended tales. Interestingly, if we apply Harris' logic to the added tales, we begin to see similar patterns emerge. For example, Tale 93 tells of a thief who steals first a cow, then an ass. In Tale 94, a farmer searches for his ass, with the "help" of a local doctor. In Tale 95, a superstitious doctor is married to a woman who tricks him into having sex more often. In this way, these three tales are connected by means of various motifs. To carry that even further, the first of the appended tales (Tale 91) includes a tricky wife who convinces her husband that she was not visiting the local priest to cheat on him, and monks are present in Tale 92. Tales 91 to 95 are framed by the presence of tricky wives and are thus connected. Many other such connections could also be made at other points in this section: Tales 112, 113 and 114 all contain religious figures who are tricked. Trickery, it would seem, appears more frequently in the appended tales than in the first ninety, but this is not unusual for the genre, and is certainly an element found quite frequently in the main corpus. Thieves also appear frequently, as nine of the twenty stories borrowed from the *Apologie pour Herodote* come from Estienne's chapter on "larrecins,"³⁴⁶ and two more (106 and 116) are from Chapter 16, "Des larrecins des marchands." This could go yet a step further, as Boudou points out Estienne's correlation between the word "larcin" and adultery, which would connect all of the tales from Chapter 15, at least in a distant, roundabout way, to Tale 90 of the original collection (*Mars et les Muses* 135).

The apocryphal editor might have used the same method to tie the primary collection to the secondary one. Tale 90 of the base text and Tale 91 both deal with adulterous female figures. In the first, the wife is punished for her transgressions through

her husband's ruse. In the next, the wife's subterfuge enables her and the lecherous priest to escape her husband's wrath, but it is, effectively, the priest who receives the punishment in not getting what he wanted and in being chased from his own bed. So, while the new tales, as we have seen, remain visibly appended, there is a connection between the base text's concluding tale and the apocryphal beginning one. In terms of general *dispositio*, we can see that the editor of the later versions might well have considered the role of order, or at least succession, within Des Périers' work, and attempted to maintain a similar flow in the additions.

As we have seen, the genre of the *nouvelle* tends to remain open to a variety of proposed endings, and both Des Périers and his later editor seem to exploit that notion. In terms of the work's overall conclusion, though, either proposed ending to the collection is quite different from Tale 90. The latter, we remember, is the story of a man who enacts vengeance upon his adulterous wife by refusing water for her mule, and by putting salt in its oats, so that when they pass a river, the mule, taken with thirst, dives into the raging water with the wife astride and drowns them both. Considering the *dénouement*, one could presume that this was a pure vengeance tale in which a clever idea, which might have been funny, turns out to have fatal consequences. However, the narrator does not focus on the narrative alone, but inserts it in a long (three full folios) discourse on feminine fragility and susceptibility to adultery, and the diversity of male reactions to it. The story is inserted towards the end, and Kasprzyk sums up several of the arguments that have been noted on this tale, which originates in the *Cent Nouvelles nouvelles* (*Nouvelle* 47). The story derives from the *exemplum* tradition, as pointed out by Sozzi, as

well as from various elements of the *Querelle des femmes* and the *contes moralisés*.³⁴⁷

The narrator ends the tale with another discursive paragraph and an assessment of the husband's behavior:

Voyla une maniere de se venger d'une femme qui est un peu cruelle, et inhumaine. Mais que voulez-vous? Il fasche à un mary d'estre cocu en sa propre personne. [...] Quant est de moy, je ne sçauroids pas qu'en dire, il n'y ha celuy qui ne se trouve bien empesché quand il y est. Parquoy j'en laisse à penser et à faire à ceux à qui le cas touche. (312)³⁴⁸

That's one way to avenge oneself on a wife but it's a little cruel and inhuman. But what do you expect? It angers a husband to see himself a cuckold. [...] As for me, I can't say anything about it: there's no one who isn't at a loss when it's his turn. Therefore, I leave these thoughts and actions up to those who are involved. (199)

The narrator draws on the relationship he had established early on with the reader, and seems to go back and forth in his assessment of the behavior of both parties involved. Once again, he presents a tale that he acknowledges could easily be used as a moral lesson, but he first confronts the lesson, and then refutes or at least problematizes it, by pointing out that multiple understandings of the situation are possible and acceptable. By “leav[ing] these thoughts [...] to those who are involved,” Des Périers shows that the argument might continue endlessly, as the “involved parties” would sit undoubtedly on opposite sides of such cases. The laugh, if one is to be had, comes at the reader's expense insofar as he or she risks an interpretation. Overall, we note that the tale and the discourse it illustrates are not funny. On the contrary, they remind us that the material of *nouvelles*

may just as well lend itself to tragic stories and real-life situations. Yet the message remains consistent: in real life as well, it is wiser to laugh, rather than cry, at what happens to us, and more generally at the diversity of human behavior. The happy-go-lucky narrator reminds the audience that the entire collection is not intended to be a one-size-fits-all moral lesson, but an invitation to laugh as a form of “medecine” for all of our ills. One is not meant to waste time contemplating the nature of the tales, but any reader who does should be aware that each of these *nouvelles* calls for nuance and complex arguments by way of the very quality of the laughter it elicits – or may elicit. A “bad reading,” it would seem, comes when the reader refuses to understand this basic principle, inherent in the rhetoric of *cavillatio*.

In yet another example, we have seen the transformation of Tale 106 from a moral tale of socially acceptable, if not spiritually acceptable, thievery by a doctor and a priest to an entertaining ruse tale, and nothing more. The editor of the later *Nouvelles Recreations* begins to show his own “good” reading of the collection, thereby departing from Estienne’s approach and apparent failings. Tale 92 is even more exemplary of the editor’s manipulation of the *Apologie pour Herodote* in that it does not take the story nearly word-for word as Jacob claimed (see 321, note 2), but it again selected narrative elements, reordered them and even transformed several key aspects of the story so as to bring it closer to the spirit of the original collection.

First, a temporal shift occurs. In the *Apologie*, the story is set during Henri II’s reign and the court fool is supposed to be Brusquet (vol. 1, 545 and note 48). However, in the *Nouvelles*, the story takes place during François I’s reign, and the fool is again Triboulet (321-322). These two connections to the original collection are reinforced by

the story's placement in the additional tales; it is second, just as the second *nouvelle* of the original text has Triboulet as a character, and is thus connected to the first tale, which includes the plaisantin. Finally, Tale 92's ending actually precedes the story in the *Apologie*, just after the very rhetorical question we cited above. In this case, then, Estienne's take is less amusing, and more moralizing. When the joke about monks building nunneries (with the many children they propagate there) appears at the end in the *Nouvelles*, it is reduced to its most humorous element. Again, the editors transform the *Apologie* into something which conforms more clearly to the *Nouvelles*, and Des Periers' original argument continues to hold weight within the appended edition.

The final tales in each edition, however, do not derive from the *Apologie*, but do feed off of different aspects of the original collection. In the 1567 edition, Tale 122 is the last story. In this variant "ending," a man tricks an innkeeper into giving him his meal, quite literally, for a song. Taken directly from Poggio, this particular tale provides no discourse or interpretation of any kind. It is, like so many tales in the full collection, extremely short and the narrator provides no set-up; he begins directly with the hungry traveler. Not only is this different from Tale 90 of the original ending, but from the majority of the tales contained therein. Sozzi tells us that only twenty-four of the ninety begin "*in medias res*." In most tales, Des Périers uses a variety of openings, just as he does endings, and they often coincide with some form of relationship, either between the narrator and the reader, or between tales (246-254), as Harris' study also pointed out. In contrast, no fewer than twenty-eight of the thirty-nine added *nouvelles* begin precisely with the narrative; there is, in this way, a clear stylistic difference between Des Périers and his later editor. For the end of this particular tale, by the same token, no interpretation

or commentary are given: “Et, à l’instant, se departit sans payer et sans que son hoste l’en requist” (378) (“And he immediately left without paying and without his innkeeper asking him to” 238). The tale focuses on the traveler’s ruse, and elicits only laughter, in keeping with the proposed contract found at the beginning of the whole collection. However, this minimal ending does not acknowledge the other aspects of Des Périers’ argument in the first *nouvelle*, and thereby illustrates the kind of ad hoc, random addition of tales so many critics, like Sozzi and Kasprzyk, have denounced in the later editions. Still, the emphasis on (and reduction to) a mere case of pleasant ruse might also be considered an implicit commentary on Estienne’s heavy-handedness, which the editors have tried to mitigate or eliminate throughout. In this sense, while the new ending does not repeat Des Périers’ argument as seen in the original, it may reinforce it nonetheless, by contrast with Estienne’s model, and show the “true” value of unpretentious tales as entertainment.

Tale 129 is the last tale in the lengthiest and most common editions, and is a version of the *Peau d’Ane* story later recounted by Charles Perrault. In this avatar, the family tries to prevent the marriage of their daughter Pernette to a young gentleman, because it makes her older sisters unhappy, but the parents’ treatment of the girl increases her lover’s desire and attracts the aid of an army of ants, who pick up the grains she is supposed to collect, one at a time. This particular tale is, like many of the added tales, situated outside of France (here, Italy), which decisively belies Des Périers’ claim to offer a specifically French collection; this distances the tale from the first *nouvelle* and underlines the genre’s universal quality - that is, that there is nothing exclusively French to this kind of story.³⁴⁹ Estienne also borrowed many tales from Italy, so, while this story

does not derive from his work, it may remind the reader of the *Apologie pour Herodote*, at least indirectly. Again, however, as in Tale 122, there is no narrative conjecture on the meaning or moral to the story: it begins, it follows its natural arc and it ends. A modern reader, familiar with Perrault's or Grimms' versions, will note that the arrival of the ants at the end of this version does not project an a "fairy tale's" air of fantasy; it seems they simply came upon this food source, as ants are wont to do, and carried away the grains without the parents' notice, thereby unwittingly aiding the girl.³⁵⁰

The central focus of the story is on the parents' determination to make their daughter suffer so that the *marchand* can get out of having her marry the neighboring *gentilhomme's* son. The *marchand's* initial refusal is justified, because he understands that the neighbor has no intention of marrying his son to a non-noble,³⁵¹ but his later rejection is purely for the satisfaction of the jealous wife and older daughters, who are guided by their own unjustified selfishness. The presentation of the characters' motivations, however, does not include many narrative comments, and consists of little more than a series of facts that move the intrigue along. Such is the case with the mother's attitude about this marriage: "D'autre part, la mere, qui se repentoit de l'avoir jamais portée en son ventre, ne voulut consentir à ce mariage [...]" (400) ("On the other hand, the mother, who regretted ever having carried her in her womb, refused to agree to this marriage [...]" 251). No reason is presented here, except the mother's own irrationality, which could certainly be condemned. This could easily lead to an "histoire tragique," in contrast with Tale 90, where a tragic dénouement was subjected to a nonchalant commentary. Here we have a happy ending, but it is only due to the ants' intervention, and no clue is given as to its meaning. We may also compare Pernette's

mother to a character like the chambermaid in Tale 14: both women are driven by some form of emotion or desire, but irrational cruelty appears to be the mother's only driving force, while the chambermaid is at least wily enough to obtain a translator so as to get along as well as possible with her employer. Also, as we have seen, the chambermaid's character enables the second anecdote to function, and adds to the humor of the whole story. Nothing of the sort occurs in Tale 129, where characters are "locked" in a set dramatic function, and it is apparent that variant interpretations are not at play. Nor is there a humorous tone, except fleetingly, whenever the tale alludes to the lovers' lovemaking. Laughter is neither the medium, nor the object of study and the tale seems to exist for its own sake, leaving the reader with a very different impression about the *nouvelles* than the one conveyed by the original ending: there can be no doubt that this is an addition, rather than something coming from the original author's hand.

The reader is certainly driven to compassion for Pernette, even without lengthy narrative discourse guiding what he or she should feel, but with its different tone and lack of any commentary, this tale does not seem to "frame" out the collection the way Tales 1 and 90 had done. Many have noted the importance of the absence of a frame in the *Nouvelles Recreations*,³⁵² but we now see that Des Périers does not avoid the idea of a frame altogether; rather, he rejects the notion of a Boccacian *cornice*, and endeavors to open and close his collection with greater subtlety. First, a sonnet appears both before and after the *nouvelles*.³⁵³ Second, the first and last tales illustrate, in different ways, the key elements of the whole: first the appeal of care-free laughter, and then its necessity. For Sozzi, this idea would apply only to the sonnets and the preamble, but our study of Tale 90 demonstrate that in fact all four pieces "fixent, en effet, les traits marquants du recueil:

sa gaîté malicieuse, son refus des soucis, son allure familière et sociable” (“fix, in effect, the collection’s marked traits: malicious gaiety, its refusal of worries, its familiar and sociable air” 241). Taken as a rhetorical whole, the *Nouvelles Recreations* likely illustrate and enact an intentionally conceived argument in favor of laughter. Regarding the appended *nouvelles*, however, we have thus far no clear evidence that the editors fully understood the point of Des Périers’ original work, even though they intentionally mimicked certain aspects of it, or that there is in fact a purposeful connection between the additional and added materials, although some elements, such as the apparent arrangement of several of the tales, including a potential link between Tale 90 (of the original) and Tale 91, suggest that it is at least possible.

More interesting, perhaps, is the seemingly intentional juxtaposition of additional tales of various origins to the original collection. The prominence of Henri Estienne’s work is a key factor in this respect, and one that might even extend to the tales that do not derive from the *Apologie pour Herodote*. Given the relationship between the two authors, and between the two sets of booksellers, we must consider the possibility that the editors are responding to Estienne’s scathing critique of tales and laughter. They might also be pointing out certain flaws in his work, by demonstrating that his tales can still stand on their own, much in the same way Des Périers constructed his collection, and that, much as he tried, Estienne could not fully eliminate the humor from his work. Finally, just as Estienne believed that Erasmus paved the way for Luther and Calvin, it is possible that the producers of the later editions were trying to point out that Des Périers, and other *conteurs*, paved the way for Estienne, and that the Reformer’s critiques of his predecessors were not fully justified. Each of these elements seems uncertain when taken

alone, but their cumulative effect becomes difficult to ignore. It is entirely possible that Du Pré junior intentionally created a variant edition, not only for profit, but for ideological purposes. There is no question that the first expanded edition must have been prepared hastily, which would explain why the exact intention of the maneuver remains uncertain and not fully fleshed out; when viewed in light of the *Apologie pour Herodote*, however, we see that the appended tales are not nearly as sloppily added as presumed, and that the editors might well have been responding with their own form of critique, perhaps in defense of a less dogmatic strain of Humanist thought, and of Des Périers himself.

Chapter 2

Shifting Targets: Satire and Parody in Du Fail's *Propos Rustiques* and their Interpolations

We have seen how two distinct versions of both the *Propos Rustiques* and the *Baliverneries d'Eutrapel* came into being in the late 1540s. Variant editions of each text can be placed under one of two larger groups: editions controlled by Noël Du Fail himself, and interpolated editions under Etienne Groulleau's publishing house.³⁵⁴ The Groulleau editions maintained the original material and the original order of the Du Fail editions, but made significant changes that would alter the overall flavor of the texts, if not their message. Most particularly, Groulleau's first two editions of the *Propos Rustiques* contained two additional chapters that were tacked on to the end of the original text,³⁵⁵ and slipped in numerous interpolations (extra words or sentences in addition to changes in spelling, vocabulary, and geographical locations). In some instances, those changes reflected nothing more than the influence of a regional compositor, while in others, they represented precise rhetorical or stylistic intent. In this chapter, we will examine the meaning of the variants and interpolations, and explore the possibility that the author and interpolator used these texts to engage in a dialogue. As we saw, Du Fail's 1549 edition of the *Propos Rustiques* did incorporate some of the smaller changes from the Groulleau text, but rejected the additional chapters; an analysis of the two competing versions and of the values they convey will show how Du Fail, while appropriating some words written by his anonymous "friend," maintained the integrity of his original creation. As a result, the role the book industry plays on the literary composition of texts

with living, active authors will come into sharper focus, although it remains unclear which group – editors or authors – exploited which the most. Viewed in this light, the (counterfeit) book industry seems able to change not only the material economy, but the intellectual economy of any given text.

As happened with the *Nouvelles Recreations* of Bonaventure Des Périers, the interpolated edition of Noël Du Fail's *Propos Rustiques* became the most known and reprinted version of the text for the next couple of centuries. This is also the case with the *Baliverneries d'Eutrapel*, but for different reasons. The *Baliverneries* were initially printed and reprinted more than the *Propos Rustiques*, but overall, the *Propos Rustiques* remain Du Fail's most successful work to date.³⁵⁶ In the sixteenth century, the Groulleau edition of the *Baliverneries* was the base text for the near simultaneous counterfeit copies put out by Trepperel and Buffet as well as for later editions.³⁵⁷ For the *Propos Rustiques*, we must remember that the later editions of Eloi Gibier (1571), Jean Ruelle (1573, under the title *Les Ruses et finesses de Ragot Jadis*) and De Tournes (1576 also under the *Ruses et finesses* title) all used at least portions of the additional chapters found in the Groulleau editions (1548 and 1554).³⁵⁸ As noted earlier, La Croix du Maine's bibliography identified the 1554 Groulleau edition as being the first printing of the *Propos Rustiques*, referring to the ulterior *Ruses et finesses* editions; it mentions the *Baliverneries d'Eutrapel*, but makes no reference to edition or bookseller (Vol. 2 35-36). Again, La Croix du Maine's bibliography is incomplete due to the uneven availability of resources, but the citation supports the conclusion that the Groulleau editions, which were also more portable than the original versions,³⁵⁹ were the most widely distributed and known.

The changes to the *Propos Rustiques* are the most obvious, because of the addition of chapters, and will serve as the main focus for our discussion here. The *Baliverneries* will serve as a point of reference and comparison, but because the changes are less easily identified than in the *Propos*, the discussion of Du Fail's second collection will be limited.³⁶⁰ As with our analysis of the interpolations and additions to the *Nouvelles Recreations*, we will focus our discussion around an understanding of the reader's contract as presented in both editions of the *Propos Rustiques* helmed by Noël Du Fail. A close analysis of the way in which that contract was fulfilled under the author in the *Propos* can then be contrasted with the same in the Groulleau editions.

This analysis will show that in some ways the Groulleau editions respect Du Fail's message, and the additional chapters in fact amplify several aspects found therein. The tone, however, does change and a game of dissimulation Du Fail enjoys playing with the reader in his editions becomes less evident under Groulleau's direction. An analysis of the interpolations Du Fail maintains and those he leaves out demonstrates how he perceived that the Groulleau editions affected his work – most notably, with respect to the added chapters. The changes found in the Groulleau editions will be sorted out – spelling, general interpolations and the final added chapters – and we will address them in that order; the significance of the additional chapters will become clearer. In short, Maugin, the most likely interpolator of Du Fail's text as presented by the Groulleau house, changes Du Fail's smart social commentary to broad parody.³⁶¹ The message of social upheaval and access to power is both displaced and enlarged, particularly in the first added chapter, and the dialogue changes focus to more clearly reflect an interest in the present. Du Fail's response in his own second edition engages his interpolator, and

perhaps, his reader, in a discussion about social constructs, and how to interpret them. Interestingly, however, Du Fail's precise role in the second edition bearing his name is questionable. This renders analysis of intentions in the variant Du Fail editions difficult, but the results of the finished product still weave an interesting tale about the development of the texts. We have to keep in mind that other members of the production teams affected the final printed versions of the texts: the bulk of the responsibility for certain aspects of both the Du Fail and Groulleau editions fell to the in-house compositors and correctors, and to the tendencies of each editing house.

Spelling

Before examining the reader's contract and the ways in which it was fulfilled in different edition groups, we must address another form of variant that appeared in each edition, regardless of group. Spelling variants are quite commonplace in sixteenth-century texts, and occur under several circumstances. Often, the Groulleau editions are credited with numerous spelling modifications that were later adopted in the second Du Fail edition of the *Propos Rustiques*, but not in the *Baliverneries d'Eutrapel*. Around the time of production of all of these editions, there is a surge in French spelling reformation. Various factors influenced spelling choices in sixteenth-century France, and the author was only one small piece of the puzzle. The French tongue was being promoted as a respectable written language and orthography was an evolving structure that was the subject of many heated debates. Many authors declared very definitive opinions regarding their spelling systems, while others remained indifferent to such choices.³⁶² Despite the variety of opinions on the matter, an author often had little to do with the

spelling of his own work, as the compositor and the bookseller frequently dictated the entire look of the final version of a text. Trends in the mid-century leaned towards updated spelling systems, though some printing houses and booksellers did not follow the mainstream. As Nina Catach points out early in her fundamental study:

Inversement, il semble que certains manuscrits d'auteurs, écrits en orthographe traditionnelle, aient été, à l'époque de la Renaissance, transcrits, avec ou sans l'assentiment de l'auteur, en orthographe modernisée ou réformée. (6)³⁶³

Conversely, it seems that during the Renaissance, certain authorial manuscripts that had used traditional spelling were transcribed into modernized or reformed orthography, with or without the author's assent.

The author's role, then, was frequently limited regarding his own text and the publishing and printing houses often bore most of the responsibility. However, as previously pointed out, many authors were known to openly lament errors and choices made by compositors during production.³⁶⁴ As authors became more aware of the effects spelling had on the readability and interpretation of a text, some would seek to become more involved in the process; but this remained a rare occurrence.³⁶⁵ Corrector was not the most common role of an author, and at the time Noël Du Fail's work was published, he was not likely spending any significant time in Lyon.³⁶⁶ Therefore, his role in the production of the two editions of the *Propos Rustiques* and the *Baliverneries d'Eutrapel* he supposedly helmed is likely quite limited.

The spelling changes that occurred between the 1547 Du Fail edition of the *Propos Rustiques* and the 1548 Groulleau edition are indicative of the latter's editorial

practices, which often lean heavily towards modernization (Catach 89). Those practices extend to the 1549 Du Fail/De Tournes edition and we see similar tendencies in De Tournes' other work around the same time (223). Other critics have also noted the various spelling systems under which Du Fail's work was published, but have discounted the role of these variations in any interpretation of the text. La Borderie does not treat those changes as central to his presentation in his critical edition, simply stating:

L'orthographe de l'édition de 1548 ne pouvant être imputée à notre auteur, nous ne relèverons point les différences qu'elle présente avec celles des éditions de 1547 & de 1549. (135)

Since the spelling of the 1548 edition cannot be credited to our author, we will not take note of the differences between it and the 1547 and 1549 editions.

La Borderie identifies the spelling differences between the two Du Fail editions, noting that the spelling system of the second edition pointed towards a “tendance marquée à la simplification” (“noticeable tendency towards simplification” 114).³⁶⁷ He acknowledges that the spelling systems adopted in different editions are more indicative of the booksellers' and printers' preferences than of Du Fail's. Maugin would likely have influenced the Groulleau editions, since he was in fact working with Groulleau at the time.³⁶⁸ Generally, Groulleau's editing house tended towards simplification and modernization of spelling, and its work bore a few unique markers; Catach identifies most of them (88-91). Interestingly, the spellings found in Groulleau's editions of the *Propos Rustiques* and *Baliverneries* were not as up-to-date as in other examples, but numerous instances of Groulleau's style are certainly present.

Contrary to La Borderie's postulation that the additional chapters supply enough evidence to determine the spelling system for those editions, it is actually necessary to look at the 1554 edition we have at our disposal to resolve those characteristics as they were applied to the *Propos*.³⁶⁹ A quick look at Chapter 1:³⁷⁰ *D'ou sont pris ces propoz Rustiques* (f. 10 v^o – f. 12 v^o) demonstrates that Groulleau did indeed apply the use of diachronic marks, particularly in the interior syllable of words such as *privément* (26, 28). He also used *ē* for the nasal vowel in words such as *anciē* (24), *tēps* and *atētif* (25). In this text, unpronounced consonants appear (*estant* 24, *acouldé* 26, *costé* 26). Double consonants do not seem to follow a set pattern of simplification (*villaiges* 24, *occupoient* 25, *frape* 26, *s'apelle* 26). This example in particular highlights a pattern Catach noted in her study.³⁷¹ Sometimes, the adopted spelling system for a book served as a loose guideline for publication, and variant spellings were often found within a single text. Milin notes differences between the 1548 Groulleau and 1549 Du Fail/De Tours editions of the *Baliverneries d'Eutrapel* and a similar, simplified, spelling system appears in the Groulleau editions of both Du Fail books (xli-xlii).³⁷² In particular, etymological letters and double consonants are left out. In these two instances, a spelling system demonstrates tendencies, but not necessarily consistency. Roughly speaking, Groulleau applies the same tendencies to Du Fail's work as he does to his other, more legitimate publications.

De Tournes was likewise known for updating spelling, and the years of publication for each of these editions fall in the timeline for a great deal of changes occurring at both houses. In the case of De Tournes, Catach notes that 1543-1553 is his initial period of simplification and that the greater reforms did not occur until 1553-1564, when he hired Jacques Peletier (222-223), who ended up working on the *Nouvelles*

Recreations et Joyeux Devis. However, during the time of publication of the 1547 and 1549 *Propos Rustiques*, Antoine Du Moulin was De Tournes' *correcteur*. Of the *Propos*, Catach notes without fanfare that simplification occurred between editions and that this is exemplary of De Tournes' other texts of this period (223). La Borderie provides a list of variants with specific examples from the two editions under the following categories: elision of mute *e*, suppression of double letters, suppression of etymological letters, suppression of vowels inside words, change of vowels and the addition of vowels or consonants (115-117). Most of the categories listed above do reflect the same type of simplification and standardization that was seen in Groulleau's publishing house. Yet changes occurred slightly later in the De Tournes house, and a different system appears between editions from the same house. Another difference is that De Tournes' examples do not reflect the use of diachronic marks that can be noted in Groulleau's texts: in sum, the two *libraires'* spelling systems are similar, but not identical. Overall, both booksellers reflect the evolving norm when we compare their work to that of their contemporaries.

The 1549 Pierre de Tours edition of the *Baliverneries d'Eutrapel* does not, however, reflect the same tendencies towards simplification. The spelling in this edition more closely reflects the spelling found in the 1547 De Tournes edition of the *Propos Rustiques*. In particular, double consonants and numerous etymological letters are present (Milin xli-xlii). Like the other editors, Milin concedes that in terms of spelling and punctuation, "il y a très peu de chances qu'elle reflète celle [ponctuation] du manuscrit de Noël Du Fail, et énormément qu'elle soit celle du compositeur" ("there is little chance that it [the punctuation] reflects that of Noël Du Fail's manuscript, and overwhelming odds that it be that of the compositor" xlii). For De Tours' part, his editorial policies of

the period tended towards the archaic when necessary (Catach 155-160). For example, the 1542 edition of *Pantagruel* maintained not only an older spelling system, but was printed in Gothic *bâtarde*, evocative of manuscripts. Conversely, by the 1547 edition of the *Tiers Livre*, which precedes his edition of the *Baliverneries d'Eutrapel*, De Tours had shifted type fonts and spelling to reflect a more modern taste.³⁷³ Catach maintains that the archaic spellings of earlier editions of Rabelais' *Pantagruel* and *Gargantua* were unusual authorial choices (159-160).³⁷⁴ However, this does not explain why De Tours would have updated Rabelais' spelling system, but not that of another author. It is possible that he was simply producing an exact duplicate of the first edition, which would have saved the costs of an initial layout. This would mean, of course, that the first edition of the *Baliverneries d'Eutrapel* would have also contained engraved images, in a departure from the *Propos Rustiques*. Another possibility is that De Tours did not have enough sets of updated characters to modernize the spelling system. Since we have no extant copy of the first edition of the *Baliverneries d'Eutrapel* for comparison, we cannot determine for certain why De Tours did not update the spelling system of this book.

It is not at all surprising that the text's spelling was reformed in the Groulleau and Du Fail / De Tournes editions. The example presented by the De Tours house in 1549 is perhaps slightly more unusual, but not entirely unheard of. The greater question here is actually whether or not Du Fail had anything to do with the spelling changes made between his editions. The fact that the second edition of one book (the *Propos Rustiques*), which Du Fail supposedly updated himself, uses a vastly different spelling system than that of the second edition of the other book (the *Baliverneries d'Eutrapel*) is very telling. Also, these editions were printed almost simultaneously. Such evidence suggests that Du

Fail might not have been in Lyon at the time these new editions were printed, and that he might not have seen the final draft of either text until *ex post facto*. This is another question that cannot be answered for certain, but it casts doubts on the argument that spelling in Du Fail's second editions resulted from the author's intervention and the adoption of some of Groulleau's practices. Each house evolved and developed its own spelling strategy during the time, but a great deal of flexibility in those strategies was demonstrated as numerous factors influenced the orthographic system for each text.

While spelling could be a merely aesthetic or, occasionally, practical choice, it was often also a political statement about the French language and its evolving role in society. Certain works, like those of Rabelais, purposely presented an antiquated spelling in order to create the illusion of a much older text.³⁷⁵ Such examples of authorial editorial demands were rare, however; most often, the author was not available and the corrector and *libraire* dictated the final format. Politically, spelling was still very much under the influence of various, and frequently conflicting, authorities: the Church, the court, and the monarchy.³⁷⁶ Thus Catach notes that modernization was frequently considered "Reformist," which resulted in a movement back towards older forms (185). Primarily, though, spelling intended to move the language towards a standardized set of rules (223). Standardization and modernization served to render the language more accessible on a global scale: a book printed in Lyon could be read as easily, among the literate, by someone from Brittany as by someone from Gasconne or Paris. Sometimes, these changes also acknowledged phonetic shifts in the language that moved French further from its Latin origin. At the same time, however, some words received an etymological spelling to make that origin more apparent (16-19).

Even though politics and aesthetics were factors in orthography, spelling was also driven by practicality. The use of modern or reformed spellings frequently required the use of new, previously unavailable characters, particularly those with diachronic marks and formerly unused Latin letters, such as the “v” where “u” was most often used.³⁷⁷ Purchasing new sets of characters was an enormous expense, and most printing houses did not have the practical means to make such acquisitions. As a result, often only the most prosperous and/or most recently established printers were able to present texts with modernized spellings. Groulleau and De Tournes were among the booksellers who, at various moments in their careers, embraced reforms.³⁷⁸ A look at the *Propos Rustiques*’ publishing history illustrates many of Catach’s findings (as well as those of Susan Baddeley’s *L’Orthographe française aux temps de la réforme*). Also, Groulleau and De Tournes were and remain among the most well-known and successful of *libraires* of their time; they would have had the means to purchase new sets of characters or to hire printers who could do so. Groulleau was a *libraire* who hired outside printers, and De Tournes, who was also a *maître imprimeur*, sometimes did the same to expand his production potential. During the period in question, however, only Groulleau presented a text with diachronic marks, which required a full set of characters. Meanwhile, De Tournes would have been saved such an expense by the spelling reforms adopted under Du Moulin’s work as corrector, which did not use many diachronic marks. As we see in this example, printing costs could be dictated by the required characters for a particular spelling system. Also, spelling itself could be dictated by the availability of characters. Printing houses would likely have limited sets available for use, regardless of the number of printers. Should the modern character sets be used to simultaneously print several works, spelling

might necessarily shift from one form to another. Antiquated forms of spelling were considered the default, since that was more readable than modern spellings with inaccurate characters. Sometimes, several spellings occur within the same text, either because of a corrector's error, or because of a limited availability of characters.

Taking into account mid-sixteenth-century spelling practices leads us to diminish Du Fail's likely role in the second editions of the *Propos Rustiques* and *Baliverneries d'Eutrapel*, at least in this aspect of the texts. Here, spelling has far less to do with the meaning of the text than it does with the process of publication, and these changes do not appear to affect the rhetorical or stylistic value of the work, except to give both editions of the *Propos Rustiques* and the Groulleau editions of the *Baliverneries d'Eutrapel* a more modern appearance. We note a distinct contrast between approaches to printing Rabelais' works and the *Propos Rustiques*, which might have benefited from a similar strategy. Du Fail may not have had the inclination to dictate spelling in the contract, or he may have desired a modern spelling, which distances the text from archaic tendencies. If a modern spelling was Du Fail's preference, then this would put the tenuous authenticity of the "rustic" text into question, and contribute to the narrative filter by which the author plays on the delicate balance between verisimilitude and reality, as we will see below. However, we believe that the correctors had more to do with the spelling of both texts, and in each set of editions, than did the author or interpolator, simply because that was more the norm, and we have no evidence that contradicts standard practices.

Du Fail's rhetoric

While spelling likely bears little or no semantic relationship to Du Fail's texts, narrative structure, on the other hand, is critical. Du Fail opens the *Propos Rustiques* with a highly formalized introduction, establishing the "author's" rhetorical intent for the collection. In this way, Du Fail, like Bonaventure Des Périers, establishes a contract with the reader,³⁷⁹ and goes on to fulfill it in very specific ways. To begin, Du Fail proposes two topics through different means. The first is the study of rural life, introduced directly by the narrator-character, a nobleman. The narrator just happens to have been invited to hear "Aucuns Propos Rustiques" and deems these stories worthy of retelling. He will begin his portrait of rusticity with an *a contrario* argument, that is, he will first define its opposite, nobility, by showing how it came to be after the fall of the Golden Age, which was a time of equality. Thus, the narrator intentionally and forcefully separates these two social classes; their distinction remains, symbolically at least, at the core of sixteenth-century civilization. To maintain, in what follows, the premise of nobility's civility and high character in contrast to the peasantry, even the most venerable of the rural interlocutors will be presented with some comedic elements. However, this tactic is not meant to reduce the peasants to mere foils or ridiculous character types; they are, in the narrator's estimation, a worthy subject that is not treated often enough. As Richard-Thomine points out:

Qu'on ne s'y trompe pas : les *Propos Rustiques* sont bien une œuvre de mémoire qui entend combler une lacune – dont sont responsables les historiographes, parce qu'ils se sont fait une spécialité de l'étude des

grands –, et donne la parole à ceux dont les voix pourraient se taire à jamais s’il n’était un secrétaire pour les transcrire. (35)

Let there be no mistake: the *Propos Rustiques* are indeed a work of memory that intends to fill a gap created by historiographers in that they only specialized in the study of the high class, and gives a podium to those whose voices would forever be silenced without a secretary to transcribe them.

The author clearly wishes to right the wrong that recorded history has committed against one of the social classes that allows for nobility’s very presence, for without the peasant class, the other cannot exist. Du Fail’s proposal, then, is a very serious matter, and one that claims historical importance.³⁸⁰

The second topic is only implied in the introduction and carried on through the *devisants*, all of whom are peasants; they intend to discuss the idealized past of their own rustic world and point out, by contrast, its current breakdown, which might imply that of society as a whole.³⁸¹ This second topic then potentially contradicts the first and could undermine the very goal Du Fail’s narrator claims to pursue. The structure of the text itself exemplifies the same sort of breakdown and blurs the lines between social classes that Du Fail’s narrator-character strives to define early on. Du Fail begins with a strict rhetorical framework, and then uses humor and dissimulation to disarm the reader who may take the hierarchy of social classes and of contemporary society for granted: a more careful reader will understand from the beginning that the divisions proposed by the narrator are in fact flexible. Pérouse examines the temporal aspects of the narrative structure, identifying a *laudatio temporis acti* within the text, but also demonstrates that

this structure lends itself to a more complex reading than superficial artifice would suggest (*Le Dessein des Propos Rustiques* 143-146). According to Pérouse, the *devisants* themselves are capable of deconstructing the meaning behind the tales of their companions, and this consistent build up and tearing down is reflective of the temporal social relationships in the past, present and future; the tales are comical, but a serious message lies under the surface and the mutability of social classes is revealed through a deeper reading.³⁸² In contrast, as we will see, the interpolated editions produced by Groulleau tend to upend that flexibility and support the purported social divisions, without allowing for the secondary interpretation. Where Du Fail decomposes society within his texts, Maugin reinforces it. Du Fail deconstructs social structures throughout, and the contract he creates with the reader is therefore fulfilled on two levels, in a paradoxical fashion. Ultimately, both readings of the text – one that insists on the stability of the nobility/peasant class distinction and one that observes its collapse – are possible within and perhaps because of the Du Fail editions' elaborately detailed framework.

Du Fail's role as the author and that of the narrator are distinguished from the beginning, per the terms of the contract. The alleged "author" of the *Propos Rustiques* is of course "Maistre Leon Ladulfi," an anagram of Noël Du Fail. He thus begins with a narrative game in which he creates a character-narrator with whom he shares some common traits. Both are young noblemen engaging in travels around the country. They are well-educated and interested in studying contemporary society. However, the creation of a character-narrator serves two functions. First, it is quite a common tendency of the period to identify oneself via cryptic means.³⁸³ Following the trend shows Du Fail as an educated writer and establishes the comic tone through intertextuality.³⁸⁴ Using this

technique also creates a distance between the young man who is about to begin a legal and political career and the young man who writes comedic short stories. The former is, in a way, protecting his future professional status. Second, the establishment of a fictional narrator distances the text from the truth it claims to present. As noted in our introduction, narrators frequently claim tales to be true stories, and this one is no exception. By starting immediately with a fictionalized version of himself, Du Fail makes it clear that the text bears certain parallels to reality, but should not be mistaken as such.

Nicole Cazauran claims that there is “l’ombre de quelque mauvaise foi” in Du Fail’s construction of Ladulfi, but she counters by showing that the representation of a realistic gathering by way of fictionalized characterization is in fact at the heart of Du Fail’s text (“La Première Manière de Noël Du Fail” 36). Gabriel Pérouse’s reading of the *Propos Rustiques* supports a similar analysis.³⁸⁵ Finally, much of Marie-Claire Bichard-Thomine’s discussion of Du Fail’s fictionalized reality is centered around this very assumption.³⁸⁶ Truth and reality are not cohesively linked in Du Fail’s text, and they serve different functions. Truth becomes something that may be discovered through our narrator’s presentation and as the reader engages with it to seek knowledge.³⁸⁷ Reality, however, is little more than a tool of the genre used to engage the reader.³⁸⁸ In this respect, Du Fail’s construction of Ladulfi is not unlike Marguerite de Navarre’s setting of her own story-telling contract, when Parlamente proposes that each member of the party “dira chacun quelque histoire qu’il aura veue ou bien ouy dire à quelque homme digne de foy” (“will tell a story that he has seen or heard from another honest person” 12). In this case, however, the supposed truth of the tales emphasizes the practical urgency of the *nouvelles* as guides for moral debates as well as a source for entertainment. By contrast,

with the *Propos Rustiques*, there is no explicit call to treat only “true” stories and events, but the context is one of verisimilitude. The narrator sets up a believable scenario in which he encounters a group of peasants during his travels and is invited to listen in on the conversation “où possible trouver[a] goust” (“that [he] might enjoy” 50). When Huguet begins to discuss banquets from previous generations, he elects to tell what he saw in his youth (55). In this case, realism more than professed truth is what allows the reader, who is as likely to be a nobleman as an up-and-coming bourgeois,³⁸⁹ to accept the tales at face value and to view them as a useful study of a social class on which not much has been written.³⁹⁰ As such, the verisimilitude of the narrator and of his purported accounts implies a measure of make-believe if not illusion that exists in writing and society itself, as a means to uncover some truth about it.

As we just saw, society, in the frame of the *Propos Rustiques*, consists primarily of nobility and peasantry, two of the three social classes inherited from the feudal system under which sixteenth-century society still operates, at least according to its own ethos.³⁹¹ Du Fail seemingly elides urban society and the merchant class in his insistence on this social division. Accordingly, members of each class must be clearly identified and the leadership role of the nobleman should be indisputable. Speaking as Ladulfi in his address to the readers, Du Fail, as we have seen, immediately alludes to this distinction of class and its importance. He then questions and potentially negates such distinctions, by demonstrating the fairly arbitrary status of class systems. First, he proposes to describe the nobility “de race” (“of birth”) from the first few sentences of his epistle “Au lecteur” (5-6). He proceeds to contemplate the early origins of society, before man was divided into separate classes. According to him, as the population grew, disputes became more

common and the victors eventually came to claim a power of birthright, thus establishing themselves as noble (7-10) because of their inherently greater valor, and earned their position in society. This transition from the Golden Age to feudalism took place over a long period of time, however: the first “governors” who assumed power through violent struggle exacted tributes from the peasants (in exchange for protection and justice) to finance war, while exempting from tax those who risked their lives in battle: that is how, over time, a class came into being, which called itself “noblesse.” While the term “nobility” might be arbitrary, the function of the classes is not.³⁹²

Ladulfi acknowledges the fact that the “noblesse” had earned its title, but presents the arbitrary nature of the disputes and of the resulting system in such a way that he sets a very precise bar for what it means to be noble. In this view, compared to the Golden Age’s universal equality, it becomes clear that society is established by division and violence.³⁹³ In Pérouse and Dubuis’ reading, nobility of blood can only derive effectively from bloodshed, and civilized society is also derived from bloodshed.³⁹⁴ Jean-Marie Constant gives an interesting perspective on the different levels of physical and economic violence perpetrated by the nobles in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. According to Constant, such violence actually increased as power began to shift to a rising class of newly-minted nobles, mostly derived from the wealthy country bourgeois (16-18).³⁹⁵ Thus a new nobility takes on the central characteristic of violence by virtue of its novelty.³⁹⁶

Many difficulties occur in markedly identifying members of the peasant and noble classes. Often, markers for one class are found in the other, directly contradicting Ladulfi’s claim that nobility is a distinct group. The introduction puts the “vilains” in

their place, but subsequent developments also raise the bar for peasants, as the “rustiques” we meet in the ensuing collection turn out to be fiscally secure, well-educated members of a kind of rural bourgeoisie. The concept of financially viable, educated peasants is intentionally contradictory within this text, and counters traditional visions of the opposing classes. First, if the *devisants* presented at this point illustrate the opposite of what is means to be noble, then Ladulfi might end up suggesting that nobility is neither an economically sound nor very well-educated class of men. One might also point out that the group consists of a variety of older men, from middle-aged (Lubin) to venerable (Huguet) and from a wealth of professions (Huguet’s schoolmaster turned winemaker, now affectionately known as a “Roger bon temps,”³⁹⁷ and Anselme’s farmer/notary, for example) (14-15).³⁹⁸ By presenting “vilain” characters that cover such a spectrum of possibilities, Du Fail’s narrator evokes the likelihood that nobility, in turn, also consists of a range of personality, age and activity types.

In addition, we are witnessing an unexpected contamination of the peasant class by the bourgeoisie’s values and attitudes. Here we see, under the appearance of a traditional society, an increasingly powerful group that is in many ways a threat to nobility. Ladulfi speaks of this group when he makes the distinction between those who are noble “de race” (born) and those who are noble because of “un tas de Logiciens et Alchimistes” (6). According to Ladulfi’s classification, those families that are currently being made noble do not really belong to the noble class. Yet, by making the distinction, he cannot help suggesting that on at least some level, they do very much belong. As demonstrated in Jean-Marie Constant’s study, families of bourgeois origins comprise fourteen to thirty percent of newly-made members of the noble class, depending on

region (14). The bourgeoisie is then an ambiguous group that belongs to both classes, although Ladulfi's structural choices clearly place it amongst the "vilains."³⁹⁹ This relegation of the bourgeoisie to the peasant class denotes the opposite movement: i.e. the bourgeoisie's contemporary threat to the existing noble class. A careful reader can already see the beginnings of the disintegration of Ladulfi's society. In this universe, society is a carefully constructed "reality."

That which is constructed may also be deconstructed, whether through analysis or the problematic nature of its engineering. In Chapter 2, Ladulfi begins to recount the stories he heard amongst a group of old peasants, and he opens with Anselme's lament "Ô temps heureux! Ô siècles fortunés!" The character complains of the current breakdown of society, thus introducing the *devisants*' story-telling (17-19). Huguet, asked to speak first, takes a moment to reflect and has a drink before beginning. These are uncanny parallels to our own Ladulfi, who takes his time and also has several drinks before he starts (15-16). This appears to be yet another way in which noble and peasant interconnect, underscoring the larger category of "man" under whose umbrella all social classes fall.⁴⁰⁰ The goal, as understood by Anselme's unwitting introduction, is to discuss society's past and to perceive how times have changed over the course of a couple of generations. Ladulfi's firmly denoted class structure ends up serving as background to a perceived breakdown of society, which is openly lamented by Anselme.

The structure of the text reflects this breakdown. It begins with a highly organized, hierarchically envisioned plan. The stories that are told start with a discussion of banquets from earlier generations, an edifying, generic "harangue" attributed (by Huguet) to the ancient community's most respected elder, a discussion of what love was

like then and the general character of society (Chapters 3-6). Over time, the reading shifts to specific character studies (Thenot du Coin and his son Tailleboudin, for example, in Chapters 7 and 8). Within the context of the ridiculous Flameaux and Vindelless town rivalry, the towns themselves take on a grotesque character, and individuals stand out to emblemize these characterizations and lend themselves to what has become, by now, a firmly satirical social study (Chapters 9-11).⁴⁰¹ There is, therefore, a shift in the treatment of specific subject matter as it moves from general discussion with examples to stories that tend to function apart from the discussion on generalities regarding society. As the treatment of the subject begins to degrade, so does Du Fail's treatment of narrative and tale-telling over the duration of the text.⁴⁰² Again, as a reflection of the move from older societal norms to new ones, narrative is highly respected at the beginning and interruptions are limited. But this rhetorical order, like the established subject matter of the tales, begins to erode over the course of the day.⁴⁰³ By the penultimate tale, we see a complete breakdown of narrative with Anselme's tale of "Perrot Claquedent," which consists of little more than a series of jokes told by the story's protagonist, who happens to be a respected lawyer – whose advice is sought by peasant and noble alike – and also a mooch and a glutton, who rules his town like a "vray coq de paroisse" (90).

Huguet, the authoritative figure of the text, takes the reins in the most disruptive fashion:

Compere Anselme (dist maistre Huguet) je vous prie soyez brief, & le faire court: car je veux (autant que la nuict soit plus avancee) vous dire quelque cas d'assez bon goust, le tout pour entretenir le propos de celle antique preudhommie. 93

My dear Anselme, said Master Huguet, I beg you to speak briefly and to make it quick, as night has fallen, and because I want to tell you some rather tasty example, all to continue the subject of this virtue of old.

This interruption marks the end of Anselme's open-ended "tale," which is more of an anecdote or *devis* reflecting a world in which everyone – peasantry and nobility alike – is hit upon by a dim-witted freeloader and happy to listen to his babbling. Huguet's comments return the group to its proposed paradigm and topic, acknowledging the breakdown which has occurred. It is all the more interesting that Huguet chooses to interrupt Anselme, who was the first to lament society's breakdown. That fact illustrates the unconscious flexibility of social structures and the inherent presence of change, because Anselme contributes to the same type of breakdown that he complains about at the beginning. He is an active and unknowing participant in the very changes he wishes to point out and deplore.

Huguet brings the reader back to the original subject and ends the day with a short tale that, however, illustrates the perils and illusions of social mobility ("De Gobemousche," Chapter 13). At the very end, the apparent nonsensical cacophony⁴⁰⁴ seems to suggest what may happen when the older generations (organized, educated, and focused) leave things to the younger ones (unstructured drunkards). However, the idea that the older generations are more disciplined is clearly disputed by Anselme's meandering tale (especially since Perrot belongs to the older generation) and by the presence of Pasquier, who is described as one likely to spend quite a lot buying rounds for everyone (15). Even the venerable Huguet may just be a "Roger bon temps" who has gone from teaching to wine-making. Du Fail presents an effective satire of those who

lament days gone by, and he will expand this theme in the *Baliverneries d'Entrapel* (Chapter 2) when he pokes fun at precisely this group.⁴⁰⁵ For Du Fail, this discussion primarily provides an opportunity for social commentary within the frame of entertainment. It does not serve to resolve questions about social structures, and it illustrates the pointlessness of lamenting the past. As we have observed through Anselme's example, the older generations are as likely to participate in social change as the younger ones. Huguet's departure leads specifically to the final cacophony of voices and the suggested breakdown of all of the prescribed structures, demonstrating the inevitability of their transformation.

One level of change is the passing of generations, envisioned by the reader as Huguet departs for the evening, followed by younger festival-goers. A more important evolution perceived by the narrator from the beginning is social mobility. As we pointed out earlier, Ladulfi specifically denies the place of the newer "noblemen" in his presentation and firmly sends those who might have access to such social ascension back to the peasant class. However, the actual presence of the newly-minted nobleman who is most likely of bourgeois origin is also acknowledged. This occurs immediately after Ladulfi explains the "true" nature of the noble class as a group of victors who prevailed in a series of conflicts, and then were privileged through tax exemption. The perspective is that of a nobleman, speaking to readers who understand and may even support such class distinctions.⁴⁰⁶ As we have also noted, the last tale of the text is presented by the most venerable and educated member of the peasant group, Huguet, who "sçait très bien enfoncer les matieres" ("knows very well how to probe the matters at hand" 19), but who also has "ceste mode antique de gringoter" ("this antiquated way of rambling" 15).⁴⁰⁷

This tale presents a case of potential social mobility, fueled by the power achieved through education and the money that enables such education – but ultimately mocks it: Gobemousche has dreams of becoming a “gros Seigneur” (94) and sends his son, Guillaume, to study under a respected master; what he learns is questionable at best, and serves little more than to impress the locals – we wonder if he is any better than Perrot Claquedent.

It remains unclear whether Huguet and Anselme (who claims to have spoken Greek with him) take Guillaume’s progress seriously. The underlying issue, however, is the achievement of a higher social status, attained not through violence, but through education and economic strength. This indicates, at least potentially, a shift in the traditional conception of power as illustrated in Ladulfi’s address to the reader. Also, this onset of social mobility ironically reminds the reader that in previous generations (the period they are supposed to be lamenting), the men were denied access to such mobility. Wittingly or not, Huguet points out that while the class system has not changed, the structures defining this system are opening doors. The perspective here is that of Huguet, an elder peasant, and thus vastly different from that of Ladulfi, a young nobleman. Ladulfi is not directly present during the course of this last tale, nor of the departure of the *devisants*, for the most part allowing the reader unmediated access to their perspective. However, a thinly disguised anagram of Du Fail and Ladulfi appears in the mention of one “Handulphi” who verifies the authenticity of Huguet’s tale and the validity of Guillaume’s training, but does so while “peschant à la ligne.”⁴⁰⁸ This brief appearance of a figure whose name sounds uncannily like that of the narrator reminds the reader that the text is being filtered to us through another party, and the perspective shifts

momentarily from the peasant-narrator to the author-narrator, who may well make fun of his characters. Again, the lines between noble and peasant are distinct yet blurred in a very subjective reality. In this way, Du Fail provides a text that maintains the assumed privilege of nobility by virtue of describing its presumably no less stable counterpart, but the varying, decaying class structures Du Fail actually explores fall short of their supposed distinctions and ultimately fail. In Du Fail's society, power determines the hierarchy and the source of power is shifting.

Throughout the *Propos Rustiques*, Du Fail uses narrative authority and verisimilitude in a manner that ends up illustrating the frailty of the sixteenth-century class system. This system is viewed throughout the narrative as a reality that threatens to become an illusion, as it breaks down over time and as social needs shift and evolve. Power by virtue of force loses its sustainability, while money and education become the main venues to achieving and maintaining power. According to Wayne Booth, "since any sense of composition or selection falsifies life, all fiction requires an elaborate rhetoric of dissimulation" (44). In the case of the *Propos Rustiques*, Du Fail's dissimulation lies in part in the proposed subject of the text. He is not his own narrator, but creates one who acts as a dissociated version of the author. Ladulfi claims to use nobility as a point of reference to educate the reader about its rustic counterpart, thus presuming what the reader knows about the true value of "Noblesse," but instead alludes to a class that still attempts to define itself via endless power struggles, while being redefined by the society in which it exists. Similarly, the peasant/bourgeois *devisants* intend to focus on an idyllic, rural society as it existed in the past, but unwittingly predict and participate in a confusing future that is already there.

Reading the interpolations

Groulleau's editions and Du Fail's variant editions indicate contrasting degrees of acceptance of this dual contract. Variants that appear within the text, except for spelling, illuminate the ways in which readers might understand the *Propos Rustiques* and the *Baliverneries d'Eutrapel* depending on the edition they are using. Not all of the interpolations change the tone significantly. A few set up a dialogue between the editions. Some simply establish authorship. Some, in the *Propos Rustiques*, suggest a new tone in the texts, and prepare the reader for the additional chapters found in Groulleau's edition. In both the *Propos Rustiques* and the *Baliverneries* we encounter corrections, clarifications, and additional commentary. The smaller changes hardly transform the overall rhetorical effect of the text, but still serve the interpolator in some ways.

Here is an example, found in the *Baliverneries d'Eutrapel*. As we have seen in the case of the *Nouvelles Recreations et Joyeux Devis*, the geographical setting may shift from one edition to another. There is such a change between Groulleau and Du Fail editions, and Milin has shown how this might alter the work significantly (xliv-xlviii). Its main function is to highlight the interpolator's Angevine origins, as the setting moves from the area surrounding Rennes to Anjou. Philipot and Milin are in agreement that this is "une transposition assez souvent maladroite, comme le montre la fréquente discordance entre les faits (distances entre localités) et le texte de Noël Du Fail" ("quite often a clumsy transposition, as demonstrated by the frequent discord between facts [such as the distance between locations] and Noël Du Fail's text" Milin xlvi). While we cannot compare the Groulleau 1548 edition to the original for such inaccuracies, Du Fail's 1549 edition evidently restored the original geography. The interpolator seems to have worked

hastily on the *Baliverneries*.⁴⁰⁹ By keeping the location in the countryside, Maugin does not change the tone in this respect, as the somewhat gentrified country peasants of the original remain intact. In this case, the geographic change serves as little more than a reminder about the interpolator's birthplace. To a small extent, this act of transposition allows Maugin to claim the text as his own.⁴¹⁰ Authorial privilege is not effaced by the process of publication, but the geographical relocation superimposes itself on the original author's claims to the text.

In the *Propos Rustiques*, a different kind of geographic substitution occurs. Philipot notes a play between regional and proper names and a mix of genuine and invented locales and people (187-192). In some ways, the presence of fantastical elements evokes a Rabelaisian influence. Yet, as he does in the *Baliverneries*, Maugin uses his changes as a sort of calling card to remind the reader of his own Angevine origins and to claim the text as his own. In this case, many variants can be clearly identified between editions, because we have the original. Overall, we have far more information about the textual interpolations in this text, and a great deal more critics have looked at these variants. La Borderie and Philipot, in particular, provide vastly different comments on the relationship between Du Fail and Maugin based on the variants that were included in the altered editions. For La Borderie, Du Fail's variants and restorations reflect disdain for the Groulleau edition, which, in the editor's opinion, "disfigures" Du Fail's text (ix, 134). Philipot, for his part, shows that Du Fail retained many of Maugin's alterations: 128 out of 345 (based on the La Borderie text as well, my own total is 127) (Philipot 223).⁴¹¹ According to Philipot, this demonstrates a significant respect for Maugin's work and potentially, a positive working relationship between the two men.

There are several ways to look at those numbers. Almost two thirds of the interpolations were left out of the 1549 version of the *Propos Rustiques*. Conversely, over half of the 212 variants we find in this edition were derived from the Groulleau text. The vast majority of those changes were clarifications or precisions (81, of which 58 from Groulleau). In other words, Du Fail certainly rejected a large majority of the Groulleau changes, but there is no doubt that he retained many significant ones. Ultimately, this means that Du Fail was most likely the one who made choices about what to keep and what to drop in his latest edition of the *Propos Rustiques*, and greatly reduces the possibility that the retained interpolations were random.

According to La Borderie, however, Du Fail:

a seulement adopté çà & là quelques additions sans importance qui ne jurent pas avec son texte & même parfois rectifient des fautes d'impression ou des négligences de l'édition de 1547. ix

only adopted here and there some unimportant additions that did not clash with his text and even occasionally corrected printing errors and oversights found in the 1547 edition.

La Borderie argues that most of the variants included by Du Fail in 1549 were selected not because they effectively improved his text, but simply because they allowed him to claim that he had in fact “reve[u] & corrigé” his work, thereby justifying a new edition. Du Fail’s rejection of the additional chapters is the key element here, underlining the importance, for the author, of publishing another edition under his name, whether or not it was in fact improved substantially. We must remember that often these formulas were mere strategies aimed at promoting sales and that De Tournes had privilege rights. Du

Fail himself would not benefit financially from a second edition and had few rights over the text, unless some unusual stipulation was incorporated into the contract⁴¹² (this is highly unlikely, as Du Fail was no more than a recent graduate and an unknown literary figure).

Perhaps De Tournes was threatened financially by the existence of the Groulleau counterfeit edition. He therefore had a good reason to push quickly for a new, authorized one. This scenario places Du Fail at the periphery rather than the center of activity in the production of the 1549 edition, but profit pressure would have only been one possible reason for which De Tournes allowed for a second edition so quickly. As we have seen in the first part of this study, it is at least possible that De Tournes worked with Groulleau, Du Fail and Maugin to create a series of editions, allowing variant versions of the text to compete as the most popular. For this may not simply be the case of two publishing houses touting rival claims of authenticity: by openly attributing improvements to a “friend” of the author, Groulleau may have invited readers to compare editions and challenged Du Fail to respond; readers in turn may be all the more eager to pick up the more “authentic” edition provided by De Tournes. If the group of authors/editors and booksellers did work together, it could be said that Du Fail’s status as the primary author benefited from it, at least at first.

Du Fail’s exact role in these developments remains crucial to our understanding of the variants; regrettably, it cannot be determined once and for all from the available information. Still, as we have seen, for Du Fail to have sifted through such a large number of variants from the Groulleau edition in such a short amount of time, he must have had access to an advance copy, or at least to a manuscript version of the text. The

same applies to Groulleau and Maugin, about whom we must also ask how they were able to put together their own edition so quickly.⁴¹³ However, many of the changes are judicious, and the addition of two complete chapters implies in any case a more advanced level of forethought and preparation. What is more, some elements of the interpolated chapters hearken more to the *Baliverneries d'Eutrapel* than to the *Propos Rustiques*. The presence of these elements emphasizes the relationship between the two texts, but also buttresses the supposition that Maugin had foreknowledge of the second. These facts increase the likelihood that Philipot's assessment is at least partly accurate, that some level of cooperation or friendly rivalry occurred between Du Fail and Maugin, and that the variant editions were laid out with the intention of creating some combination of self-contained dialogue and marketing strategy.⁴¹⁴ De Tournes and Groulleau (and, likely, De Tours) would then have been complicit in this arrangement, if not instrumental, although the precise reasons for this remain a matter of speculation.

On the other hand, we should consider the way in which Du Fail carefully connected the *Propos Rustiques* and the *Baliverneries d'Eutrapel* with the motto: "Puis que ainsi est" ("Since that is how it is" 99 and 1, respectively). Du Fail carefully ends the first and begins the other with this same phrase. Michel Bideaux argues that this *devise* in conjunction with several other statements in Du Fail's opening epistle in the *Baliverneries* is a clear rejection of the interpolated edition of the *Propos Rustiques*.⁴¹⁵ If indeed some of the prefatory comments in the 1549 *Baliverneries* did not also appear in the earlier Du Fail edition of the same, they could in fact be construed as a complete rejection of the Groulleau editions of both texts. However, the liminary epistle to a different friend seems to present typical, self-deprecating references to the *Propos*

Rustiques as these “choses indisposées, mal couchées, mal dressées, sans lime, encore moins de grace: que veux tu d’avantage si le papier souffre tout?” (“ill-arranged things, poorly laid out, poorly set up, without polish, even less grace: what more do you want if paper puts up with everything?” 6-7). Further, Milin’s critical edition demonstrates that there are few variants between this epistle and the one found in the counterfeit editions, and none in this particular citation. While Bideaux concedes that Du Fail’s supposed rejection is cryptic, we are not convinced that it is absolute. We do have, in the two appearances of the *devise* and the reference to the *Propos Rustiques* in the *Baliverneries*, two clear examples of the means by which Du Fail connected the two books and their messages, but, likely, nothing more. Unfortunately, the extant editions of the *Baliverneries* do not allow us to settle this point. However, Bideaux’s observations, if not his conclusions, appear valid and provide further evidence that Du Fail’s two texts were not as disparate in nature as many assume: there was a clear connection between them, which the interpolated editions altered significantly with the suppression of Du Fail’s motto and the addition of two chapters. In light of such objections, we have to acknowledge that the idea of a collaboration between Du Fail / De Tournes and Maugin / Groulleau to create the whole series of editions remains a pure hypothesis.

In La Borderie’s view, as we have seen, the Maugin interpolations “disfigure” the text of the *Propos Rustiques* (134), but such an assessment is bound to vary with our interpretation of the variants and their history. We will show that a level of disfigurement did occur. Yet, in one potential scenario, and whether or not those changes were made with the author’s fore-knowledge, he chose to retain quite a few; in another scenario, the author had little to do with the corrections made in the second edition published under his

name. What is clear is that not all of the changes selected or rejected are as haphazard as they appear to La Borderie. A closer look at the 1548 variants compared to the 1549 ones will help clarify the editor's intentions, and will show, at any rate, that Du Fail likely had some part in the 1549 edition of the *Propos Rustiques*, as claimed in the book's title.

The 1549 edition maintains a large number of Maugin's suppressions (see Appendix B: 18 total) and additions (17 total), but the largest number of variants he keeps consists of corrections and clarifications (58 total).⁴¹⁶ In some cases, he restored words or passages Maugin had eliminated. Individually, each example has some influence on the reader's understanding of the text. In numerous cases, the changes are small, amounting to stylistic differences that either emphasize or deemphasize a minor point. Such cases include the suppression of an adverbial emphasis, in which Du Fail restored the adverb deleted by Maugin:⁴¹⁷

Mais escoutez comme elle luy disoit, que tousjours estoit sa coustume de l'embesogner à aller luy querir à boire, & qu'il n'y sçauroit envoyer un autre, pource qu'il voyoit bien qu'elle estoit empeschee *bien profondement* à devuyder du fil meslé, & qu'elle voudroit qu'il fut en gaigne de ce qu'il luy falloit (39, 144).⁴¹⁸

But listen how she would tell him that it was always his habit to give her the task to get him a drink and that he would not know how to ask someone else, because he well saw that she was occupied *very deeply* with spooling tangled thread and that she wished he would take care of what he needed.⁴¹⁹

Maugin tried to make this sentence lighter by removing the adverb, but Du Fail must have felt it was needed to express the woman's exasperation. In another example, the suppression of a verb renders a sentence less clear and Du Fail corrected the "correction": "Vrayement (dist maistre Huguet) compere, vous le pouvez bien, & ne *devez* point plaindre le temps passé [...]" ("Truly sir, said Master Huguet, you can well do it and you *should* not regret the past [...]" 41, 144). Such cases do not significantly alter the text, but may modify its meaning somewhat. The first is merely a de-emphasis of the wife's bitterness about her husband's interference with her duties: the sarcasm is actually lightened. In the second, suppression does not serve the interpolator, either in tone or style. La Borderie chose to focus on many such examples, criticizing their lack of coherence and fidelity to the original text. Even Philipot found variants of this kind "sans intérêt et sans raison d'être" ("uninteresting and without reason" 250).⁴²⁰ At any rate, in the two cases we just saw, Du Fail restored the text to its original version in 1549, re-strengthening the sarcastic tone of the first example and repairing grammatical coherence in the second.

Here is another example of a Maugin interpolation that, while very subtle, seems to alter the tone and style of the narrative. Following a brawl between the men of two neighboring villages, Flameaux and Vindelles, in which the Flameaux side gains the upper hand, "Les Vindelloyes voyans ainsi mal mener & accoustrer leur povres *meschants* marys, voulurent en faire la vengeance sur les femmes de ceux de Flameaux" ("Seeing their poor, *craven* husbands being treated and cared for so badly, the Vindelles women resolved to take revenge on their counterparts from Flameaux" 71, 157).⁴²¹ Maugin's deletion of "meschants" (in the sense of "inept" or "cowardly") would seem to

make the husbands less abject than they were in the original: the Vindelles women appear more justified in supporting their husbands by seeking revenge, and the violence of the peasants seems a bit more respectable and less a quality of their lowly character than part of a recognizable moral code. On the other hand, as the episode unfolds, the women of both camps are driven by unmitigated belligerence, even after the men decide to end the dispute; all women, at this point, have become objects of ridicule.⁴²² With the word “meschants” removed, the reader may begin to see the Vindelles women’s deluded mindset and their inability to reason (their husbands, after all, had begun the feud), which drives the dispute to farcical proportions. In Du Fail’s version, it is possible to see that the women are driven by blind loyalty, rather than delusion, but are just as ridiculous, because they know their husbands were culpable to begin with, and are also worthless, but do not care. Given any of these interpretations, the change made by Maugin is indeed subtle, but, as we will see, opens the text up to a greater travesty later on.

In another example, an entire sentence is eliminated from the Groulleau editions. Maistre Pierre Baguette, a braggart from Vindelles who thinks himself a master swordsman, demonstrates a series of moves with his “rapière,” including one about which he says: “*Voilà un coup dequoy on ne donne remission*” (“Here is an attack for which no remission is given” 81, 160). The commentary is striking, not because of Pierre’s puffery – that is consistent with his characterization in the rest of the tale – but because there is no physical description of what he is doing, or in what situation he would make such a move. In other words, this line becomes disconnected from the physicality of the rest of the passage, where he verbalizes what he is doing (while he is doing it) and accompanies each move with glib superciliousness. Perhaps Maugin felt that this allusive sentence

took away from the pedantry of the physical actions and the redundancy of verbalizing them, or he was particularly disturbed by the use of the word “remission,” which conjures obvious religious overtones. In either case, Du Fail restored that sentence, which, for him, may have underscored Pierre’s arrogance even better, while setting up the comeuppance that he would later receive. Overall, the entire passage evokes, in Rabelaisian fashion, the ridiculousness of the “vilains” who imitate noblemen,⁴²³ although we might also understand, implicitly, that the pedantry of the aristocracy and their outdated, haughty codes of behavior are also a target. The choice to suppress or to keep this sentence, however, comes down to style and the differences are very subtle.

The majority of interpolations consist of changes or additions to the text. Many of the word changes are short, usually involving a single word or two: “rafreschissans la memoire de *leurs jeunes ans* / **leur adolescence**” (“refreshing the memory of *their young years* / **their adolescence**” 14, 137). In this example, Maugin only sought a minor stylistic change. He does seem, at times, quite sensitive to stylistic effect and contextual meaning (although, as we will see, he can also ignore the latter): when Pasquier speaks of “la vie *du bon* Thenot” (“the *good* Thenot’s life”) in the Du Fail editions, but of “la vie *de ce* Thenot” (“*this* Thenot’s life”) in the Groulleau editions (54, 149), it is perhaps because the expression “*bon* Thenot” already appeared in context and, as the story is being told to a passing stranger, the “*ce*” could simply reflect the point of view of someone who has just heard the name.

Additions appear frequently as well, and some are relatively short with fewer than five words, while others are far more significant, with five or more words. Some short additions are simply stylistic; yet others, due to Maugin’s more overt approach to the

subject matter, do alter the tone and the reading of the various characters as guided by the narrator. Some of these short additions remain in the later Du Fail edition, while others are purged. As we saw, La Borderie's critique of all of Maugin's changes is consistently negative, and he rarely hesitates to point out illogical alterations to the text. In the first chapter, a short addition to Huguet's description is "Celuy (**respond il**) qui se gratte le bout du nez **d'une main & la barbe de l'autre!**" ("The one," he **responds**, "who is scratching the end of his nose with one hand **and his beard with the other!**" 15, 138).⁴²⁴ As La Borderie points out, Maugin's Huguet is also holding a book, effectively requiring three hands, were this additional descriptor true. That is why, according to the nineteenth-century editor, Du Fail "eu grand soin d'en purger son edition de 1549" ("took great care to purge it from his 1549 edition" 138).⁴²⁵ In no fewer than fourteen examples, La Borderie criticizes Maugin's ineffectiveness and praises the care with which Du Fail restored his original text, but counter-intuitively indicates that Du Fail was not familiar with the Groulleau edition.⁴²⁶ As this example shows, some additions were easily purged by logic, and the author's presence was not needed. That Du Fail had to be involved in the second De Tournes edition of his *Propos Rustiques* is more strongly suggested by the elimination of lengthier additions, and (paradoxically) by the retention of some of the interpolator's work.

Taken together, brief additions, suppressions and changes amount to a subtle change in emphasis and guide the reader towards a better (or cruder) understanding of Du Fail's intended message. In some of these instances, the reader is guided to many of the same themes, but irony is often exaggerated and the more understated or ambiguous quality of Du Fail's subtle humor is lost, while additional meaning is brought into focus.

One of the most notable additions to the text occurs alongside some minor deletions. At the beginning of Chapter 5, “De Robin Chevet,” told by Lubin, himself an avid storyteller,⁴²⁷ Du Fail offers a list of his tales. In the 1547 and 1549 editions (give or take some spelling differences between the two), the reader would see this:

Et ainsi occupés à diverses besognes, le bon homme Robin (après avoir imposé silence) commençoit un beau compte du temps, que les bestes parloyent (il n’y ha pas deux heures) comme le Renard desroboit le poisson aux poissonniers, comme il fait battre le Loup aux Lavandieres, lors qu’il l’apprenoit à pescher, comme le Chien & le Chat alloient bien loing. De la Corneille qui en chantant perdit son fromage. 37

And thus occupied with many tasks, that good man Robin (after having commanded silence) began a beautiful tale from the time when animals talked (barely two hours ago), about how the Fox stole fish from the fishermen, how he had the Wolf beaten by washerwomen while he taught him how to fish, how the Dog and the Cat traveled far. Of the Crow who, in singing, lost its cheese.

But readers of the 1548 and 1554 editions would see the following:

Et ainsi occupés à diverses besognes, le bon homme Robin (après avoir imposé silence) commençoit le conte de la Cigoigne du temps que les bestes parloient, ou comme le Renard desroboit le poisson, comme il fit battre le Loup aux Lavandieres lorsqu’il l’apprenoit à pescher, comme le Chien & le Chat alloient bien loing. Du Lyon Roy des bestes, qui fist

l'Asne son lieutenant, & voulut estre Roy du tout. De la Corneille qui en chantant perdit son fromage. 143

And thus occupied with different tasks, Robin, the good man (after having commanded silence) began the tale of the Stork from the time when animals talked, or how the Fox stole the fish, how he had the Wolf beaten by washerwomen while he taught him how to fish, how the Dog and the Cat traveled far. Of the Lion, King of the beasts, who made the Ass his lieutenant, and wanted to be King of all. Of the Crow who, in singing, lost its cheese.

In this case, the additions are more significant than the suppressions, which seem to simplify the text: Maugin may have wanted to eliminate the redundancy of “poissoniers,” for example. In both versions, this list of animal fables or tales told by Robin Chevet is followed by references to other folklore figures, such as Melusine, were-wolves, and fairies (which he claims to be able to “see,” although he has been short-sighted, the narrator points out, ever since a friend beat him on the butt with a shovel 37). The character’s name is also evocative of the medieval pastoral and fabliau tradition, in which “Robin” is the generic male peasant or shepherd who may or may not get the girl. We remember, too, that the narrator had first joked about this tradition early in his epistle to the reader (7): that “Marion” preferred “Robin” to “Gautier” may have caused the first conflict and ruined the Golden Age. In both versions of the text, then, the tale-maker is somewhat discredited due to the stories he tells and the way he tells them.

The fable is considered amongst the least serious literary genres, just as tales are. In this list, Aesopian tales are mixed with *Le Roman de Renart* and other sources, but by

adding an Aesopian reference (to the story of the lion and the donkey who go hunting together), Maugin emphasizes the classical, written origins of this genre as though he wanted to emphasize Robin's educated background,⁴²⁸ and further distance the text from the oral frame from which it appears to derive. We have seen that the connection between the spoken and written word plays an important role in Du Fail's writing. Rather than strengthening the link from the spoken word of folk tales to the spoken word of Robin Chevet to the written word of the narrator/author, the heightened presence of the Aesopian fable reinforces the link that sends us back to the written word of classical literature,⁴²⁹ no matter how "popular." We could consider that the written may take over the spoken here, just as written knowledge takes over spoken knowledge in the last tale – the story of Gobemousche and Guillaume.

Again, behind this is the notion that education could establish one's role in society instead of birth, but the role of one's birth in education is important. Maugin's additional emphasis highlights the irony of "Robin's" knowledge, just as Du Fail does with Guillaume in the last tale. In fact Robin, contrary to Thenot (who likes the "vieilles fables d'Aesope"), does not seem to know or care about the origin of his tales – he has trouble remembering them, needs to drink a lot to refresh his failing memory, and has to fart loudly to recapture his listeners' attention. Guillaume's education, in the last tale, serves as a means to social improvement if not ascension, but that reward derives from perceptions about educated men in his very limited original milieu. In this way, Guillaume's education is also a joke, albeit one that brings him some success. In the Maugin version of Robin's tale, the fact that the reader recognizes more references may add a layer of irony, further underlining the storyteller's ignorance and making it look

more farcical. The addition may also feel different by bringing in the “Lyon, roi des bêtes,” alluding to the fable in which the lion denies the donkey any part of the game they hunted together. The “lieutenant” (we could perceive him as a hard-working bourgeois merchant or anyone – peasants included – trying to rise above his condition) is a victim of the king’s abusive power, but also of his own ambition. Conversely, the king might be interpreted as one who attempts to use the successful bourgeois or any hard-working non-noble to secure his power – or his “lion’s share.” While nothing results from this addition (the narrator’s enumeration of topics simply continues on), it does widen the scope of the social critique implied by Robin’s tale, or makes it more explicit; and this may be why Du Fail removed it.

As this example demonstrates, Maugin’s interpolations in the Groulleau editions tend to place greater emphasis – at times not without distortion – on themes that are certainly present, however more subtly, in the Du Fail text, and readers of Groulleau’s editions are more likely to grasp those themes with less effort. In this instance, the tone does not change significantly, but the interpolation aids the reader in his understanding of the underlying themes. We begin to see that Maugin’s version of the *Propos Rustiques* is often broader and more openly farcical than Du Fail’s version. Most of these changes do not alter the intrigue of the text dramatically, but they affect the reader’s perspective.

Longer additions, as can be expected, go much further in this direction. The farcical posture is more exaggerated. For example, the added text increases the misogyny⁴³⁰ and anti-clerical sentiments found in the original. The lengthiest addition within the original text occurs in Chapter 8: “De Tailleboudin &c.” (61, 151-153). It is interesting that all of those elements come together in this particular addition, since it is

the one chapter in the original that already bears all of these qualities. Tailleboudin, the prodigal son of Thenot, squanders his inherited wealth and moves to the city to become a “gueux,” which he claims is superior to all other conditions. In this tale, the “rustique” ideal is replaced by the underbelly of urban life: beggars, pimps, and thieves, all described at great length.⁴³¹ In this case, however, it was perhaps easier for Maugin to simply expand on existing elements.

In this chapter, the 1549 edition maintains a couple of Maugin’s minor exaggerations. For example, he replaces his original “trois jours” (57) with the interpolated “**un an**” (150 – Tailleboudin fakes infirmities to beg and earns more in one day than a farmer in one year) and, about a female beggar, “son gaing, d’un jour de Pasques, troys francs” (“her earnings of about 3 francs on one Easter Sunday” 59) becomes the Groulleau editions’ “son gaing, d’un jour de Pasques, **quatre escuz, & le rebillare du demenche de Quasimodo** troys francs” (“her earnings of about 4 écus on one Easter Sunday and about 3 francs on Quasimodo” 151).⁴³² Du Fail rejects the longer addition to this tale, in which Tailleboudin, who in Du Fail’s text was explaining briefly how some “vieilles” from the gueux’s “college” are making money by negotiating the illicit “amours des grosses Bourgeoises,” expands on this subject. First he recalls an anecdote about a “vieille” selling, to a “prothonotaire,” the favors of “la femme de sire Pierre,” called “la Siresse” (152); this derisive title suggests (and mocks) a bourgeois woman, not a noble woman.⁴³³ Then he praises a master “Maquerelle” who managed to secretly bring “trois Dames de la grand’ ville” (152) inside a convent of “freres Hermites,” and to sell her own cook to its “Abbé commendataire”: these tricks represent the “souverain degré” in the art of pimping. Tailleboudin himself, later in Du Fail’s tale,

boasts about his own success as a pimp: he recruited a young girl who “scavaoit tresbien son badinage” and pretended not to be a common whore, but Tailleboudin’s virgin daughter, in order to earn better money from the “Muguets” and “Maquerelles” who were after her. Ultimately, Tailleboudin sells her to a “gros Chanoine” (61-62) then spirits her away to sell her to fifteen more customers, all of whom catch “la verole” from the supposed virgin.

The original text’s mention of “les amours des grosses Bourgeoises” gave Maugin an opportunity to emphasize their depravity: they are reduced – just as the young girl at the end of Du Fail’s tale is reduced – to whores and Madams. Thus the joke at the end about the fat cleric who pays an exorbitant fee to deflower the young girl Tailleboudin whores out becomes, in the Groulleau editions, a natural extension of the entire monastery that illicitly takes in several “Dames de la grand’ville,” not to mention the “prothonotaire” who purchases the “Siresse.” In keeping with tradition, clerics are, in both versions, gullible and driven by their lascivious nature, and their role is amusingly predictable. As La Borderie and Philipot have pointed out, Maugin develops this farcical theme, which is present but not so central in Du Fail’s work (see Philipot 226-227). In Chapter 2, “Le Banquet Rustique,” “Messire Jean” is a popular, if somewhat laughable local cleric who Pasquier and Huguet joke is the father of many local children (“les enfans de la paroisse,” “the parish’s children” 22), but who does not take on the grotesque nature we often find developed in Maugin’s version (“les filz de putain de la paroisse,” “the parish’s whored bastards” 139).⁴³⁴ In the *Baliverneries*, the cuckold of tale 1 accuses a “messire Jean” – whether the same or another, it is unclear – of sleeping with his wife.⁴³⁵ The clerical joke remains throughout Du Fail’s books, but the tone is

quite different. Yet Maugin's version also emphasizes that what the "gueux" sell to the clerical class are the wives of the wealthy elite (bourgeoises, perhaps even noblewomen). It was Du Fail who first hinted at this idea of a connection between bourgeois and whores; but in 1549 he did not retain Maugin's development. We clearly see here that issues of social class and social mores, involving the overall structure of society and not just the "rustique" world, take on greater, more explicit importance in the interpolated editions.

Thus, class warfare becomes an obvious focal point, at the expense of the original text's subtlety. Contrary to La Borderie, who maintains an unwavering disdain for anything other than Du Fail's original text, Philipot argued that Maugin changed the tone or focus for a reason. I am indebted to his astute critique of the interpolator's work, which claims that Maugin actually clarifies the ironic tension Du Fail creates between the "fameuse thèse de l'immobilité bienheureuse des classes populaires" ("the famous thesis of the blissful immobility of the popular classes" 230) and the actual mobility of society as a whole, in which the dichotomy of "high" and "low," "noble" and "vilain," which was ambiguous but upheld in Du Fail's version, seems further eroded by corruption. As a result, in the words of Philipot, "à une satire ironique, qui s'arrête juste sur les limites de la caricature grimaçante, succède une satire franchement grotesque" ("an ironic satire, which stops just short of twisted caricature, is succeeded by a bluntly grotesque satire" 227). As we have just seen, Maugin's grotesque tone surfaces in at least some of the additions and changes found throughout the primary text, but it is of course best illustrated in the two additional chapters.

Additional chapters

While the inclusion of these two chapters rounds out some of the themes of the collection, it presents a sense of closure that was not in the original, and the intriguing irony is lost: the original “cacophonous” ending of Du Fail’s is still there, but the “fading” effect is utterly lost now that it is followed by another day of storytelling. In the first additional chapter (let us call it Chapter 14), the power struggle over class status immediately manifests itself through the appearance of two of Huguet’s nephews – in other words, members of the next generation, and the focus shifts away from the older men. Huguet, who is the primary voice of the *Propos Rustiques* has taken ill, and the “propos” will evolve differently when handled by his younger counterparts; the interpolator gives youth a voice in a text in which it was not meant to have one. Now, even though the two cousins are supposed to share the same “rustic” origin, one, “Thibaud Monsieur,” uses a nobleman’s appellative as his own name and the other, “Fiacre Sire,” does the same with a bourgeois appellative (165).⁴³⁶ This onomastic play between peasant, bourgeois and noble is interesting, because it seems to acknowledge the gist of Du Fail’s implied warning and subtle commentary about upward mobility and the blurring of social distinction, but changes their value to one of in-your-face comedy.

As we have seen, the *Propos Rustiques* and the *Balivernerries d’Eutrapel* are tied together in the Du Fail editions via subtle techniques, especially the presence of the motto “Puis que ainsi est”.⁴³⁷ In the interpolated editions, Maugin makes his own bridge between texts by using the added chapters to insert the loose dialogic set-up, instead of a circle of *devisants*, and subject matter found in the second of Du Fail works. Themes which are dominant in the *Balivernerries d’Eutrapel*, especially cuckolding (the subject of

the *Baliverneries*' first chapter, in which Eutrapel – a young nobleman – makes fun of a peasant who complains that his wife is sleeping with a priest), are the main focus of Chapter 14, in which women, reduced to sexual objects, and the clergy are the targets of endless farcical, obscene jokes. Philipot notes that the end of the chapter is “d’un antiféminisme brutal” (“of a brutal antifeminism” 229). At the same time, the rustic world essentially disappears: even though the nominal setting is another village festival, the two cousins are talking and behaving like “escoliers”; their ability to exploit their education becomes a central element of their perspective as narrators.

Fiacre, the “bourgeois,” insists that times have changed and “charrues” and “Boeufz” are now obsolete subjects: “il fault parler de choses plus grandes & haultes” (“we must speak of greater and more important things” 166), he says. Thibaud concurs, and as an example of “greater and higher things,” he suggests that they talk about “des bons tours, & souveraines sciences que nous aprenions estudiant en l[’un]iversité de Sirap” (“good deeds and of the sovereign knowledge that we learned as students at the university in Sirap” 166).⁴³⁸ The anagram seems to mask, but in fact only emphasizes the shift from country to city.⁴³⁹ Fiacre agrees, but as this subject triggers allusions to the behavior of their wives and sisters, he returns to the past: they will discuss instead how their uncle Huguet was when he fell in love. Fiacre, in the spirit of much French Renaissance literature,⁴⁴⁰ seems to be claiming that love is a “higher” subject than oxen and plow. Accordingly, the description of love is then interspersed with numerous academic and poetic references, which only serve to develop a lowly, hyper-sexualized view of Huguet’s interests in his “Perrine.”⁴⁴¹ Huguet turns into a fool in love and he is unable to profit from his own very advanced education when he

se fourra si avant en l'amour qu'il laissa Dialectique, Logique, Phisique, & toutes telles reveries à tous les dyables, pour mieux obtemperer à ses passions & entretenir ses fantaisies. 166

found himself so deeply embroiled in love that he said to Hell with Dialectic, Logic, Physics and all other such daydreams in order to better obey his passions and entertain his fantasies.

Education – and the lengthy “chanson” he composes for the occasion, which ranges from romantic to bawdy, and which Fiacre, who has trouble remembering the whole of it, quotes in two installments (the second is coarser than the first) – does not serve Huguet’s obsession very well: the obsession fails and Huguet’s amorous capacities are ridiculed by the whore (“pute”) in question; they end up exchanging obscenities.

This episode mimics Panurge’s unsuccessful attempts to seduce a high ranking “dame” in Rabelais’ *Pantagruel* by writing a poem to her⁴⁴² – except that Huguet does get what he wants at the very end, as soon as he simply accepts to pay his lady “cinq ou six francs” (175). While many elements of the Du Fail editions of both the *Propos Rustiques* and the *Baliverneries d’Eutrapel* attest a Rabelaisian influence, none are as obvious as this example from the Groulleau editions, which is also a parodic reversal of Huguet’s character in Chapter 6, “La difference du coucher de ce temps et du passé, et du gouvernement de l’amour de Village.” With Chapter 14, Maugin increases the farce element and its crudeness, but also makes it parodical, seemingly by design, as the joke is played against Huguet himself, who earlier (Chapter 6) makes fun of the Petrarchan love code: he is an old “Rustique,” who regrets the simplicity of ancient sexual mores. In Maugin’s version, he becomes a hapless student in the “Sirap” culture, who fails to

impress prostitutes with his romantic aspirations. La Borderie vehemently rejects Estienne Pasquier's famous comments that Du Fail was nothing more than a "singe de Rabelais" ("copycat of Rabelais" xxxv-xxxix), declaring that "[D]u Fail ne visa pas même à l'imiter" ("Du Fail did not even intend to imitate him [Rabelais]" xxxv). As most sixteenth-century readers would have been familiar with the Groulleau editions, it is entirely plausible that this chapter, more than any other element of Du Fail's works, inspired Pasquier's own dismissive view.

Two interpretations of the episode appear in the chapter, as Fiacre and Thibaud each give their own perspective. It is quite often difficult to determine who is speaking in the dialogue – more difficult than in the *Baliverneries*, but Thibaud seems even more cynical than Fiacre, who reminds his cousin that Huguet wanted her first "comme amy, [...] non comme putain" ("as a lover, [...] not as a whore" 171). Thibaud refuses to elevate the nature of the lovers' relationship to a sincere, let alone platonic interest, but reduces it to a mere sexual urge in a series of vulgar observations (167 and *passim*). Thibaud frequently makes highly educated references, but they are often used to insult women and clerics and to mock Fiacre's apparently more idealistic perspective. However, Fiacre may not be any less sarcastic than his cousin, as we learn about how Huguet finally bought Perrine's favors.

It is important to note as well that most of this chapter and the whole of the subsequent chapter do not appear in the 1573 version of *Les Ruses de Ragot Jadis*. There, the first additional chapter goes only as far as the first part of Huguet's love song, and a number of the elements that illustrate Maugin's coarse, farcical approach to Du Fail's text are eliminated, along with much of the debate between "Sire" and "Monsieur."⁴⁴³ The

ending found in the original is no less compromised, but the shift in tone is less pronounced than in the earlier Groulleau editions, and Rabelaisian imitation thus appears more limited.

The second added chapter (let us call it Chapter 15) returns to the “Banquet” theme, illustrated in a positive light by Huguet in the second chapter of Du Fail’s text (“Banquet Rustique”), and much more negatively by Anselme in Chapter 12 (“De Perrot Claquedent”). In Chapter 15, an “impacient” Guillot declares that he wants to hear no more talk of love, and proposes to discuss preparations for an upcoming feast between several local towns. Thus, there is a return to village culture: Guillot hates city mores, made popular by “noz bragardz,” and condemns those who abolish “les bonnes usances” (177). However, the tone changes, even hardens, with a coarsening of the effect initiated by Du Fail in the Perrot chapter, and ends up reflecting the vulgarity and extravagant nastiness of the country peasant with a high degree of scatological comedy. Guillot, we discover, intends to invite some local monks, who had taken advantage of some of the village’s girls, to a ceremonial banquet which will consist only of the most inedible, disgusting dishes possible, which he enumerates at great length. The banquet is, in effect, a vengeance.

The nostalgia for banquets of the past is entirely upended in this chapter, because of the extreme nature of the satire. As a result, reading the Groulleau edition, we see the banquet theme travel from subtle irony inherent in rustic nostalgia itself, as described in Chapter 2, to its perversion in the hands of Claquedent in Chapter 12, to its final descent into a form of war. Du Fail certainly has fun with nostalgia in his own version of the text, and suggests a level of corruption in the person of Perrot, but Guillot, who claims to be a

guardian of tradition, goes much further. In Du Fail's version, the elders are unaware of their own involvement in social changes, but they retain a sense of humor in front of them. Guillot, on the other hand, believes he resists these changes, but has been taken over by his own anger. Du Fail's text makes subtle comments about the differences between city and country folk (the potential perversity of the former is hinted at in Tailleboudin's character), as well as between generations; he plays with his own rejection of these class changes through an aesthetic in which subtle rhetoric threaded throughout an unlikely genre enables astute social commentary. Unfortunately, that aesthetic would have been lost to most sixteenth-century readers, who ended up being more familiar with the interpolated editions, within which cultural differences are radicalized, and make the nostalgic turn of the country elders sound even more than ridiculous: it now sounds enraged.

The second additional chapter thus rounds back to other elements found in Du Fail's text, and reminds the reader about the initial contract, but exaggeration becomes a primary stylistic element. In this case, the *devisant* is also an old man who is presented as more grotesque than venerable. Guillot is not present in Du Fail's introduction and only appears at the end of the first interpolated chapter when he comments on Fiacre and Thibaud's discussion. As with Ladulfi and Huguet, drinking precedes tale-telling in this chapter. Unlike Huguet, however, Guillot does not follow the Ciceronian protocol of being prompted to speak, but does so of his own volition.⁴⁴⁴ The distinction made here is not one of just class, but of social milieu. That is, Guillot is from the country and does not understand, in fact reviles, the social manners expected by those from the city. He is "impacient (comme sont communément tous gens de village) & assez indiscret [. . .]"

(“impatient [as are all villagers] and quite indiscrete” 176). The difference between country folk and city folk becomes a key element in this chapter.⁴⁴⁵ Yet, the banquet he describes is a far cry from the tradition of which Huguet speaks, and his enemies’ gluttony becomes a farcical “piege” into which they will fall.

Huguet had begun the description of his “Banquet Rustique” by noting that variety and spices were unknown to their ancestors, as these things were later “transferees des Villes en noz Villages” (“transferred from the cities to the villages” 20). The distinction between country and city folk is clear, but that polemical element of Huguet’s discourse is quickly forgotten and the description is not ruined. By contrast, the greater emphasis on this distinction placed in the Groulleau editions lends itself to the kind of “bluntly grotesque satire” Philipot identifies. According to Guillot’s plan, his guests – his victims, really, the “Moynes de Cunaud”⁴⁴⁶ – will eat the viscera and the least desirable cuts of meat. They are supposed to enjoy, for example, “des testes de veau [...] farcies de culz de Poule” (“calve’s heads [...] stuffed with chicken butts” 177-178), and “des aureilles de vache à l’estuvée, le poil osté, celà s’entend” (“steamed cow’s ears, with the hair removed, it goes without saying” 177). They will also be offered eighteen-year-old ganders in their feathers, as those from the “Ville Dieu” (the “City of God” 178)⁴⁴⁷ ate only the skin of the animal and “laisserent la chair à qui la vouloit prendre” (“left the flesh for whoever wanted it” 178), and now they will have to pluck it themselves. The entire chapter focuses on Guillot’s plan and while there is a logic to it, it all serves to emphasize the country peasants’ determinedly un-gentrified ways. Since this chapter ends the early Groulleau editions of the text, the reader is left with a very different final impression than a reader of the Du Fail editions. In this way, Du Fail’s subtly shifting

treatment of class is forgotten in favor of another, much broader caricature, in which all sympathy for the ways of the “Rustiques” is lost.

Both sets of editions of the *Propos Rustiques* present class structures that are supposed to be stable, but are in fact fluctuating, with the role of cities and the bourgeoisie directly or indirectly threatening the distinction of the noble and peasant classes. The greatest difference does not lie in the questions that are put forth, but in the way those questions are put to the reader. In the Du Fail editions, a reader must perceive the subtleties and extract the secondary matters for a full understanding of the message. In the Groulleau editions, Maugin eliminates Du Fail’s subtlety, makes the satire heavier and the text feel like a parody. In this way, the sophistication of Du Fail’s arguments is reduced to the ridiculous. Maugin’s interpolations exaggerate what is “lowly” about tales as a genre to produce a negative vision of the “low” world they are supposed to be describing.

It is possible, as we have seen, that Du Fail and Maugin saw copies of each other’s editions even before publication and even that the two collaborated alongside the *libraires* to present this series of editions challenging one another. The extent to which this collaboration occurred is uncertain, as is the extent to which Du Fail conceived the 1549 editions of his two books as a response to the Groulleau editions. Be that as it may, it is clear that the sixteenth-century reader would have most likely been exposed to the latter, and thus might have lost track of Du Fail’s complex social commentary. If there was in fact a contest, friendly or not, between the two versions, it appears that Du Fail did not win it.

The dialogue that is created between the two editions involves a shift in their relation to their subject matter. For Du Fail, class structure, as defined by the contrast between “noble” and “vilain,” plays a central role in the recounting of the country peasants’ discourses and tales. The frame of his discourse is clearly under pressure, and several cracks become more visible in the *Baliverneries*, but it still allows for a sympathetic portrayal of rustic life. For Maugin, class structure is important, but the relationship between city and country mores plays a greater role in determining how it evolves. More important, Maugin pokes fun at the heart of Du Fail’s treatment by changing the tone so drastically to mock the countryside’s traditional mores and its current corruption. The restoration of the original ending in the 1549 Du Fail/De Tournes edition certainly reflects an attempt to restore the balance of Du Fail’s satire and the main focus of his text. Yet, from a material perspective, Groulleau was the most successful of the three *libraires* to publish Du Fail’s work. Strictly speaking, the Groulleau editions were counterfeit, but the dramatic changes effected by the interpolator, and their ultimate success, reflect something more than a mere commercial operation: they tell us something about what kind of “propos rustiques” the educated public wanted to read.

Chapter 3

L'Heptaméron in the hands of Gruget and Boaistuau

Claude Gruget and Pierre Boaistuau each developed, and were esteemed for, very different styles of writing in activities that included translation and editing. In this final chapter, we will look at their respective editorial styles, and compare the versions of Marguerite de Navarre's collection as each envisioned it. This makes our approach to the *Heptaméron* significantly different from our approach to the *Nouvelles Recreations* and the *Propos Rustiques*, because the manuscript versions were not edited, in the modern sense, as a "base text" during this period in question or at any point in the sixteenth century.⁴⁴⁸ While Cazauran and Lefèvre have recently elected to edit the Gruget edition precisely because it was the most well-known text, both versions printed during the sixteenth century are frequently critiqued for their many infelicities.⁴⁴⁹ Many of the errors found in both editions may, as we have seen, be attributed quite simply to the speed with which these two men were forced to work by their employers: Sertenas, Gilles, Robinot, and Caveiller with Benoist Prevost, the printer.⁴⁵⁰

However, a great deal of information that is provided in the editions reveals each editor's interpretation of the text. Both reveal certain aspects of their respective visions in the prefaces, the letters to the readers and the tables, which precede the collections. The tables provide particularly interesting insight, because these were constructed entirely by the editors and prepare the reader for not only what is to come, but more important, for how to understand what is contained in the collection: editions of the *Nouvelles Recreations* and the Groulleau editions of the *Propos Rustiques* offer far less editorial

material.⁴⁵¹ In addition, the notable suppression of several tales in each edition has been studied and explained, to a certain extent, if not to everyone's satisfaction, and the seemingly sloppy elimination of major parts of the dialogues by Boaistuau has also been heavily criticized since the collection's first printing; both aspects of the two editions will be reviewed in this chapter. But Boaistuau was not the only one who repressed some aspects of the manuscripts: Gruget also practiced editorial incisions, despite his typical strategy to remain as faithful as possible to the author's intended work; many instances are imitative of Boaistuau's choices, while others are found only in the Gruget edition. Significantly, the order in which the remaining tales appear might reveal even more about how the editors originally intended their versions of the collection to appear in relation to one another.

According to Anatole de Montaiglon, Le Roux de Lincy is supposed to have presented the "vrai texte" of the *Heptaméron* when he selected BNF fr. 1512 as his base manuscript in 1853 (Avertissement, *L'Heptaméron des Nouvelles de la Reine de Navarre* 11).⁴⁵² In contrast, Cazauran and Lefèvre state in both of their recent editions that they have chosen to return to the Gruget 1549 edition as a base text because it was the one that most readers would have known for several centuries.⁴⁵³ However, as Cazauran and Lefèvre are quick to point out, no study of the *Heptaméron*, or edition, for that matter, can claim to treat a truly "authentic" text, as envisioned by Marguerite de Navarre; this problem, as we have seen, seems to be replicated, for different reasons, with Des Périers' and Du Fail's works.⁴⁵⁴ Every edition, including those by Boaistuau, Gruget and De Thou (manuscript only, of course), has depended upon a series of editorial choices based on the available versions (Preface, *H* (2013), Book 1, especially viii-x, xlix-lii). Again, we will

not examine the problem of Marguerite de Navarre's authenticity in any given edition, but we will look at the overall effects produced by the Boaistuau and Gruget ones. We propose that each editor's version of the collection was an image of his unique editorial approach, which extended in many respects to all texts they treated.

Gruget: translator

Since Gruget's edition is both the least radically different from the manuscript tradition, at least in some respects, and the most successful, we begin there, even though it was printed just after the *Histoire des Amans Fortunez*. This edition of the *Heptaméron des Nouvelles* is exemplary of Gruget's more conservative editorial approach, but also reflects an understanding of the religious climate, and suggests that he, like his counterpart, was rushed.⁴⁵⁵ Gruget was most well-known for his highly successful translation of Messie's *Diverses Leçons* (1552), but his reputation as a translator had been established earlier, with *Les Epistres de Phalaris* (1550), and Sperone Speroni's *Dialogues* (1551).⁴⁵⁶ In the preface to the latter, he comments on the art of translation: "Le principal motif d'une traduction n'est pour attribuer la richesse d'une langue à l'autre, pource que chascune langue retient sa propre et peculiere phrase et maniere de parler, qui le plus souvent ne se peult traduire" ("The principal reason for a translation is not to confer the richness of one language on another, because each language retains its own, peculiar structure and manner of speaking, which most often cannot be translated" Chavy, vol. 1, 650). Gruget did not then seek to impose the specific traits of any language on French, but to allow for the sharing of meaning and content, inasmuch as it can be transmitted via translation. He believed then that each language's unique qualities should

not, nor could be transferred to any other. It is precisely their singularity that makes them “rich” languages and good translators, accordingly, understand that distinction.

It is therefore clear that Gruget disagrees vehemently with certain aspects of Du Bellay’s school of thought, as represented by the *Deffence et illustration de la langue françoise*, which advocates “enriching” the French language by imitating Latin and Greek models. Similarly, Gruget criticizes a related trend that he views as pretentious – the contempt for translations as lacking “invention,” meaning that they are incapable of creating new arguments in new ways:

Et s’ilz veullent encores repliquer que, puis que nostre langue est si riche comme je l’estime, je devrois donc escrire quelque bonne invention [...], j’y puis respondre le commun proverbe qui dit, riens n’estre dit à present qui n’ait esté dit par avant. Aussi quand on voudroit exactement rechercher ce qu’au jourd’huy on appelle invention, l’on trouveroit que plustost se doit nommer adición ou interpretacion sur les premiers labeurs d’autruy que vraye invention. Parquoy j’ay voulu suivre l’opinion de Ciceron, qui dist estre meilleur de traduire en sa langue les bons auteurs estrangers que d’imiter ses predecesseurs pour courir après leur louange et bonne reputation [...]. (651)

And if they wish to also reply that since our language is as rich as I deem it to be, I should write some kind of good invention [...] I can answer with the common proverb that nothing is said today that has not been said before. Also, should one want to precisely find out what we call “invention” nowadays, one would find that such works must be called

such works “addition” or “interpretation” of others’ original labors, rather than true invention. This is why I wanted to follow Cicero’s opinion, which states that it is better for a man to translate good foreign authors into his own language than to imitate his predecessors to chase after their praise and good reputation [...].

Cicero (via Crassus, in Book I of the *De Oratore*) argued that it is a mistake to imitate earlier models in one’s own language: instead, Crassus sought to create Latin equivalents of Greek originals.⁴⁵⁷ Translation, for him, is an exercise, and one of the tools of imitation. It does not follow that any possible “invention” is itself reduced to a form of imitation, or that an “author” should merely seek the laurels of another. On the contrary, imitation is one of the means through which innovative invention will be achieved.⁴⁵⁸ Gruget, by contrast, values translation for its own sake; he understands that a translator acknowledges his source, and avoids the self-imposed delusion that what he is writing is somehow original. While he concedes various levels of invention in different forms of writing in the same preface (“les uns ont la grâce d’inventer, les autres de traduire” – “some have the talent to invent, others to translate”), Gruget subordinates the role of invention to that of imitation, thereby devaluing invention by comparison, and further subordinates imitation to translation, which he considers its most accurate and demanding form.⁴⁵⁹ Nothing, according to Gruget, is truly original, and in that way, only translation, which is inherently self-aware, is honest.

Du Bellay, we recall, agreed that translation held an important role in France, but would not sufficiently enrich the French language so that it might rival Latin and Greek, which was, in his view, the primary function of literature – meaning poetry and oratory

(210-213). He believes that those who lacked certain abilities are destined for translation: those include not only an aptitude for true *inventio*, but also for *elocutio*, namely the ability to reproduce the stylistic effects of one language in another. The problem is that each language bears its own unique markers, and to this extent, Du Bellay and Gruget agree. However, Gruget concludes that translation cannot overcome the difference, whereas Du Bellay holds that imitation, the key component and a starting point for all great writing, can do so. It follows that true invention is always possible for the talented writer, because he will forcibly interpret the works he imitates and recreate them in his own fashion, especially when working in a language different from that of the works he is imitating. The *Deffence* views the kind of “imitation” found in translation as very different from that found in true writing, and strictly dichotomizes the two functions.

Du Bellay maintains, throughout [the *Deffence*], the strategic separation between translation as a means of domesticating the encyclopedia of *res*, which he accepts, and as a means of ‘perfecting’ the French language, which he rejects. Equally, no overlap is allowed between translation (from which concern for *elocutio* is virtually excluded) and imitation, to which *elocutio* is fundamental. (Cave 61)

Translation, then, is excluded from the art of writing, because the formula is missing an element. Despite this marginalization, it remains true that the “proprietary distinctiveness between languages” (Norton 256) forces a translator to transmit a message that is unique to its culture and time of origin. Du Bellay recognized the proprietary qualities of individual languages and would in fact take on the task with Virgil’s *Aeneid*, realizing that the challenge forced an alternate form of *inventio*, thereby lifting translation, which

he had previously scorned, to the level of poetic imitation.⁴⁶⁰ Conversely, Gruget subsumed all writing to imitation more narrowly understood, with translation (stripped of stylistic pretensions) remaining the most “honest” form of writing.⁴⁶¹ Their respective views are not surprising: after all, Du Bellay was primarily a poet and Gruget was a translator. For Gruget, translation and invention were inherently different and a talent for one did not necessitate a talent for the other (even though true “invention” was unattainable), but for Du Bellay, the poet and orator held greater ability and could even, as a second thought, handle translation, because it was subsumed as another form of invention (Norton 255-257).⁴⁶² Both men agreed, though, on certain limitations to translation itself, but not on the virtue, role and aptitude of the translator or the poet and orator.

Translation theory of the sixteenth century often draws two schools of thought from Cicero, but both schools acknowledge translation as a form of interpretation and reading.⁴⁶³ Glyn Norton analyzes Fausto da Longiano’s 1556 treaty as a means to understanding the complexities of translation theory of the mid-century.

At the initial level (Argument, Arrangement, Elocution), the translator is a Reader with all the analytical and perceptual commitments implied by the term; at the narrower level (Composition, Dignity, Number), he transposes these insights, gleaned as Reader, into the articulative functions of Writer. Together, the two functions are predicated on a deeper awareness that reciprocity between any two languages is at best relative, sometimes determined by precise equivalencies in morphology and syntax, at other times, by new and transforming patterns of expression. 202

Gruget's emphasis was on the initial level of reading, and he attempted to remain as "true" to a text as possible, while he understood that any use of another language transposed its own meaning to a text, just as time and culture forcibly transposed a different understanding by the reader.⁴⁶⁴

Du Bellay, however, emphasized the second level, stating that translators who focused on word-for-word renderings were too limited by the nature of their work as a specific kind of imitation to be viewed as writers, and that transformation is inherent in imitation (he would later apply the same reasoning to good translation). For him, only "le poète et l'orateur sont comme les deux piliers qui soutiennent l'édifice de chacune langue" ("the poet and orator are like two pillars that support the edifice of each language" 231). The translator, in the strictest sense, does not appreciate his own interpretation of a text, or the nuanced particularities of the target language, unless he is willing to break away from the original text. Three years after the *Deffense*, his *Enéide* (1552) exemplifies this kind of break: it allows Du Bellay to enlarge his own perspective and refine his own theories, broadening the translator's authorship and readership of a text. He uses paraphrase and interpretation throughout in his desire to present a Virgil "naturalisé," or a French version of Virgil, which bears its own separate identity from the original.⁴⁶⁵ Thus, by his own example, the translator regained a level of authority, which had been denied to him by the *Deffense* and "il se sera rendu compte que la traduction, pas moins que l'imitation, nécessite un champs d'action plus large" ("he realized that translation, no less than imitation, required a larger field of action" Worth 493).

Peletier, as we saw, seems to fully discount any possibility that a translator can function as an author. At the same time, however, he admits that a good translator is

bound “not only by an author’s invention, but also by disposition, and even, as best he can, by elocution, as much as the nature of the translating language allows it.”⁴⁶⁶ Peletier saw the paradox of the translator, whose work is needed precisely because languages are unique, and the value in finding the “arc of optimal proximity” from the original to the target language that very few men can achieve (Norton 99-100). Correctly achieving this “arc” would allow for an accurate translation that respects and recreates the original text in the target language. Gruget’s work may not, in practice, fall very far from Peletier’s and even Du Bellay’s ideals in his desire to remain true to the text, but among these writers, there existed a paradoxical mutual acknowledgement and disregard for each other’s chosen form of work, as well as a need to draw sharp distinctions; even though Peletier, for example, likely edited the first edition of the *Nouvelles Recreations et joyeux devis*, it is possible that he did not name himself because he did not view himself as an author – in this case, there was no translation, only transmission. For Gruget, the challenge of translation itself bore an authenticity that many of the Pléiade poets would not recognize, and Gruget silently invalidated the authenticity of their production, although he was never viewed as a theorist.⁴⁶⁷ The collective of Gruget’s work effectively contributes to the on-going polemics on writing, and specifically, translation, interpretation and invention.

Gruget extended his philosophy to the *Heptaméron des nouvelles* and the editor’s task. Most interestingly, he praised the Queen’s grasp of complex rhetorical theory: “car de trois stiles d’oraison, descrits par Ciceron, elle a choisy le simple, semblable à celui de Terence en Latin, qui semble à chacun fort aisé à imiter, mais à qui l’experimente, riens moins” (“for of the three styles of oratory, as described by Cicero, she chose the

simple one, similar to Terence's in Latin, which seems quite easy for anyone to imitate, but for he who experiments, is anything but" Book 3, 1177).⁴⁶⁸ In this way, Marguerite, far from writing in a merely spontaneous or unsophisticated manner, certainly engaged in a form of *imitatio*, but did so in unassuming fashion, as required by the principles of simple style. In addition, as we recall from his preface to Speroni's *Dialogues*, Gruget did not believe that a fully new *inventio* was possible— at least not in fulfillment of an unattainable ideal of originality. Accordingly, he may have placed the *Heptaméron des nouvelles* amongst heritage literature, either because he considered the stories as part of a long-standing oral tradition, or because the stories, in that they are supposed to be "veritable histoire" (*H* (2013) Book 1, 15), disclaim originality by their very nature and all deal with real life, which is, according to its prologue, the true task of the *Heptaméron*. For Gruget, it is Marguerite's style that deserves praise, and the most valuable element in her personal, well-moderated, *elocutio* relates to the "beaux discours qu'elle faict, sur chacun des ses comptes" ("beautiful discussions that she wrote, about each of the her tales" *H* (2013) Book 3, 1177), which had been mostly suppressed or reduced in the alternate Boaistuau edition. This is what elevates Marguerite's work above the *Decameron* and makes it original - not in relation to all writing, but in comparison to Boccaccio, whose tales are not subjected to witty instruction or discussion. Thus Marguerite's uniqueness by comparison to her predecessor is both affirmed and balanced by her claim that these stories are true-life narratives, keeping her literary ambition in check, and by her mastery of the "simple," conversational style. For these reasons, Gruget deems her worthy of praise "non seulement par dessus les plus excellentes dames,

mais aussi entre les plus doctes hommes” (“not only above the most excellent ladies, but also among the most learned men” *H* (2013) Book 3, 1177).

In any case, Gruget’s key justification for his own edition is that the previous one did not acknowledge the author and did not respect the text as it stood, as though its “simple” nature allowed this kind of manipulation. Effectively, Gruget accused Boaistuau of the kind of self-aggrandizing that he blamed in all “authors” of “new” works when they did not recognize their models and of attempting to ride on Marguerite de Navarre’s laurels.⁴⁶⁹ As a translator, Gruget uses his skills to, in as accurate a representation as possible, make worthwhile texts available to a larger public. Likewise, textual restoration is vital to a work’s appropriate transmission, and as an editor, Gruget believes it is his responsibility to help make this work available to a larger public, not only to please the author’s daughter, but because it is worthy of being shared. To change the unassuming, yet inherently complex, nature of the text into anything else is to corrupt what was praiseworthy. Gruget claims to make careful, academic considerations and comparisons in order to restore the text as it was envisioned by the author,⁴⁷⁰ and the dedicatory letter, his only direct means of communicating his intent, firmly places his approach to the *Heptaméron des nouvelles* in the same theoretical line as his earlier translation work.

Gruget’s approach

As Gruget claimed, much of the text was restored to correspond with the manuscripts, which are as close to the author’s intention as possible. The new editor put the stories back into the same order found in the *Heptaméron* manuscripts, and reinstated the original dialogues and the divisions by days, which respected the *cornice* structure of

the prologue; none of this was present in Boaistuau's *Histoires des Amans Fortunez*.⁴⁷¹ Further, Gruget restored the number of stories to seventy-two, as it existed in the most complete manuscripts. It was this fidelity to the existing tradition, combined with Gruget's own reputation that earned his edition such success throughout the next several centuries. However, favor shifted away from his work as later editors acknowledged that Gruget had, himself, made some very clear changes to the manuscript text. First, he replaced three of the tales with alternate versions, two of which had been suppressed by Boaistuau, and one of which seems to be of his own selection.⁴⁷² Second, he included numerous variants and deletions that did not exist in the known manuscripts, but were present in the *Histoires des Amans Fortunez*, which shows that he used Boaistuau's edition as well as manuscripts to inform his own (Cazauran, "Boaistuau et Gruget, éditeurs" 163).⁴⁷³ Certain restorations were, themselves, edited by Gruget, and are evidence that fidelity to the manuscript was not his only consideration. As a result, it is not possible to discuss Gruget's changes without consideration of at least some of Boaistuau's own interventions. Also, given that this was an edition of a French language text, rather than a translation, we might think that Gruget's general principles of fidelity and modesty should have prevailed all the more strongly, and question his motives for such a series of changes.

In many instances where portions of the text were deleted, Gruget and Boaistuau both sought to reduce the evangelical and even reformist tone of the text, or to protect the anonymity of certain nobles. They removed, for example, the names of the Duke of Urbino (*Nouvelle* 51), Madame de Neuchâtel, and the seigneur of Chariotz (*Nouvelle* 53).⁴⁷⁴ In the latter two examples, they simply eliminated the names, but for the Duke, Gruget

writes in accordance with Boaistuau's edition: "Un Duc d'Italie (duquel tairay le nom)" ("an Italian duke whose name I will keep quiet" Book 2, 608).⁴⁷⁵ This duke is an historic figure, and in light of the somewhat controversial nature of the story's character, the editors might have had an interest in simply avoiding any direct references to someone with strong connections to recent popes (he was Jules II's nephew).⁴⁷⁶ Whether Boaistuau was initially protecting the Duke's anonymity or any personal risk of a perceived slight on the Duke's family is uncertain. It is possible that Gruget simply maintained Boaistuau's phrasing without such considerations, as he did so in other moments of the text.⁴⁷⁷ The other two examples are not identified as historic figures,⁴⁷⁸ and we do not know the reasons for the suppression in this case. In the case of *Nouvelle* 58, which does not include Marguerite, daughter of François I, and the Duchess of Montpensier's names, historical figures are distanced from the text, but for no apparent reason, other than to perhaps maintain a certain level of propriety relative to the royal family.⁴⁷⁹

Several of the lengthiest eliminations that Gruget maintained from Boaistuau's text express Marguerite de Navarre's evangelical tendencies; those cuts protect the author (posthumously), the king (her nephew), and, perhaps more important, the editors and *libraires* from any accusations of heresy. While alive, Marguerite often toed the line between acceptable evangelism and reformist thought, and she was protected by her brother when the *Miroir de l'Ame pécheresse* was censored by the Sorbonne, two years after its publication,⁴⁸⁰ but her bookseller, Antoine Augereau, did not fare as well – he was burned at the stake for the sacrilege of dealing several condemned texts following the "Affaire des Placards" in 1533.⁴⁸¹ Marguerite herself was ultimately vindicated, and even received a letter from the Pope attesting to her "piety" (Jourda 94). While she had

managed to remain on the edge, but still within the auspices of Catholic doctrine, the situation was transformed in the years following her death and as France marched toward the precipice of the Wars of Religion. Lutheran and Calvinist thought owed much to Lefèvre d'Étaples, one of Marguerite's theological mentors, and certain aspects of Marguerite's work would be interpreted as overtly reformist in the late 1550s. As a result, the editors and, undoubtedly, the group of *libraires* responsible for publication would not risk their lives over a few sentences when no such conviction existed on their part, while the intellectual and economic value of the collection gave great weight to the decision to publish the *Heptaméron* before anyone else, even if it had to be modified.

For example, several noted changes take place in the Prologue and in *Nouvelle 23*. Common to both Gruget and Boaistuau, several descriptive lines about Oisille are missing early in the Prologue:⁴⁸²

non qu'elle fut si superstitieuse qu'elle pensast que la glorieuse Vierge
laissat la dextre de son filz où elle est assize pour venir demourer en terre
deserte, mais seulement pour envye de veoir ce devot lieu dont elle avoit
tant ouy parler, [...] (Book 1, 2-3)⁴⁸³

not that she was so superstitious that she thought the glorious Virgin left
the right hand of her son where she was seated to come reside in this
earthly desert, but only out of a desire to see this devout place about which
she had heard so much said, [...]

As Cazauran and Lefèvre point out, during Marguerite's lifetime, Oisille would have been viewed as someone who separated ritual from true spirituality; later in the century, such claims were precisely a key point of rupture for Calvinists and many other

reformers.⁴⁸⁴ At the same time, the *devisants* were viewed as avatars for real-life people from Marguerite's life: Oisille is (and was) widely interpreted as Marguerite's mother, Louise de Savoie,⁴⁸⁵ and is one of the most influential characters of the collection. It would therefore have been imperative to edit her opinions for many of the same reasons that names were removed, and this tendency towards prudent censoring appears ubiquitously: for example in the elimination of *Nouvelle* 44, as the friar's comments and, especially, the comments in the debates, express the lack of faith of the religious class.⁴⁸⁶ Also, this very short tale mentions the family of Sedan, known for its reformist tendencies.⁴⁸⁷ In this case, the simplest solution is to delete the whole tale. Regarding Oisille's example, Cazauran suggests that Marguerite's own memory and experience must have strongly informed the development of the *devisants* as characters (*L'Heptaméron de Marguerite de Navarre* 30-31), and early readers' suspicions of this would increase the urgency for the sixteenth-century editors to exact prudence on the text.

So it is with the subsequent deletion of a passage from *Nouvelle* 23, also found in Boaistuau. In this tale of a wife and husband tricked by a friar who sleeps with the former, the husband discovers and explains the ruse to his wife. In his desire to seek vengeance, the husband leaves the wife alone as the *Nouvelle* culminates to its inevitable end (in which husband, wife, and new-born child die),⁴⁸⁸ and she ruminates on what has just occurred. The explanation on the origins of the victim's despair is deleted and the reader knows only that she "se trouva si troublée en l'assault de ce desespoir" ("found herself so troubled from the assault of this despair" Book 2, 355)⁴⁸⁹ before she takes her

life and, unwittingly, her newborn's life. Readers would not have seen the excised passage:

elle qui n'avoit jamais aprins des cordeliers sinon la confiance des bonnes œuvres, la satisfaction des pechez par austerité de vie, jeusnes et disciplines, qui du tout ignoroit la grace de Nostre bon Dieu donnée par le merite de son filz, la remission des pechez par son sang, la reconciliation du pere avecques nous par sa mort, la vie donnée au pecheur par sa seule bonté et misericorde [...] (Book 2, 355)

she who had never learned anything from [Franciscan] friars but to trust in good works, absolution of sins through austere living, fasts and discipline, who was wholly unaware of our good God's grace, given by his son's merit, the forgiveness of our sins by his blood, our reconciliation with the father by his death, life given to the sinner his sole goodness and mercy [...]

The excised text, which included clear criticism of the friar's hypocrisy, also insisted on the paramount importance of God's grace in the remission of sins, which became a major point of contention between the Reformers and the Catholics.⁴⁹⁰ Many passages and tales that highlight the hypocrisy of religious figures remained in both editions, indicating that this was not the reason the editors chose to cut this particular passage. The focus of this specific censoring was clearly Oisille's discussion of grace, which by 1559 might have been construed in a reformist light.

Portions of *Nouvelle 55* that treat a similar topic were also eliminated or changed. In each instance, the perspective of the tale changes, generally not within the narrative

itself, but in the introduction and the debate surrounding it. In this tale, a merchant decides that upon his death his horse must be sold and the proceeds donated to the Church as an act of repentance for absolution. In each version, the wife cleverly sells the horse for only 1 ducat, but the cat (as a part of the deal for the horse), for 99 ducats, and is able to keep the bulk of the money while still giving the willed sum to the Church. The husband's motives are questioned differently in the various treatments of the story, and the manuscripts' insistence that only an internal shift will bring about "true" repentance was softened extensively by Gruget, who again followed most of Boaistuau's text. The focus, as a result, turns to the potential ruin of the family.⁴⁹¹ For example, in the introduction, the sarcastic phrasing of the manuscripts, "en faisant quelque petit present à Dieu après sa mort il satisferoict en partie à ses peschez comme si Dieu donnoit sa grace par argent" ("by giving some small gift to God after his death, he will absolve in part his sins as if God gave his grace for money" Book 2, 637), becomes a condemnation of the family's potential ruin: "pensa de satisfaire à son peché s'il donnoit tout aux mendians, sans avoir esgard, que sa femme et ses enfans mourroient de faim, après son decez" ("thought he would absolve his sins if he gave everything to the mendicant friars, without consideration that his wife and children would die of hunger after his death" Book 2, 637). The husband's choice is questioned for practical and moral reasons, rather than theological or spiritual ones, and the editors managed to avoid considerations of impropriety.

Gruget did not, however, inattentively adopt all of Boaistuau's alterations. The change in emphasis is slightly inflected by Gruget with a subtle, but effective, word switch, and the example demonstrates his interest in maintaining the integrity of the

author's intentions, while adapting to the times. Gruget's variant "un marchand," was the most neutral of possibilities, for manuscripts proposed "un riche marchand," whereas Boiaistuaau wrote "un pauvre marchand" (Book 3, 637 and *Amanz Fortunez* f. 106 v^o). Each of these options places a different level of culpability on the merchant's decision to buy his absolution, and changes the tale's significance. When Boiaistuaau changed the "riche marchand" to a "pauvre" one, it became clear that this man's decision risked the family's survival. It appears that Gruget partially accepted the logic of Boiaistuaau's correction, since he chose not to restore the epithet "riche," yet he would not retain a term that was added to (and directly contradicted) the original. Still, the hefty theological questions that could be construed differently at the time of publication fade into the background in both edited versions, and practical issues come to the fore. It is clear that many of the changes Gruget made in cases like those of *Nouvelles* 23 and 55 are not reflective of his own approach to the text, but of Boiaistuaau's; he at least found it convenient to simply follow the religious prudence of his predecessor.

In many such cases of deletion and even revision, the editors' caution in a volatile religious climate is easily explained. Ultimately, the numerous cuts defused the text's impact, perhaps preserving the lives of those involved in the printing of the *Heptaméron*, but Cazauran finds that such changes do affect the meaning of the work:

Dans sa version de *L'Heptaméron*, qui fut si longtemps la seule à être connue, il se perd quelque chose de la spiritualité de Marguerite de Navarre et de la liberté de sa pensée. Gruget, en la matière et malgré son hommage à Jeanne d'Albret, ne fut pas moins circonspect que Boiaistuaau ("Boiaistuaau et Gruget, éditeurs" 163).

In his version of the *Heptaméron*, which for so long was the only one known, something of Marguerite de Navarre's spirituality and freedom of thought is lost. Gruget, in the matter and despite his homage to Jeanne d'Albret, was no less circumspect than Boaistuau.

Clearly, many of the changes to the text to which Cazauran refers originate with Boaistuau, but Gruget's docility in this respect did not prevent him from engaging in a large-scale restoration of what his predecessor had deleted. Under Boiaistuau, without the day-to-day frame, the *Heptaméron* was no longer a re-imagining of the *Decameron*, appropriated to a different purpose,⁴⁹² but became something other, and the changes Gruget made went a long way to recapture that important element. Nevertheless, it is important to remember that Gruget made a few of his own, rather notable changes to the manuscript editions.

We recall that he did not cut all of the same *Nouvelles* as Boaistuau, as he restored 63, 66 and 72, but replaced the deleted *Nouvelles* 44 and 46 with alternate tales, and *Nouvelle* 11, which Boaistuau had maintained, was also replaced. Cazauran engages in a detailed study of the "pseudo-nouvelles" and found that, statistically speaking, many of the word choices and stylistic traits found in Gruget's dedication to Jeanne de Navarre, the *Dialogues* of Sperone Speroni and noted variants of the collection itself, likely indicate the editor's authorship of these replacements, despite his numerous borrowings from Boaistuau:⁴⁹³ most clearly, these three tales were not lost *nouvelles* from the Queen (Cazauran, "Enquêtes d'authenticité," 544-545).⁴⁹⁴ Further, the replacement of *Nouvelle* 11 has long remained a mystery, because it certainly did not eradicate the *grossièreté* of other tales⁴⁹⁵ and the debate, completely unique to this *nouvelle*, assigns the *devisants*

comments that are not in character and “ne sont pas du tout dans la manière de Marguerite de Navarre” (“are not at all in accordance with Marguerite de Navarre’s manner” Cazauran and Lefèvre, *H* (2013), Book 3, note 1, 858).

Cazauran believes that Gruget might simply have found it easier to replace *Nouvelle* 11 with another tale because it was very short, and while the original *nouvelle* was “étrangère à toute polémique religieuse ou morale” (“foreign to all religious or moral polemic,” Cazauran, “Sur Trois Récits de l’*Heptaméron*: de l’importance des arrière-plans,” 520), “on risquait peut-être, malgré l’anonymat, de déplaire – qui sait? – à Madame de Roncée ou à sa famille” (“one risked, perhaps, despite anonymity, displeasing – who knows? – Madame de Roncée or her family,” 523). As for Gruget’s debates, the female and male *devisants* were sometimes reduced to their most basic contrast: the women presented borderline evangelical, moralistic readings of this new story and criticized the farce contained therein, whereas the men indulged their taste for the grotesque to a degree not seen elsewhere in the text (525). A portion of the debate for pseudo-*Nouvelle* 11 shows this to be the case:

En quelque sorte que ce fust, dist lors Hircan, si n’avoit il pas tort de demander des jambons pour des andouilles; car il y a plus à manger. Voire, et si quelque devotieuse creature l’eust entendu par amphibologie (comme je croirois bien que luy mesme l’entendit) luy ny ses compaignons ne s’en feussent point mal trouvez, non plus que la jeune garse qui en eut plein son sac. – Mais voyez vous quel effronté c’estoit dist Oisille, qui renversoit le sens du texte à son plaisir, pensant avoir affaire à bestes comme luy, et en ce faisant chercher impudemment à

suborner les pauvres femmelettes, à fin de leur aprendre à manger de la chair creuë de nuit. – Voire mais vous ne dictes pas, dist Simontault, qu’il voyoit devant luy ces jeunes tripières d’Amboise, dans le baquet desquelles il eust volontiers lavé son, nommeray-je? non, mais vous m’entendez bien: et leur en faire gouster, non pas roty, ains tout groullant et fretillant, pour leur donner plus de plaisir. (Book 1, 158-159).

“Whatever kind [of preaching] this was,” said Hircan, “he was not wrong to ask for ham instead of sausage, for there is more to eat. Indeed, and if some devout creature understood it as a double-entendre (as I well believe he himself understood it), neither he nor his companions would have found themselves less for it, any more than the young girl whose sack was full of it.” “But you see how shameless he was,” said Oisille, “reversing the meaning of the words for his own pleasure, thinking that he was dealing with beasts like himself, and in so doing, sought impudently to subor those poor young girls, in order to teach them to eat raw meat at night.” “Yes, but you aren’t saying,” said Simontaut, “that he saw these young, well-endowed tripe-sellers⁴⁹⁶ from Amboise in whose buckets he would have washed his . . ., shall I say it? No, well, you get my meaning. And have them taste of it, not roasted, but thus swarming and wriggling, to give them greater pleasure.”

Simontaut and Hircan are thus reveling in the gross humor of the story, while Oisille and the women are offended for the honor of the girls and for the hypocrisy of the friar, who by rights of his task as a religious figure, should seek to protect them from the world and

teach them the correct ways of the gospel. Instead, in keeping with the “sermon joyeux,” he takes verbal advantage of their naiveté, and plays on words to exploit the gospel to his own advantage. This example is in stark contrast to the debates presented in the rest of the *Heptaméron*, however: *devis* were the primary means by which Marguerite de Navarre revealed her own project, and it was crucial that the *devisants* use those debates to expose their complex, highly singular personalities; it was never as simple as the men versus the women (even if, in some cases of the manuscripts, that occurred to a limited extent during the occasional debate).⁴⁹⁷ Gruget had himself commented on the richness of the debates, and on their particular importance to the project; the restoration of the dialogues remains a key component of his editorial policy on the *Heptaméron*. Above all, Hircan and Simontaut, no matter how provocative they like to be, never talk in this “facétieuse,” vulgar fashion elsewhere, and Gruget himself must have felt it, since he has Parleme reproach Simontaut for having forgotten his “accoustumée modestie.” We might wonder, then, if this stylistic “fausse note” was triggered by the facetious nature of the suppressed *Nouvelle* 11, or if it occurred because Gruget was rushed by Sertenas and company and did not have time to improve his own narrative in keeping with the deceptively challenging simple style he so admired in the author. Perhaps, also, these two factors played into another, larger issue, and Gruget’s heightened sense of linguistic registers and peculiarities, resulting from his work as a translator, allowed him the freedom to recognize when certain choices could be made in favor of one quality over another. Despite the apparent error in tone he seems to be committing here, Gruget does present a short tale that would make the company laugh, as promised by Nomerfide, and

so, perhaps, he allowed himself to err on the side of excess out of greater deference to that promise, in keeping with the facetious and Rabelaisian traditions.

In contrast, the debates of the inserted *Nouvelle* 44 emphasize and reinforce the characters and their opinions found in Marguerite de Navarre's *Nouvelle* 40 (Book 3, note 20, 986) in a move that highlighted desirable portions of the collection (according to the 1558-1559 religious climate) and allowed for the convenient dismissal of questionable passages. The tale found in the manuscripts is generally agreed to elicit several aspects of evangelical theology that were later considered reformist, and in some instances, banned by the Sorbonne.⁴⁹⁸ The original tale itself is quite short, and the lengthy debate⁴⁹⁹ that follows does not focus on the folly of women (one aspect of the tale), but on the exploitations of the clerical class. In it, a friar comes to dinner to collect a pig as alms, as offered annually by a family of petit-bourgeois. Asked about his religion's "foundation," he mentions the "folie des femmes," thus cleverly insulting women: his frankness sparks the anger of the irascible Madame de Sedan, but pleases the husband, who doubles the offering.⁵⁰⁰ The debate focuses on the friar's behavior, rather than that of the Monsieur and Madame de Sedan, and on the impurity of his approach, which diverges from "preschent purement et simplement l'Escripture" ("teaching the Scripture purely and simply," Book 3, 560).⁵⁰¹ These points of contention were most easily erased from the text by both editors, and Gruget, like Boaistuau, opted to leave out the tale entirely, rather than restore it with a new debate and some stylistic changes that would encourage a new, less dangerous, interpretation. One must consider if that decision was made out of excessive prudence, or if, perhaps, Gruget refused to transform the original out of deference for his own philosophy on translation and writing, and, perhaps, for the author

herself. There can, in either case, be no question that the insertion of a different tale and set of debates was deliberate.

The “milieu bourgeois” of the new tale is not, however, “de la manière de la reine” (“in the Queen’s manner” Book 3, note 1, 984), and it eliminates a central religious figure, as found in the original. Instead, it harkens back to the motifs of *Nouvelle* 40, in which a beautiful woman is refused consent to marry by the man who was responsible for her: in *Nouvelle* 44 (Gruget), a merchant father and in *Nouvelle* 40, a noble brother, who favors the one sister over the others, whom he had already given in marriage. In each case, the women marry their lovers without consent, but the endings are dramatically different. In *Nouvelle* 40, the woman, who is considerably older than her Gruget-created counterpart, witnesses her husband’s death at the hands of her brother, who shows no mercy when she explains that they were in fact married. She is then forced into isolation for her disobedience, and when the brother tries to make amends, she demonstrates a complete retreat into a religious life, and far from him and his worldly desires.⁵⁰² In Gruget’s *Nouvelle* 44, an only daughter is seduced by the son of her father’s best friend, who, after his own father’s death, employs a ruse, taking advantage of the familiar relationship and tricking the mothers into getting together. He steals her virginity; he then promises to marry her, and he is later true to his word.

In each case, the debate centers on the notion of marital consent, and who has the authority to give such consent. The responses in both sets of debates are no less varied and nuanced than in other parts of the collection, and the men and women do not fall neatly on one side or the other of both cases; only Oisille’s position appears to be inflexible. For *Nouvelle* 40, most of the *devisants* indicate favor with the woman’s ability

to consent for two very specific reasons: she is well past eligible marrying age, and her brother has irrationally and selfishly resisted any proposed matches, in defiance of generally accepted social practice.⁵⁰³ Gruget's constructed debate of *Nouvelle* 44 complicates the issue with the girl's youth, and several consider the idea that what occurred was "violement" ("rape," used by Oisille, Book 2, 556), or at the very least "rapt" ("abduction," Longarine's term, Book 2, 557). The nature of the debates also hearken back to *Nouvelle* 21, the tale of Rolandine, which is directly connected to *Nouvelle* 40, because the woman is Rolandine's relative, and the readers thus discover the origins of Rolandine's tower. More important, Rolandine's case is similar to both other *Nouvelles*, and she marries outside of paternal consent, claiming her rights as a 30-year-old maid. French law was, until 1556, somewhat vague on questions of the majority age for marital consent without parental approval, and on the consequences of such marriages. The rules tended to be dictated by region, but shifted to a centralized authorization for the disinheritance of minor children (30 for sons, 25 for daughters), thus favoring the family role in marriage.⁵⁰⁴ Even given the temporal distance of Rolandine's case, to its earlier example in *Nouvelle* 44, most regions recognized 30 as majority age. In the whole of these stories, then, majority age becomes an important factor in the legitimacy of consent and in the legal and moral questions that arise in its consideration. The debates in *Nouvelles* 40 and 44 highlight these questions, and a collective look at some of the key *devis* suggests how Gruget allowed himself to interpret Marguerite de Navarre's personal opinions.

Oisille, for example, argues in *Nouvelle* 44 that young people are not mature enough to make such decisions for themselves, and that older family members are better equipped to serve that function.

Vous en direz ce que vous voudrez (repliqua Oisille) si fault il que nous recognoissions l'obeissance paternelle, et par default d'icelle, avoir recours aux autres parens. Autrement s'il estoit permis à tous et toutes, de se marier à volonté, quants mariages cornuz trouveroit on? Est il à presupposer, qu'un jeune homme et une fille de xij. ou xv. ans, sçachent ce que leur est propre? (Book 2, 556)

“Say what you will,” answered Oisille, “but we must recognize paternal rule, and lacking that, turn to other relatives. If everyone were otherwise allowed to get married according to their own will, how many adulterous marriages would we have? And can we presume that a young man and a girl of twelve or fifteen years old know what is proper for them?”

She continues along this line of reflection, but we must consider that Gruget may have been addressing Marguerite de Navarre's unhappy first marriage, as had been arranged by her mother, Louise de Savoie, long considered the model for Oisille. Her line of reasoning is consistent with her comments in *Nouvelle* 40: “En bonne foy, dist Oisille, quand il n'y auroit point de Dieu, ne de loy, pour apprendre les folles à estre sages, cest exemple est suffisante pour leur faire porter plus de reverence à leurs parens, que de s'adresser à se marier à leur volonté” (“In good faith,” said Oisille, “when there would no longer be a God, or law, to teach foolish girls to behave, this example suffices to make them show more reverence to their relatives than to set out to marry according to their

desires.” Book 2, 510). In the case of *Nouvelle* 21, Oisille respects Rolandine’s decision to marry, but only because the character found a way to compromise between parental and individual rights. Rolandine held to both religious and social principles, by marrying according to “God’s will,” while refusing to consummate the marriage until her father either gave approval or died (Book 2, 306-307, 326-327). Oisille’s argument, then, favors power of consent to the family members in lieu of the individuals, and Gruget’s inserted *Nouvelle* 44 gives further emphasis to this.

Parlamente’s argument is complicated by shifts between several editions. As a result, the nuanced contrast between Oisille and Parlamente gains the most emphasis in Gruget’s edition. As *Nouvelle* 21’s narrator, Parlamente presents for Oisille a character that fully merits respect: ““En bonne foy, Parlamente, (ce dist Oisille), vous nous avez racompté l’histoire d’une femme d’un tresgrand et honeste cuer”” (““In good faith, Parlamente,” thus said Oisille, ‘you have told us the story of a woman with a great and honest heart.’” Book 2, 326). The debate, however, does not center on marital consent laws, and Parlamente does not speak about them directly herself. *Nouvelles* 40 and 44 are different examples, and a clear opinion evolves where one does not exist in the manuscripts. First, in the Boaistuau/Gruget versions of *Nouvelle* 40, Parlamente states that by the consent of the “parties” (Book 2, 514), a married couple should be left alone, but in the manuscripts, the term used is “parens” (“relatives,” Book 2, 514). The tale remains intact, but the editors’ word change forces a different reading of Parlamente’s opinion, lending weight to the role of individual consent in marriages, or at least creating a certain ambiguity as to whom the “parties” might be – the individuals and invested family members alike. Further, Gruget’s debate in *Nouvelle* 44 allows Parlamente to

again criticize a mother's irresponsibility: “‘Tout cela n'est procédé,’ dist Parlamente, ‘que de la grande bonté et simplicité de la marchande, qui sous tiltre de bonne foy mena, sans y penser, sa fille à la boucherie.’” (“‘All that only proceeded,’ said Parlamente, ‘from the merchant's great goodness and naïveté, who, under the auspices of good faith, led her daughter, without thinking, to the butcher.’” Book 2, 557). She does not explicitly defend the girl's right to consent in such a case, but she does place a good amount of the blame on the conditions which led the girl to make such a decision. Like Rolandine, the girl was put into a difficult position by her mother, more so than by her choices. Parlamente, like Oisille, seems to agree on the role of family consent, but the burden of responsibility falls to that family and if they should fail to exercise it properly, undesirable consequences are likely to ensue, which should not be blamed on the victim. This comment, in addition to the word change in *Nouvelle* 40, presents a nuanced opinion for Parlamente that is not necessarily present in the manuscripts, and that is far less visible in Boaistuau's edition.

Gruget's changes and the insertion of a new *Nouvelle* 44 exact a blatant shift from risky theological questions to more contemporary legal ones. However, the new emphasis, which links his inserted text to *Nouvelles* 40 and 21 also allows Gruget to interpret the personalities of the *devisants* in his own fashion, and we see Oisille's character become more rigid, and Parlamente less so, as she develops an opinion that is less clearly perceived in the manuscripts. In this way, Gruget allows himself a liberty of interpretation that seemingly exceeds his own role in the reestablishment of the text, but perhaps further demonstrates his appreciation for the debates as a tool for instruction.

The replacement of *Nouvelle* 46 is in other ways the most surprising of Gruget's additions, primarily because of what he elected to maintain. Gruget employs the same opening and closing as the manuscript, and gives his added tale the same milieu and main character (the Cordelier De Valles, though his moral character takes on a completely different tone). He even includes portions of Marguerite de Navarre's original debate, all of which had been eliminated in the Boaistuau edition.⁵⁰⁵ In the Gruget edition, the *devisants'* anger at the *cordelier's* hypocrisy is softened, primarily because of the character's change in nature, but also because the focus shifts to social order. The rapist *cordelier* of the manuscripts is suppressed and replaced by a somewhat naïve *cordelier* who give two sermons that pit the sexes against one another in a poor attempt to resolve marital disputes. As a result, Gruget is able to maintain portions of the debate and blend them into his own work, but ultimately elicits a very different meaning from them.

The corresponding debate contains references to evil, trickery and the hypocrisy of men. Oisille says, for example:

Toutefois, dist Oisille, on doit soupçonner le mal, qui est à éviter, car il vault mieux soupçonner le mal, qui n'est point, que de tomber par sotement croire en celuy, qui est. De ma part, je n'ay jamais veu femme trompée, pour estre tardive à croire la parole des hommes: mais ouy bien plusieurs, pour trop promptement adjouster foy à leur mensonge.

“However,” said Oisille, “one must suspect evil, which is to be avoided, because it's better to suspect evil where it is not present, than to fall for having stupidly put one's trust in the one that is. For my part, I have never seen a tricked woman tricked because she was slow to believe the words

of men, but I've heard of several who were too quick to put faith in their lies." Book 2, 575

In the context of the deleted tale, the "tricked woman" was the mother who believed the friar was teaching her daughter a lesson about laziness, only to discover too late that her daughter's pleas for help were to prevent a rape. The woman's utter foolishness and trust in the friar are cause for blame as far as many of the *devisants* are concerned, for, as they point out in other tales as well as here, many men, regardless of their position or rank (and especially friars), are prone to evil acts.⁵⁰⁶ In addition, the evil men to which the *devisants* refer are in this case *cordeliers*, and their hypocrisy and abuse of position is underscored by the relationship of this debate to the preceding tale. No one debates the culpability of the friar, for his acts are clear violations of moral and social laws and the debate underscores an agreement that there is little or no nuance to interpret.

Gruget's insertion strays quite far from this understanding. "Trompé" can also refer to the spouse of an adulterer, and in this case, the tale begins with a woman who, upon discovering that her husband had been philandering, began to verbally harass him about it. His response was to beat her to the extent that the village complained to the friar. The friar explains that a man who beats his wife will be cursed to hell by his neighbors as he was, and from whence there is no return: "Et fy, fy de tells mariz: au diable, au diable" ("Oh fie, fie, such husbands. May they go to hell, to hell" Book 2, 570). The women take advantage of this and become wholly uncooperative, and the *cordelier* must give a new sermon in which he compares women to devils and gives men the right to beat their wives again. Most people, the friar included, had sided with the wife, until the women of the whole village abused the religious counsel that had been given, and the

cordelier himself was forced to demonize the women to restore social order. Here, the adulterous and abusive husband is guilty of evil, but his evil is isolated and everyone agrees that his behavior was incorrect. The women, however, colluded to conspire in a new lie that tipped the balance of power, or, perhaps more important, radically disabled the social structure. The debate then refers not only to the victimized wife as the “femme trompée,” but to the evil of the women who corrupted the intent of the friar’s words. The hypocrisy lies not with the *cordelier*, but with his female constituents who ultimately behave in a manner that supports their lower role in the social order. In this instance of tale-swapping, then, the *nouvelle* determines the meaning of the debate even more than the debate determines the meaning of the *nouvelle*.

This example differs from Gruget’s treatment of *Nouvelle 44*, which was completely eliminated and shows that the editor’s claims of deference to his subject – both the author and the collection – did not fully dictate his approach to the text. Gruget was willing to bowdlerize portions of the debates by adapting them, at least in the case of *Nouvelle 46*, to a very different context. It is possible that Gruget simply wanted to soften the lesson imparted by the debate (along the lines of “evil is everywhere”), and that he believed this was a key aspect of Marguerite’s intentions. It was not likely the violence of the *cordelier’s* actions that forced Boaistuau and then Gruget to cut the original *Nouvelle 46*, but the meaning of the violence when placed alongside the debate. When Oisille comments that it is better to presume the presence of evil, she adds: “Parquoy je dy, que le mal, qui peult advenir, ne se peult jamais trop soupçonner de ceux, qui ont charge d’hommes, femmes, villes, et estats” (“Which is why I say that evil, which can occur, is something we can never suspect too much from those who are responsible for men,

women, cities and states” Book 2, 575). This statement, alongside the tale of an evil friar, could be extended without much difficulty to all responsible parties, including the Church itself, and corruption is certainly implied. Is it still the case when this statement appears in the context of the pseudo-*Nouvelle* 46, where the friar’s evil is far less extreme, and where the question of social and moral hierarchy between men and women seems to be taking center stage?

Further, Gruget actually splices the debate for *Nouvelle* 46 by interjecting some of his own dialogue into the preceding text. He brings the discussion back to the problem of the Cordeliers’ hypocrisy and rampant sexual abuse: Hircan suggests that the friar’s call for men to beat their wives serves him as a “ruze” to drive the alienated women into his own arms; Parlamente and Dagoucin agree that the hypocrisy of the friars is the greatest danger: “A la verité, dist Dagoucin, ils ont tellement decouvert leurs menés de toutes parts, que ce n’est point sans cause, que l’on les doit craindre, combien qu’à mon opinion la personne, qui n’est point soupçonneuse, est digne de louange” (“‘In truth,’ said Dagoucin, ‘they have well discovered their games everywhere, so that it is not without cause that one must fear them, so much so that in my opinion, the person who is not at all suspicious, merits no praise’” Book 2, 571). At this point, Gruget defers back to Oisille’s judgment from the original. A portion of the original debate was eliminated, because it spoke directly to the tale, and would not have made sense. In it, Hircan and Parlamente spoke as well, so Gruget shows some consistency, but Dagoucin’s appearance is new. The splice is fairly dramatic, especially in comparison to the other two instances of added tales. It shows a greater level of forethought in regards to stylistic problems we encountered in the added *Nouvelle* 11 and does not appear to refer back to debates of

other tales, as is the case with the added *Nouvelle* 44, but perhaps Gruget considered the splice with the original debate a strong enough connection.

We are left to speculate on the exact reasons why he would have taken such an approach. In part, he might have disliked the manuscript tale 46 for stylistic reasons, because it was the only example of a double tale in the collection: this may have disrupted the editor's sensibilities to the extent that he felt the need to replace it. Also, Gruget may have been trying to paint Vallé, who is identified in the tale, in a more honorable light, just as he may have done a favor for Madame de Roncex by dropping her tale entirely. Since the discussion does return to the friar's hypocrisy, we are not inclined to believe that the deletion was motivated by religious reasons, even though the extent of the hypocrisy is softened by the elimination of explicit descriptions of violence (the outright description of a rape is replaced by vague third-party comments about a man hitting his wife). Finally, there remains the possibility that outside influences, for undisclosed reasons, determined his final decision to eliminate those specific tales. We recall that we do not know the extent of Jeanne d'Albret's collaboration in this edition, which means she might well have dictated the excision of these three tales. Sertenas and company's role appears to be a stronger possible influence, since, as we have seen, Boaistuau's comments in his edition of the *Histoire des Amans fortunez* clearly point to them for the number of tales he was forced to include, and for the speed of the production process, which left little time to correct errors.

In any case, Gruget demonstrates that he was not entirely complacent with issues related to the types of corrections and changes he made to this edition of the *Heptaméron des nouvelles*, even though he conceded to numerous changes that originated with

Boaistuau. Certain factors were of undeniable importance to Gruget and it seems he tried to remain true to his own claims in the dedication: he retained, at all costs, the original disposition and overall number of tales, and restored the debates almost in their entirety. Therefore he might have been *forced* to insert tales that Marguerite had not written, in order to keep the number right, thus maintaining fidelity to the original and to his own scrupulous theories on textual transmission in this edition, a paradox, to be sure, but one that may have been imposed by the very politics of publication and editing that led to the publication of a very different edition of Marguerite de Navarre's collection only months after the first.

Boaistuau: translator

Boaistuau's views on the role of translation in literature differ from both Gruget's and Du Bellay's ideas in numerous respects, but his distinction from Gruget stands out: in a word, Boaistuau strived for *inventio* throughout his brief career, even though what he produced mostly consisted of what Gruget would call "adicion ou interpretacion sur les premiers labours d'autrui" rather than "vraye invention." That philosophy extended to his treatment of the *Heptaméron*, and also bears on his treatment of other texts, most especially Bandello's *Novelle*, which were printed under the title *Histoires Tragiques* less than a year after the *Histoires des Amans Fortunez*. The *Théâtre du Monde* and the *Chelidonium*, we recall, were published the same year as the *Histoires des Amans Fortunez*, and the *Histoires Prodigieuses* followed only two years later; Boaistuau would have had to work on all of these texts either simultaneously or back-to-back in order to maintain this rate of production.⁵⁰⁷ Whether as a translator or as an editor, he reinvents

the works with which he is engaged: he creates, for example, a kind of Bandello “naturalisé” with his makeover and restricted selection and makeover of tales from the Italian collection. *Histoires des Amans Fortunez* is not a translation, of course, but then again, *Chelidonium*, which Boaistuau claimed to have translated, was not exactly one either. In truth, each of the texts he writes, edits, and / or translates over the course of a few years is a transformation of its original, or, in the case of the *Chelidonium*, an composite, partly translated and partly original work, deemed to be something else.⁵⁰⁸

In a comment that is often cited,⁵⁰⁹ Boaistuau claims that it would have been easier to write the *Amans Fortunez* stories from scratch than to have to edit the collection as it stood. His version certainly contains numerous errors of inconsistency that indicate either his own impetuosity or a rushed pace of production, but may also support the claim that the task was a difficult one. One may note that he makes the same kind of claim in his address to the reader of the *Histoires Tragiques*:

Te priant au reste ne trouver mauvais si je ne me suis assubjecty au stile de Bandel, car sa phrase m’a semblé tant rude, ses termes impropres, ses propos tant mal liez et ses sentences tant maigres, que j’ay eu plus cher la refondre tout de neuf et la remettre en nouvelle forme que me rendre si superstitieux imitateur, n’ayant seulement pris de luy que le subject de l’histoire [...] 7

I beg you, in any case, not to look down on me if I did not subject myself to Bandello’s style, for his syntax seemed so rough to me, his vocabulary incorrect, his arguments so poorly linked and his ideas so thin, that I felt it more valuable to reforge the whole thing anew and put it into a new form,

rather than become a superstitious imitator, as I only took the story's subject from him [...].

It would seem at first that Boiaistuaau, like Gruget, strictly separates invention from the rest, making no claim on the former, since he retains the stories' "subject," but his contempt for Bandello – not just his style or language but his "propos" (the unfolding content of the stories) and "sentences" (the ideas or judgments expressed therein) as well – is so intense that he feels compelled to offer more than a stylistic upgrade. A comparison with what he says about the *Amans Fortunez* shows that a similar rhetorical point is at play in Boiaistuaau's understanding of imitation and of invention proper. He is keenly aware that he is in one case editing and in another translating the work of another writer, but he insists on making a claim to the texts in their entirety, of which he ends up being "le seul auteur" ("the only author" *Histoires Tragiques* 6). In both cases, Boiaistuaau makes no pretense about what he does with the works, and views authorship in a very different light from Gruget, and from Peletier, for that matter.⁵¹⁰ For Boiaistuaau, imitation should not be "superstitious": it is to be subordinated to *inventio*, and to the amelioration of style – in other words to a new, complete rhetorical process, almost equivalent, in prose, to what Du Bellay had in mind for poetry. In his letter to the reader of the *Amanz Fortunez*, Boiaistuaau warns that an author's style might unintentionally lead to a "mauvaise interpretation" of a given subject (*Histoires des Amans Fortunez* f. x r°, hereafter *HAF*); it is the editor's responsibility not just to "correct" such stylistic infelicities, but to guide the reader toward an overall understanding of the work. In this way, Boiaistuaau finds his own take on the two functions of writing and translation described by Norton.⁵¹¹

He sees himself clearly as both a reader and an author, and, like Gruget, strives to make valuable texts available to the masses, by way of his own methodology. In above-mentioned passage, Boaistuau cites stylistic issues as only part of the reason for his adaptation of the *Heptaméron*, and places readership and interpretation at the fore:

Ce que j'ay fait partie pour la nécessité & decoration des histoires, partie pour server au temps & à l'infelicité de nostre siècle, ou la plus part des choses humaines sont si exulcerées, qu'il ne se trouve œuvre si bien digéré, poly, & limé, duquel on ne face mauvaise interpretation, & qui ne soit calomnié par la malice de quelques delicats. *HAF*, f. x r^o

Which I did in part for the stories' need and adornment, and in part to be of use to the times and our century's infelicities, where most human things are so ulcerated that one cannot find a work that is so well thought out, polished and refined which is not subject to someone's misinterpretation, nor slandered by the malice of some fussbudgets.

In keeping with Cicero, Boaistuau notes that time periods and cultural moments can have an important influence on the reading of any given text,⁵¹² but also speaks quite directly about reading tendencies in 1558 France. Marguerite's most polished work had already been "poorly interpreted" (or at least, unfavorably censored) by many, and even Bonaventure Des Périers' *Cymbalum mundi* had been radically censored by both Catholics and Protestants, because the unbalanced climate of religious fanaticism encouraged such inclinations among those in power. Boaistuau suggests, in this respect, that his intention is, as much as possible, to clear away the textual elements that would most likely lead to radical (mis-)interpretation.

His colleague and protégé Belleforest hails Boaistuau's role as "corrector" in a preliminary poem to the *Histoire des Amans Fortunez*.⁵¹³ Belleforest's poem is interesting, in that it develops a lengthy analogy about Boaistuau's work and, especially, his work on this collection of tales that is quite similar to Du Bellay's celebrated analogy (which he borrowed from Speroni) in the *Deffence et Illustration*. In both cases, the writer must cultivate the wild plants of their own languages in order to produce the most fruitful vines; it is through this process that glory and honor will be achieved. Du Bellay references the development of Latin via the Greek models as an incitement to cultivate the "sauvage" language by using both Greek and Latin (Book I, ch. iii),⁵¹⁴ and Belleforest specifies his mentor's relationship to Marguerite de Navarre's work:

Mais des que ay ouy marteler / Sur le taillant de tous le prime, / Par lequel
 emonder tu peux / Les fruitiers que bons rendre veux: / Lors ay je dit,
 heureux l'esprit, / Qui de tel fruit mit la semence: / Plus heureux celuy
 qui apprit, / De l'exposer en evidence: / Lequel maintenant tant dispos, /
 De ce beau livre tant propos / Avec les dieux aux heureux champs / Ou
 son Ame sainte reside: / Scachant que ses comptes plaisans, / Devoient
 estre un jour par l'aide / De toy, ô Launay, corrigés, / Et de leurs sauvages
 purgés, / De quelque getton ne sentant / La douceur propre à sa racine, /
 De quelque bourgeon forlignant / De sa tige franche, & divine / De quoy
 tel honneur recevras / Que à jamais le los tu auras (lines 57-78 f. ix r°)

But as soon as I heard the very best / Of all blades being hammered out, /
 By which you can prune / The fruit trees that you want to improve / That's
 when I said: happy is the spirit / That planted the seed of such fruit /

Happier still is the one who proved able / To expose it to the eyes / And is
 now so well poised / To so enjoy this beautiful book / With the gods in the
 happy fields / Where her holy soul resides, / Knowing that her pleasant
 tales / Would one day, with your aid, / Oh, Launay, be corrected / And
 purged of their weeds, / Of any sucker, not feeling / The sweetness coming
 from its proper root, / Of any bud degenerating / From its noble and divine
 stem / From which you will receive such honor / That you will be praised
 forever.

Belleforest directly applies words already used by Du Bellay to Boaistuau's rendering of the *Heptaméron*, and shows an example of Du Bellay's call in action, as this unkempt thing (although blessed with an already natural beauty) is honed into a more perfect creation. As Du Bellay interpreted the Greco-Roman model of linguistic cultivation, one must ideally use elocution, reconnected with an invention worthy of the original, as a means to develop both the vernacular and the works produced in it: there is a collaboration of sorts between the two domains (linguistic and literary), as each reinforces the other, but they remain distinct. In addition, works that are imitations of prestigious models while developing their own *inventio* and *elocutio* will help glorify France, the French language and the authors themselves (Book 1, chapter v, 210-213). Boaistuau applies the same idea to the task, seemingly much narrower, of editing a text. Accordingly, the recipients of this book's glory and honor are later noted by Belleforest to be France, the original author, but the "correcteur" as well (lines 91-100, f. ix v°), who earns a new status and is celebrated as a second author, in a language that Du Bellay and his peers reserved for poetry of the highest order.⁵¹⁵

Boaistuau agrees that mere translation is inherently faulty, because it is, as Du Bellay stated, “impossible de le [the subject of the translation] rendre avec la meme grâce dont l’auteur en a usé” (“impossible to reproduce it with the same grace as that used by the original author” Book 1, chapter v, 211) – or, as we saw in the case of Bandello, because the author’s style is so poor that the translator has to reinvent it. For the *Histoires des Amans Fortunez*, Boaistuau himself does criticize the state of Marguerite de Navarre’s style in the unfinished text,⁵¹⁶ but the implication is such errors are not typical to the original author, whom he praises (using grammatically masculine forms) in his dedication: “lequel n’a besoing de trompette & herault, pour magnifier ou exalter sa grandeur, considéré qu’il n’y a eloquence humaine qui plus vivement le puisse depeindre, que luy mesme s’est peinct par les celestes traicts de son propre pinceau” (“who does not need trumpet and herald to magnify or exalt his greatness, considering that there is no human eloquence that can more vividly depict it, than he did by painting himself with the celestial traits of his own brush” f. v, r^o)— by which Boaistuau means Marguerite’s “autres escripts” rather than the present one. He also criticizes those who have obstructed the important transmission of knowledge by poorly attending to books, which have been “dissipez & ruinez,” and “putrifiez & corrompus” (f. iv, v^o) throughout the ages.

We recall, as well, that Du Bellay made it clear in the *Deffence et illustration* that certain forms of writing are more valid than others, in contrast to Gruget’s more inclusive philosophy. Worthy writing is distinguished from unworthy writing in part by the exercise of *inventio* – or, to be more precise, by the full activation of the *inventio* – *elocutio* synergy; where that is lacking, most notably in direct translations, there is no direct benefit to the vulgate language, or to the translators, whose glory ultimately lies in

the pure transmission of content - or in another's writer's work and, in that case, is a travesty of true glory (Book 1, chapter vi 213-214).⁵¹⁷ Boaistuau's notion of writing hinged on many of the same elements; the most obvious difference lay in the choice of prose (tales) over poetry as a medium.⁵¹⁸

That particular choice shows where Boaistuau's differences with his contemporaries – and the Pléiade poets in particular - ran deeper: for him, all forms of writing were malleable and worthy of this second helping of *inventio*. If an author was treating any text, in any form, it was his responsibility to apply his own vision to the work, to guide its reader, to render it even more meaningful and beautiful, and to contribute on yet another level to the “encyclopedia of *res*” (Cave 61). He might have criticized those who “corrupted” other's works, but he seems to believe that preservation takes on several different forms, which are not mutually exclusive in his mind (and will be criticized as “corruptions” by his detractors). Translation is not, in this view, as it is with Du Bellay, forcibly separate from invention and subordinated to the higher calling of imitation: the linguistic limits of translation instead invite a more open interpretation of transmission in which the translator is responsible for presenting the reader with not only the subject, re-created as vividly as possible, but with a linguistically-appropriate, contemporary reading of the work in question.⁵¹⁹ Hence, Carr's observation: “More than a mere translation of the Italian original, Boaistuau allows himself complete freedom with his source, changing details when he feels it is necessary, adding and deleting passages wherever required by his understanding of the story” (*Pierre Boaistuau's Histoires Tragiques* 25). For Boaistuau, this applied just as well to the *Histoires des Amans Fortunez*,⁵²⁰ even though no translation was involved, precisely because the work

was unfinished, and because contemporary society could no longer understand the text the way he believed it was originally intended.

Moreover, several parallels appear between Boaistuau's production of the *Histoires des Amans Fortunez* and that of the *Histoires Tragiques*, and these lead us to compare his relationships with Gruget and Belleforest. Gruget must have conceded the soundness of certain aspects of Boaistuau's strategy, as we have seen that he included many of Boaistuau's changes in the *Heptaméron des nouvelles*. At the very least, the times called for prudent choices, to which Gruget, as we saw, often yielded, but we must also remember that the same group of publishers (as we discussed in Part I) hired both Boaistuau and Gruget to produce versions of the same text nearly simultaneously: it is clear that Gruget had Boaistuau's manuscript in hand while working on his own edition. What's more, Boaistuau worked with Belleforest around the same time as the publication of the *Amans Fortunez* to present the series of translated, but notably edited, collections from Bandello's *Novelle*; Boaistuau would contribute only one edition of the *Histoires Tragiques*, and Belleforest went on to complete several, in his own distinct style.⁵²¹ In the case of both Bandello's and Marguerite de Navarre's work, then, there were multiple variant editions evolving from different people, but always under the same set of publishers.⁵²²

For Boaistuau's part, he worked intentionally with Belleforest to plan the "translation" of several editions of Bandello, and we are forced to wonder if the same type of collaboration on Marguerite de Navarre's collection was possible between Gruget and him.⁵²³ There are some differences between the separate editions of the *Heptaméron* and those of the *Histoires Tragiques* that indicate that Boaistuau thought

the alternate edition was irrelevant to his own project. First, Boaistuau does not refer to an anticipated second edition as he does in the beginning of the *Histoires Tragiques*: “Mais d’autant que j’espere qu’il te fera voir le second Tome bien tost en lumiere, traduit de sa main” (“In as much as I hope that he will bring the second volume to light, translated by his hand, very soon” 6). Publication evidence supports the idea of a cooperative agreement: Belleforest’s first edition, the *Continuation des histoires tragiques*, appeared the same year as Boaistuau’s, in 1559, and privileges for both were issued on the same date in January of that year (Simonin, *Vivre de sa plume au XVI^e siècle* 52-57). The six tales of Boaistuau’s original *Histoires Tragiques* were not the same as the twelve in Belleforest’s *Continuation*, which allowed for a counterfeit edition called the *XVIII Histoires Tragiques* that contained both editions in one collection and would appear no fewer than nine times from 1560-1596 (234-297).⁵²⁴ The editions of the *Heptaméron* would never inspire this kind of collation, counterfeit or otherwise. Further, unlike his rival’s protégé, Gruget does *not* present a preliminary piece in the *Amans Fortunez*, nor does Boaistuau reference any impending alternate edition, even though the evidence indicates that he was most likely aware of Sertenas’ project with Gruget. The latter, as we have seen, clearly criticizes Boaistuau's approach in his edition of the *Heptaméron des nouvelles*.⁵²⁵ Collaboration was not unfamiliar to Boaistuau, but does not appear to be involved in the separate *Amans Fortunez* and *Heptaméron* presentations. All of this supports the theory that Sertenas and company’s demands were developed in an *ad hoc* manner and that Boaistuau's initial focus was on his own editorial approach, but quickly shifted to getting the work out to meet his employers’ demands.

Boaistuau's approach

It is possible that Boaistuau's original project was, as he indicated in his letter to the reader, to freely choose from amongst the available tales, and to arrange them according to his own vision, as he was doing with the *Novelle*. Boaistuau indicates in his preface to the reader of the *Amans fortunez* that he did not originally intend to present the entire collection. He was only asked to edit some of the stories found in the manuscripts:

[...] je fus seulement requis de retirer & mettre au net dishuict ou vingt histoires des plus notables, reservant en autre saison plus opportune, & avec plus de repos de parachever le reste. Toutefois ainsi que les hommes sont curieux de novalitez, je fus sollicité avec tres instantes requestes de poursuivre ma pointe, [...] (f. x, r^o)

[...] I was only required to pull out and clean up eighteen or twenty of the most notable stories, reserving the rest for completion at another, more opportune time, and with more leisure. However, since people are eager for novelties, I was very urgently solicited to pursue my effort, [...]

He goes on to state, we recall, that he was not thrilled with the speed with which he was forced to finish a complete edition of the collection. We may accept his statements at face-value, and presume that the first eighteen or so tales were intended for his original, abbreviated collection. Be that as it may, the changed structure of the collection – notably the virtually expunged *cornice* – suggests more similarities between Boaistuau's approach to the *Amans Fortunez* and the *Histoires Tragiques*, further suggesting the editor's progression towards a sub-genre that would trigger a new vogue in *nouvelles* with a flurry of subsequent publications that went well beyond Belleforest: for example,

Bénigne Poissenot's *Nouvelles Histoires Tragiques* (1586) et François de Rosset's *Histoires mémorables et tragiques de ce temps* (1619).⁵²⁶ Choice of tales and disposition then become major factors when considering the rhetorical intent of the collection as it appears under Boaistuau, and that is why the focus of our study falls on the first part of the collection.

A common theme appears in the ensemble of the first eighteen tales: they seem to fit the “structure” of the tragic tale; even more important, some are identified as such.⁵²⁷ This structure is not exclusive to the first tales, as it is prevalent in many of Marguerite de Navarre's *nouvelles*, specifically those referred to as “piteous stories” (Campagne, “Marguerite de Navarre and the Invention of the *Histoire Tragique*” 94), but we still may note Boaistuau's purposely expressed interest in this concept. First, he selects an ambivalent title: *Histoires des Amans Fortunez*; “fortunez,” as previously discussed, might mean “fortunate” or “unfortunate,” depending on the favor Fortune bestowed on a given recipient (Greimas 302).⁵²⁸ Furthermore, Campagne notes the role theatricality plays in the *histoire tragique*, and “[e]lements of this theatricality are also present throughout Marguerite de Navarre's ‘piteous stories’: characters are often presented as the victims of ‘Fortune,’ whose sudden reversals are emphasized by the narrators” (95). This is taken further in *Nouvelle 70*, when the story is called a “tragedy” by Oisille, the narrator (Campagne 95). In Boaistuau's account of the Châtelaine de Vergy, he changes the order, giving the *nouvelle* first billing, thus pushing forward the “tragic tale” agenda. This idea is cemented in the “Table de toutes les histoires” that he constructed himself: after the description, we read “Histoire tragique & fort notable” (“Tragic and very notable

story” f. xi, r^o). Boaistuau therefore exploits elements that are already present in the *Heptaméron* to at least begin to formulate a guided reading of the collection.

Boaistuau has been heavily criticized for having dropped portions of the debates, as well as for shuffling the tales’ arrangement without regard to the daily frame structure established in the Prologue, and without correcting errors created by the upended *dispositio*. Closer analysis, however, demonstrates that the debates do in fact remain, to a large extent, present if not intact. Numerous deletions that did occur appear to have been made to suit the religious climate, and many, as we saw were retained by Gruget.⁵²⁹ What becomes incredibly confusing is the near – but not total – effacement of the daily frame structure: the debates are not corrected to introduce the accurate narrator, and the introductions for each day were mostly deleted, or subsumed into the previous day’s discussion. For example, in the transition from *Nouvelle 5* (manuscript and Gruget 5) to 6 (manuscript and Gruget 14), Boaistuau incorporates the announcement from the end of manuscript *Nouvelle 13*, so as to properly introduce the next tale, but he makes a noticeable error with the *devisants*.⁵³⁰ In all of the editions, Guebron had been named at the end of *Nouvelle 4* to narrate *Nouvelle 5*, but in Boaistuau’s (and Gruget’s) versions, Parlamente erroneously passes the baton at the end of the tale, as if she had been the speaker, which was the case for manuscript *Nouvelle 13*.⁵³¹ A similar error is made in Boaistuau’s transition from *Nouvelle 19* (manuscript and Gruget 11) to 20 (manuscript and Gruget 33).⁵³² In this case, he uses the last couple of lines from manuscript *Nouvelle 32* to present the next tale’s *exordium*, but does not change the narrator: Dagoucin is announced in 19, but Simontault (as presented in manuscript and Gruget 33) passes his voice to another at the end of 20.⁵³³ Boaistuau clearly made an effort to include the

proper *exordium* for each of the tales as he rearranged them, but did not carefully adapt the text for consistency; this is perhaps, as we have already suggested, due quite simply to the speed with which he was forced to work, but it is also likely that Boaistuau's priorities with the collection lay elsewhere.

The rearrangement of the introductions to each new day is also problematic. We may note that in the first twenty *nouvelles* of the *Amanz Fortunez*, there remain two daily introductions. The first appears at the end of *Nouvelle* 12 (manuscript and Gruget 20), and blends into the end of the discussion without break.⁵³⁴ The next tale begins the same way as all the others, with no more than a single space and a heading that notes the story number: "Histoire Treziesme" (f. 43 r°). Gruget, however, not only restores the order, but makes the division between days visually distinct. At the end of day one and of *Nouvelle* 10, spaced apart from the text appears the mention: "Fin de la premiere journee" (Gruget f. 42 r°) followed by a page break. The second day is given a full heading in a larger font, which includes a decorative engraving: "Seconde journee des nouvelles de la royne de Navarre" (Gruget f. 42 v°). The introduction is also set apart with an italicized font (Gruget f. 42 v°-43 r°). This visual separation is included for each day in the Gruget text. For the *Amanz Fortunez*, however, Boaistuau subsumes the introductions throughout, and even creates some confusion as to how they fit with the text. For *Nouvelle* 18 (manuscript and Gruget 10), Boaistuau does not elide Parlamente's comment: "Puis que j'ay donné au soir fin à la *dixiesme*, c'est à moy à eslire celle qui doit continuer celles du jourdhuy" ("Since I ended yesterday evening with the *tenth*, it is up to me to elect she who must continue today's tales" f. 81 r°-v° emphasis mine). It is disruptive and confusing to the reader since the announcement of the end of the tenth tale should indicate the end of the

first day, but the text has apparently moved to the second because of the tale's placement. Also, it is clearly not the tenth tale in the new arrangement, and this kind of oversight is disorienting enough to be considered sloppy. Boaistuau thus made no effort to rearrange the daily introductions to suit the new disposition of texts, and he simply incorporated them into the body of the stories. Still, he did not delete them entirely. The fact that he chose to keep these introductions, however egregiously placed, indicates that his project was not constructed irrespective of Marguerite de Navarre's intended frame: perhaps he felt that the visible presence of the Boccaccian frame would overshadow his intended reading of other aspects of the collection.

The retained Prologue, which establishes the ten tales per day, one per narrator structure that intentionally evokes the *Decameron* (which is directly referenced) may give further insight. Certainly, some readers would have recognized this presentation from the manuscript that was known to have been in circulation, and it may have allowed Boaistuau himself to confirm that the work indeed originated with Marguerite de Navarre. Even in the new, sharply reduced and transformed setting, the Prologue may have allowed the readers to make sense of the debates, since they remain the primary means by which tales are introduced. It is also possible that Sertenas and company decided to have Boaistuau include the Prologue as a part of their own editorial strategy, and just like many of the tales, it was inserted regardless of his opinion: he at least had the time to make a few changes to the text, but not many.⁵³⁵ Given that Boaistuau and Gruget were working under the auspices of the same group of *libraires*, it is likely that one difference was intentional: in the *Amans Fortunez*, the Prologue is not numbered as part of the collection, whereas in the *Heptaméron des nouvelles*, it very much is. Yet

another possibility, however, is that Boaistuau sought to exploit the original *cornice* as a means to support the veracity of what follows, thereby even more dramatic force to the tales he chose to retain: these stories are not only shocking, but all the more so because they are supposed to be true.

Jean-Claude Arnould juxtaposed frame-tale structures in Des Périers' *Nouvelles Récréations* and the *Heptaméron*: "L'absence d'encadrement dans les *Nouvelles Récréations et joyeux devis* doit par conséquent être comprise, positivement, comme une dilution dans un discours intégral de la superposition qui au contraire se structure dans la *cornice*" ("The absence of frame in the *Nouvelle Récréations et joyeux devis* must as a result be understood, positively, as a dilution in an integral discourse of superposition which on the contrary finds itself structured in the *cornice*," "Le joyeux devis des *Nouvelles récréations*" 33). Boaistuau's edition finds itself somewhere between the two extremes, since there remains a frame, but it appears to be broken, or at least fades into the background. The original frame of the *Heptaméron* pushes the collection's focus onto the debates and the interplay of the *devisants* with their circumstances, with each other and with their tales. The frame also guides the movement of the collection, dictating much of the interaction. When the frame is present, but subjected to a subordinate status, which is made clear by the edition's visual cues, the frame no longer guides the collection forward. The stories themselves become the focal point, and meaning is subject to the interaction between the different stories, rather than various interactions with the *devisants*.

This could be considered, therefore, a preliminary step towards a different vision of the *Heptaméron*'s tales. Tom Conley suggests that in many instances, "[t]he rhetoric

[of the *histoire tragique*] is conditioned by a verbal perspective focusing on the *piteux spectacle* or *chef d'œuvre* of the work's own printed performance" ("Graphics of Dissimulation" 79), and, in some ways at least, this may be true in the *Amanz Fortunez* as compared to the *Heptaméron des nouvelles*. The shift encountered by Boaistuau's dilution of the frame in the *Amanz Fortunez* shows at least an interest in peeling away some of the layers of Marguerite de Navarre's project, and shifting the focus onto his own.

Where the frame of the collection has been subdued, the "Table de toutes les histoires contenues en ce present livre, laquelle contient aussi les sommaires desdictes histoires" ("Table of all of the stories contained in this exact book, which also contains the summaries of said stories" f. xi, r^o) has been added.⁵³⁶ The summaries of this table are quite different from those found in Adrien de Thou's manuscript, which appear to be the first manifestation of their kind in the *Heptaméron*, and do not appear to have been constructed by Marguerite de Navarre. Gruget seems to use his competitor's table for inspiration, but the descriptions are considerably shorter, and do not retain Boaistuau's moral focus. The summaries for the tale of the Châtelaine de Vergy may serve as a comparative example. The three different tables present this story (manuscript and Gruget *Nouvelle* 70, Boaistuau *Nouvelle* 1) in a very different light: first, Adrien de Thou's description:

La Duchesse de Bourgogne, ne se contentant de l'amour que son mari lui portait, prit en telle amitié un jeune gentilhomme que, ne luy ayant pu faire entendre par mines et œillades son affection, lui déclara par paroles; dont elle eut mauvaise issue. (*L'Heptaméron*. Ed. Simone de Reyff, 551)

The Duchess of Burgundy, not content with the love that her husband had for her, took such a liking to a young gentleman that, unable to make him understand her affection by way of faces and winks, she made an open declaration, from which a bad outcome ensued.

Second, Boaistuau's:

En la premiere histoire est fait mention de l'incontinence d'une Duchesse de Bourgogne, qui devint amoureuse d'un de ses gentilhommes, lequel pour la fidelité qu'il devoit à son maistre, ne voulut consentir à son deshonneste vouloir, & pource l'accusa envers le Duc son espoux, auquel il decella celle qu'il aymoît, qui fut cause de la mort de la duchesse, de luy & de sa dame. Histoire tragique & fort notable. (*Amans Fortunez* f. xi r^o)

The first story describes the immoderation of a Duchess of Burgundy, who fell in love with one of her gentlemen; the latter, due to the fidelity he owed his master, would not give in to her dishonest intent, and because of this, she denounced him to the Duke, her husband, to whom the gentleman revealed who he loved, which caused the deaths of the Duchess, him and his lady. Tragic and very notable story.

Finally, Gruget's:

L'incontinence furieuse d'une Duchesse, fut cause de sa mort, et de celle de deux parfaicts amans. (*H* (2013), Book 1, clxxv)

The furious immoderation of a Duchess caused her death, and that of two perfect lovers.

De Thou leaves out a key character and does not provide the denouement – he obliquely refers to the “mauvaise issue” that happens to the Duchess, but the other victims are not mentioned, and the summary appears relatively neutral, due to a lack of morally or emotionally specific terms. The Duchess makes an obvious mistake, but the dramatic nature of that mistake, and the passion-driven ending with the violent deaths of three people is left out of the synopsis. Gruget has clearly paraphrased Boaistuau’s synopsis, as evidenced by vocabulary repetition, but it is tremendously abbreviated and does not provide any exposition beyond the fact that an amorous transgression causes three deaths, which is already more information than De Thou provides. He does, however, bring the “perfect lovers” into sharp focus, thus centering the story around love as such; and adds the word “furieuse” to his description of the Duchess, thus emphasizing her sin, though we have no indication about what she did. We are then aware, from the beginning, of the impending denouement, and are prepared to blame the Duchess’ passion.

In contrast, the Boaistuau summary is much lengthier. It includes all of the same information as Gruget’s, but this protracted exposition provides the reader with a more guided reading, extending the emotional register of the Duchess’ guilt and going into some detail about her desired lover’s honor. The gentleman’s lover and her fate are mentioned, but the focus of the summary is not on the lovers’ relationship, let alone its perfection. The overall tone that defines the plot here follows many of the same patterns of the genre that Boaistuau would follow in the *Histoires Tragiques*, and he uses the Table as a means to establish that tone. “Belleforest, Rosset, and others sought to stir the emotions of their readers by depicting reversals of fortune, the destructive effects of human passions, as well as a wide variety of cruel and often unbearable spectacles”

(Campagne 95). The *Châtelaine de Vergy*, as Campagne points out, suits each of these characteristics, and “besides its moralistic function (to denounce excessive passion), it is designed to generate pathos – as shown by the tears in the *devisants*’ eyes at the end of the story” (95). The Table, as demonstrated in this example, initiates that function for the reader and when fully engaged, “we cannot avoid judging the characters we know as morally admirable or contemptible, any more than we can avoid judgments on their intellectual ability” (Booth 131). Boaistuau’s summary tells the reader which characters are “admirable or contemptible” from the start.

In another example, the table summaries of the tale of Floride and Amadour (Boaistuau 18; manuscript and Gruget 10) show that Boaistuau remains focused on his project even though the denouement does not reveal the tragedy of a tale.

Adrien de Thou:

Floride, après le décès de son mari, et avoir vertueusement résisté à Amadour qui l’avait pressée de son honneur jusqu’au bout, s’en alla rendre Religieuse au monastère de Jésus. (*L’Heptaméron*. Ed. Simone de Reyff, 541)

Floride, after her husband’s passing, and having virtuously resisted Amadour, who had pushed against her honor to the end, went and became a nun in the monastery of Jesus.

Boaistuau:

Des amours de Florinde, & d’Amadour, ou sont contenus divers discours amoureux de la chaste amitié de Florinde, laquelle ne peut estre vaincue par aucune servitude ou artifice d’Amadour. (f. xii r^o)

On the love of Florinde and Amadour, in which are contained diverse love discourses on the chaste friendship of Florinde, who could not be vanquished by any of Amadour's submissions or artifices.

Gruget:

Amours d'Amadour et Florinde, où sont contenues maintes ruses et dissimulations, avec la treslouable chasteté de Florinde.

Love of Amadour and Florinde, in which are contained many ruses and dissimulation, with the praiseworthy chastity of Florinde.

Some aspects are reversed in this example. De Thou gives away the ending, and tells us that Florinde eventually retreats from the harassing behavior of her less than honorable lover, and from the world. While we immediately see her as an "honorable" and "virtuous" character, the approach is very matter-of-fact; the judgment about the circumstances is very objective based on the social conventions expected of a widow. Boaistuau and Gruget do not give away the ending; again, Gruget's synopsis is abbreviated, but reminiscent of his predecessor's. In all of the versions, Florinde is presented as an honorable figure; Amadour's character is not directly addressed by Gruget, but De Thou and Boaistuau do not hesitate to name Amadour directly as the author of the manipulations which go against Florinde's character. By leaving out the ending in this description, Boaistuau de-emphasizes the less than theatrical, non-violent denouement, but retains focus on Florinde's chastity. Unlike many of the characters in the *histoires tragiques*, she is not driven by uncontrolled passion, and counters her lover's presence. Boaistuau does not appear to (and cannot really) turn this tale into a tragedy, per se, but he directs the reader towards an expressive response regarding the morality of

the character, driven by the vocabulary: “amour,” “amoureux,” “chaste,” “amitié,” and “vaincue” are examples of the emphasis placed on the emotional triggers. For Boaistuau, the tale drives the pathos felt by the reader, but the editor’s task is to lead the reader in the correct direction with his summary descriptions.

Boaistuau may have initially been given the liberty to create his own project, and establishing the Table of summaries appears to have been a first step in guiding the reader towards an understanding of that project. The Table itself, however, much like a great deal of the overall text, seems to have been hastily prepared, and is fraught with errors in numbering the tales. *Nouvelle* 19 (manuscript 11, the tale of Madame de Roncex) is not included in the Table, and the numbering of the *nouvelles* is incorrect from then on (19 is really 20, and so forth). A second error occurs when *Nouvelle* 29 (manuscript and Gruget 45 – f. xii v^o-xiii r^o) is left out, and the numbering is now off by two. The mistake was apparently noticed, however, at the end of the Table. Boaistuau summarizes with numbers up to 59, then skips numbers 60 and 61, without any indication as to why, and picks up immediately with number 62, which now corresponds to the text to the end (f. xvi r^o). It is unclear, of course, whether these mistakes are due simply to haste, or if Sertenas’ potentially *ad hoc* approach to adding the remaining tales created confusion during preparation and the oversight occurred when more tales were added after the Table had been prepared.

The fact that the tale of Madame de Roncex was skipped is certainly interesting, because it was the one tale Gruget deleted that Boaistuau did not, and also because its placement between *Nouvelles* 18 and 20 goes against any ideas Boaistuau might have had about developing a collection not unlike the *Histoires Tragiques*. The tale itself does not

suit any of the described parameters for the genre – it is a very short and funny scatological tale that elicits no pathos whatsoever – and appears oddly placed between the tale of Florinde and Amadour and the one about the incestuous priest and his sister. It is possible again that Sertenas demanded the inclusion of more tales once Boaistuau had already prepared the first “eighteen or so” stories, and since *Nouvelles* 18 and 19 followed each other in the manuscripts as 10 and 11, respectively, it was simply easier to insert it, rather than make further adjustments. Boaistuau does seem to work with clusters and groupings of tales: manuscript 3-4 correspond to the same in the *Amans Fortunez*; manuscript 14-24 are a consistent grouping in the first eighteen (*Amans Fortunez* 6-16); manuscript 33-45 remain in the same order, with the exceptions of 37, 40 and 44 (*Amans Fortunez* 20-29 – 44 was one of the deleted tales); other series of short clusters appear. If we closely examine the titles Boaistuau gives to the remaining tales, we can uncover several groupings that seem to develop themes that, perhaps, Boaistuau intended to create.

Nouvelles 21-27 (manuscript 33-36, 38-39, 41-42) seem to present a common thread of having more positive endings and are not driven by the kind of pathos we see in the first eighteen. This, of course, does not correspond with the aesthetic of the *histoire tragique* that begins to develop in what we suspect to be Boaistuau’s originally intended collection, but demonstrates, instead, a *reversal* of that theme. *Nouvelles* 27-32 (manuscript and Gruget 42, 43, 45) seem to express a socially conscious motivation; the poorly behaved characters are also not punished tragically, as happens in the first main group of tales, but they receive a sort of come-uppance through embarrassment and social stigma. *Nouvelles* 33 and 34 (manuscript and Gruget 57 and 61) contain “simple”

characters. *Nouvelle* 35 (manuscript and Gruget 29) is an oddly-placed tale of punishment and moral decline, but contrasts well with 36 (manuscript and Gruget 65), in which tragedy is averted. *Nouvelle* 36 seems to introduce the next set of inverted tragedies. However, 37-45 (manuscript and Gruget 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 27, 28) clearly present examples of the Italian “*beffa*,” a style of tale in which a character that intends to deceive another becomes the target of his own ruse. Most of the remaining tales do not have a clear focus, based on Boaistuau’s titular descriptions, but the very last tale, which was also treated by Bandello, is shocking and carries a very clear moral that seems to fit with the theme of a *histoire tragique*. Perhaps Boaistuau removed this from the original grouping of 18-20 tales and placed it at the end in order to frame out the collection with his vision of this sub-genre. If he truly took the time to create these sub-groupings and create a different *dispositio*, then it is certainly possible. Perhaps he originally intended to exclude the tale for different, unknown reasons. In all, this brief view of the various sub-groupings seems to confirm that Boaistuau was conscious of the interplay and drive of the stories themselves, rather than of the debates and the Boccaccian frame.

To summarize, the changes that Boaistuau performed on the text appear for three reasons. First, he seemed to be working towards a particular genre aesthetic that evolved much further in his next project, which would be the *Histoires Tragiques*; second, he made numerous sloppy errors, most likely due to the haste with which he worked at his employer’s behest; third, his project, such as it was, seems to have been disrupted by Sertenas’ demands: he may have been forced to develop a collection that strayed from his original intentions, but at least allowed its presence to be felt. None of this is to say that Boaistuau was intentionally working to establish a new sub-genre, as such, via the

Heptaméron, but that he had an interest in this particular type of story, and that his focus was evolving and perhaps sharpening while he worked on several different projects simultaneously. Belleforest would, in fact, later be credited with firming up the sub-genre's structure (Campagne 92), and with giving it its determinedly "moral" focus (Sturel 6). There are, however, significant similarities between Boaistuau's editorial approach to the *Heptaméron* and the *Novelle* with respect to the apparent selection of texts and the importance of summarizing the tales to guide the reader's emotional response, so that it seems fair to conclude that many of the most notable changes were not as haphazard as has been deemed. We have clearly established the likelihood that Sertenas' interference created an environment in which Boaistuau could not treat the text with his usual mix of audacity and precision, and the resulting collection was laden with *errata*; the *libraire's* haste may also have extended, to a lesser degree, to Gruget, who repeated many of the errors in his own work. The latter, however, was better received primarily because of his apparent (and actual) fidelity to the text: the frame was re-established and the arrangement was corrected. Boaistuau's attempts at redirection in the *Amanz Fortunez* were, in some ways, unsuccessful, mostly because they were left unfinished, much like the work he attempted to "correct," and because the plan was forced to evolve in a new direction. Like many of his contemporaries, Boaistuau exploited the idea that such an edition should reflect the editor's readership and be organized around his own sense of *inventio* – not just "subject," but "propos" and "sentences." Various factors, however, would not allow for that ideal to come to fruition as anticipated, and would contribute to the negative reception of the *Histoires des Amans*

Fortunez, at least once the reading public had Gruget's alternate version available to them.

Both Gruget and Boaistuau were highly successful men of letters who worked under Sertenas, but each subscribed to his own deliberate philosophy regarding translation, editing and writing; those views would dictate their respective approaches to Marguerite de Navarre's *Heptaméron*. Gruget does not appear to have influenced Boaistuau's work on the text, but the reverse is clearly the case. The booksellers' demands possibly forced Boaistuau to adjust and transform the entire collection, and thus diluted certain aspects of the intended work. Meanwhile, Gruget's purposeful fidelity to the text of the manuscripts appears to have been compromised only in a few cases of error (perhaps also due to speed), rare suppressions (demanded by Jeanne d'Albret or someone else) leading to the insertion of different tales, or judicious editing mandated by the increasingly volatile religious climate. Boaistuau, by contrast, presented a text that was unquestionably imperfect, because it did not fully stick to the vision he may have had, was riddled with disorienting mistakes. In this way, Boaistuau's presentation of the *Histoires des Amans Fortunez* may be perceived as a valid, if incomplete, *reading* of the collection, and may, with further comparison, give greater insight into a nascent sub-genre of *nouvelles* that would soon become the most popular, as well as Marguerite's role in the birth of the *histoire tragique*. In any case, the story of the *Heptaméron*'s first two editions reveals not only different treatments and different perceptions of Marguerite de Navarre's unfinished masterpiece, but how much those contrasting approaches were

governed by coherent – if divergent – principles, shaped in turn by the rhetorical and theoretical discourse of the period.

Conclusion

Tales are generally considered a rather fluid genre, open to interpretation and shifting paradigms amongst different authors (and narrators, in the cases of the *Propos Rustiques* and the *Heptaméron*); this flexibility extended to material making of the collections themselves and variant editions flourished. In many cases, as we have seen, the eager and booming book industry, and many of the laws in place at that time, encouraged such printings. The term “variant” hardly suffices to encompass a range of possibilities, from changes constructed by the authors, to counterfeit editions, to drastically different approaches to the same text under different editors. It can be extraordinarily difficult to determine the most authentic or definitive edition of a text, because quite often, we no longer have access to manuscripts (let alone author’s manuscripts), not to mention that fact that two of the collections under our consideration were published posthumously. Often, the reading public would determine the most popular edition, and that would ultimately be considered the most authoritative version of a text by virtue of its success, opening it up to numerous reprints, thus perpetuating the image of authority.

In each of our examples, we can note that the first edition did not achieve authoritative status, and for the *Nouvelles Recreations et joyeux devis* and the *Propos Rustiques* in particular, the interpolated editions reigned. For the *Heptaméron*, Boaistuau’s error-ridden *Histoires des Amans Fortunez* proved to be too radically different from the familiar, convenient, and comfortable edition that Gruget prepared and Boaistuau ended up blasted with negative criticism. Gruget’s edition of the *Heptaméron*

des nouvelles bore its own set of interpolations and other changes, but these seemed far less disruptive to the readers, and more faithful to the original intent of the collection.

The rhetorical character of each collection shifted with each edition, and, as a result, many sixteenth-century readers would have encountered different (at times vastly different) meanings under the same title. The additional tales presented at the end of the *Nouvelles Recreations et joyeux devis* do not fit in with the global vision of the work as Bonaventure Des Périers seems to have envisioned it, but they do exploit the best known aspects of its genre in a way that not only expands the collection, but might serve as a response to one of Des Périers' most radical critics; the use of the latter's work throughout the interpolations upends Henri Estienne's rigid moral stance, by demonstrating that his tales, under any frame, are still tales, and are malleable. The additions might also remind Estienne that his work is in fact inherited from Des Périers (and Rabelais) just as much as it is inherited from Calvin. Des Périers was no longer allowed to speak for himself, so his well-received collection defended him on its own ground, and used itself, so to speak, as the subject to engage in a debate on the value and purpose of tales.

In a somewhat different fashion, the changes inflicted on the *Propos Rustiques* shift the collection in relation to its subject (rural life) and Noël du Fail's text loses many of its subtleties to become a parody of itself. The debate here does not center on the purpose and value of collections of tales, but on social structures and life. Maugin's interpolations place the "rustiques" on a lower rung of society, rather than retaining the more nuanced and focused approach championed by Du Fail. Finally, Pierre Boaistuau and Claude Gruget exact distinctly different visions of Marguerite de Navarre's

collection: both appear to have been rushed and make numerous errors; both engage with the literary climate of the times by applying their own theoretical critical or biases to the collection. The commonplace praise of invention finds itself belied, or fails altogether, when coupled with errors that create a dissonance in the text, and when used on a highly respected, though deceased, member of the royal family who happens to belong as well to the national literary heritage.

Further, and perhaps most important, many of those involved in the variant editions seem to be aware of and engaged with one another. While the *Nouvelles Recreations* had additional tales tacked on by an unknown interpolator, the additions remain distinct from the original collection, and possibly function as we suggested, as a reaction to criticism against Des Périers – his most virulent critic’s own work was exploited to turn the tables in the original author’s favor, and to show that the collection stands on its own merit. Certain subtleties of Des Périers’ work were overlooked in the additions, but the original text remained untouched and a different (though not inconsistent) purpose entirely was served. In consideration of the *Propos Rustiques* and the *Amans Fortunez / Heptaméron des nouvelles*, it is very possible that some level of collaboration occurred as the different editions went to press. At the very least, Maugin and Gruget probably had at their disposal early drafts of the *Propos* the *Amans Fortunez* respectively, which enabled the almost inhuman speed of turnout of these later editions, and in some instances, allowed for the use of interpolations in one’s own “corrections.” Much of what occurs in all of these cases seems to be at the behest of the impatient *libraires* who, especially in the case of the *Heptaméron*, pushed ahead with production deadlines, perhaps even changed their plans frequently, and were ever eager to get ahead

of the reading public's tastes; there resulted a climate in which writers and editors could engage in what looked like theoretical debate on poetics via the practice of subject and example, but it is clear that the industry imposed certain restraints on the terms of such debates, by way of the material conditions under which they appeared. Many classic rhetorical arguments functioned as intellectual justifications for those restraints – or invoked them as an excuse for various failings. Conversely, the texts' endless transformations nourished a concept of the genre as inherently flexible: tales, then, and the editions that contain them ended up creating their own, improvised critical discourse, on the margins of the time's more established and official positions or theories.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

Sixteenth-century book culture creates an environment that not only encourages, but in many ways, demands the production of multiple variant editions for popular works. These conditions may be exacerbated in certain genres, which are not considered valid literature by many theorists. In the case of the *nouvelles*, a genre that has proven to be relatively pliable and already manifests itself in many different forms, the large-scale interests of *libraires* to publish possibly drives even greater flexibility of form, resulting in numerous – at times dramatic – alterations to the collections. The extraordinary competition between booksellers, and even, sometimes, editors and writers also contributes to the changes inflicted on the texts. Finally, marketing strategies of the industry’s elite spin notions of authenticity and newness, sometimes converging, sometimes in opposition, in order to elicit the potential buyer’s “curiosity” (Charon-Parent (*Les métiers du livre à Paris* 142) and to convince him that one particular edition was *the* one to purchase.

All this activity’s theoretical and intellectual environment puts collections of tales in a somewhat ambiguous position: since the genre was an unacknowledged one – and one that certainly had no place in considerations of rhetoric, it should not, in theory at least, seriously claim any rhetorical value. However, we have seen that many of the authors of these collections of tales either could not avoid the influence of their own schooling and experience (because that was simply how one approached writing), or (and most important), because they were talented enough to exploit this courtly pastime as a means to create their own site for *inventio*, in a less than pedantic form, which they chose perhaps for this very reason. Marguerite de Navarre was one of the best educated women of the Renaissance and a renowned spiritual poet: she used the *Heptaméron* to study

notions of sin and virtue, merit and grace, as they pertained, specifically, to very earthly realities in day-to-day life and society, and to demonstrate that many of the questions posed are not easily answered. Noël Du Fail dared to honor the “vie rustique,” as viewed from the eyes of a member of the “petite noblesse,” and engage in a somewhat nostalgic (but nonetheless objective-minded) discourse on the changing certainties of social mobility, all guided by the classical legal education he was finishing at the time.

Bonaventure Des Périers disguised his own discourse regarding preconceptions of the genre itself and challenges the reader to simply enjoy the ride, but in the very act of doing so guided both a reading that is open to interpretation and to various levels of understanding, and a reflection on the nature and effects of enjoyment. For Des Périers, perspective determined understanding, and we cannot escape our own: he was quite possibly speaking directly to the many critics of the *Cymbalum mundi*, who, despite being (or perhaps because they were) on opposite sides of a deepening religious dichotomy, all believed Des Périers was specifically attacking them, and his last words pointed out the certainty of subjectivity in reading.

Some of the key rhetorical points made by the authors in the original drafts – in as much as we can determine authenticity – fall to the wayside as collateral damage in the revised variant editions, especially at the hands of interpolators and editors, who often engage the texts in a new bout of intellectual discourse about the subjects many of these collections treat. Under consideration are the value and purpose of tales, the changing layers and shifting values of social strata and rural life, the conundrums of translation and editing, and in particular the extent to which an editor’s personal reading of a collection might be allowed to dictate his rendering.

Des Périers' interpolator remains unknown, and made no significant changes to the heart of the collection, but he added, in two separate installments, a series of tales that bore different sources, the most notable of which was Henri Estienne's *Apologie pour Hérodote*. As we saw, certain key aspects of Des Périers' ideas about interpretation and perspective are lost in the added tales, and these would have been the reader's last taste of the *Nouvelles Recreations*: for many, this last taste, however spurious, would be what they retained. Nevertheless, the additions may function primarily as a response to Estienne's critique of Des Périers himself, and as a competitive nudge from Galiot Du Pré's sons to Estienne, since their fathers were business rivals in Paris. In the realm of possibilities, intellectual and economic competition may thus both weigh heavily in this set of variants, and they may transform at least part of the purpose of the collection, but it could be said to be partly in defense of its actual author.

The transformations that occurred in the *Propos Rustiques* allow us to envisage a living author engaged in intellectual, and perhaps proprietary, discourse with his more successful interpolator. The timing of the publication of the legally privileged editions (helmed by the author) and their counterfeit variants leads us to believe that Maugin and Du Fail may have had copies of their respective editions, but it is unclear whether or not this was an intentionally created rivalry. In either case, Maugin's approach to Du Fail's text erased some of the subtler qualities of Du Fail's writing, and of his "study" of rustic life by making parody out of Du Fail's satire. In this example, the author's attempts to reclaim his text were ultimately unrewarded, since Maugin's edition dominated. In some ways, however, Du Fail's own project becomes clearer in comparison to Maugin's vision of his work. Ultimately, however, the sixteenth-century reading public was exposed to a

different perspective on rustic life than the one intended by the author, although it still bore his pen name.

Marguerite de Navarre's project became subsumed to those of her editors: Boaistuau and Gruget, respectively, although Gruget's vision meant to honor her own. Both men were highly successful translators whose approaches to the transmission of texts differed considerably, and their editions of the *Heptaméron* reflected that. Boaistuau initiated a plan that echoed his particular tastes and interests in tales at that time: he was likely already at work on the *Histoires Tragiques*, a "translation" of Bandello's *Novelle*, or was at least beginning to develop it. If we take Boaistuau's own comments at face value, he never intended to produce a complete (or nearly complete, since he excised four tales from the manuscript editions) edition, and he began by selecting a small set of stories from amongst the whole, just as he would later do with Bandello. Presuming that the first set of tales were chosen for that purpose, we see that many of them bore a number of the same traits as those he selected from Bandello, and certain elements in the development of the *histoire tragique* can therefore be traced in this way. Consideration of Boaistuau's approach to the *Chelidonium*, as well as to the *Théâtre du monde*, and the *Histoires prodigieuses* might give further comparative insight into his overall approach to the *Amans Fortunez*. Meanwhile, Boaistuau's heavily criticized near-complete erasure of the collection's *cornice* has the effect of shifting the rhetorical driving force behind the collection: meaning must now be derived from the stories themselves, rather than from their relationship to the narrators, to the days in which they are told and to their general environment. Boaistuau's project, however, fails to an extent because he was forced to complete it too hastily (errors inevitably abounded), and above all because he was, or so

he claims, forced to add the maximum number of stories back in. The end result is confusing and often disorienting. Not only were readers unfamiliar with the concept of the *histoire tragique*, which had yet to be invented, but Boaistuau's focus on this particular register ended up largely blurred, and the drastic reduction of the frame, which created glaring inconsistencies, would leave the public with a collection that took the genre's flexibility too far and left them less than comfortable – thus breaking the first rule ascribed to this kind of literature: a collection of tales needed, above all, to put the reader at ease and clear the path to enjoyment, a task at which the *Amanz Fortunez* evidently failed.

Gruget's vision was more rigid and, as we saw, he touted his interest in respecting the author's original plan. His role was not to envisage the project anew, but to simply pass it along. He was forced to delete some passages, which fit mostly in line with Boaistuau's cuts, because the religious climate (already risky during Marguerite's time) now required even more prudence. Many of Gruget's changes centered on that idea, but he did replace a few of the tales with his own. When he did so, he mostly worked to explore ideas that were already present elsewhere in Marguerite de Navarre's dialogues, while exercising religious caution, but he seems to have been quite deaf to the subtler aspects and carefully maintained tone of Marguerite de Navarre's lighter, bawdier narratives and *devis*, for which he nevertheless professed great admiration. However, not all of the additions can be explained by the same reasons, and some of Gruget's choices remain a mystery. Most of his errors were directly copied from Boaistuau, but his edition restored the most familiar, and what many considered to be the most crucial elements, to the collection as a whole: namely the *cornice* and the original arrangement of stories. By

comparison to Boaistuau's edition, Gruget's was far more accessible, and fidelity to the known author earned, in this case, more respect than imposing a structure (or lack thereof) pertaining to a different personal vision of the collection. This is not meant to suggest that Gruget's successful edition finalized the debate on translation and editing, but it does show that certain circumstances might bolster the validity and ultimate victory of one argument over another: we should not presume, even in the presence of Gruget's edition, that Boaistuau's was doomed to fail; instead, we must appreciate the obstacles that hindered the first editor's vision and rendered it ineffective.

A new question thus arises from these examples and from our experience more generally: to what extent do our findings apply to other forms of literature published during the same period? Recent Renaissance scholarship tends to focus on the complex, often troubled relation of literary works with their material presentation, including aspects that had long been underestimated as trivial. Spelling, for example, has long been discounted as a major factor in matters of interpretation, but Mireille Huchon and others have shown how later editions of Rabelais' works adopted updated spellings, countering the author's own preference for (and careful design of) older spelling patterns.⁵³⁷ Older spellings would of course reinforce the impression that *Pantagruel* and *Gargantua* were parodying older texts – “true” chronicles, as it were; while updating the spelling might distance the text from that tone and effect. At the same time, we should consider that later readers, say twenty to thirty years after the initial publication, might no longer have been able to read those spellings easily, and reader accessibility might have been lost or compromised without an update. What developed in this way was a potential or actual

rhetorical conflict between a work's poetics and its reception. Sixteenth-century writers became increasingly aware of this situation, and took steps to remedy it.

Ronsard, in particular, was one of the most aggressive of the Pléiade poets – in fact unique – in this respect. He constantly updated his poems and, from 1560 on, created successive “collective” editions of his works in an effort to impose additions and changes of his own making, to continue to expand his work while meeting the industry's demands.⁵³⁸ It is very probable that Ronsard's understanding of marketing strategies – and the high likelihood of his being counterfeited if he was not ahead of the game – played a large role, alongside strictly poetic considerations, in the continued changes he made to the details and general organization of his complete works – notably with respect to his *Amours*, the most popular of them. George Hoffmann's study of Montaigne's successive editions of the *Essais* certainly suggests that this may well be the case. Our own study shows that continued updates and re-editions might be the most prudent method for maintaining control over one's own text, which was otherwise subject to full-blown adulteration. From this perspective, it would appear that collections of tales – posthumous ones in particular, which were uniquely vulnerable – worked against the tendency represented by Montaigne or Ronsard; they offered a kind of “free for all” space in which authorship itself was fluid and ill-defined, thereby fostering, rather than controlling, the manipulations of editors and publishers.

We have found that, at least in the case of tales, the business climate of the book industry bore a tremendous influence on intellectual output. Common marketing strategies were just that because they proved to be effective, and even a living author might not be able to successfully defend an updated version of his own text when up

against an interpolated version that was, perhaps, better marketed or catered more pointedly to the public's taste. It is also clear, on the other hand, that readers had little patience for sloppily prepared editions; while some room for error was considered acceptable, it was important to keep the flow of the text as unencumbered as possible: the most successful interpolations were those that were adjusted so as to fit well (at least apparently) with the rest of the text (Gruget, Maugin), or, by contrast, to clearly distance themselves from it (Des Périers' interpolator), which is in part why Boaistuau's edition failed. In an age driven by the prestige of imitation, collections of tales were, as a popular genre, susceptible to influences other than just sources and tradition. They were also subject to a thriving industry's ingenious practices, based on profit-driven motives, in constant, creative tension with the intellectual backgrounds, habits and principles of all the writers involved – not only the authors, but the editors and interpolators who helped bring their works to the printed page. As a result, this supposed less-than-worthy genre allows us – in fact, compels us, more than any other – to consider its material and rhetorical (or financial and intellectual) aspects as two sides of the same coin, which is what we have tried to do in the present study.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: EARLIEST EDITIONS 1547-1625

1: CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF EDITIONS

1547

Du Fail, Noël. *Propos rustiques de Maistre Leon Ladulfi Champenois*. Lyon: De Tournes, 1547 / in-8

*Du Fail, Noël. *Discours d'aucuns Propos rustiques fececieux et de singuliere recreation de Maistre Leon Ladulfi Champenois*. Paris: Groulleau, 1547 / in-16

*Du Fail, Noël. *Baliverneries, ou Contes nouveaux d'Eutrapel, autrement dit Leon Ladulphi*. Lyon: s.n, 1547

1548

Du Fail, Noël. *Discours d'aucuns Propos rustiques fececieux et de singuliere recreation de Maistre Leon Ladulfi Champenois Reveuz et amplifiez par un des ses amys*. Paris: Groulleau, 1548 / in-16

Du Fail, Noël. *Baliverneries, ou Contes nouveaux d'Eutrapel, autrement dit Leon Ladulphi*. Paris: Groulleau, 1548 / in-16

Du Fail, Noël. *Baliverneries, ou Contes nouveaux d'Eutrapel, autrement dit Leon Ladulphi*. Paris: Trepperel, 1548 / in-16

Du Fail, Noël. *Baliverneries, ou Contes nouveaux d'Eutrapel, autrement dit Leon Ladulphi*. Paris: Buffet, 1548 / in-16

1549

Du Fail, Noël. *Propos Rustiques de Maistre Leon Ladulfi Champenois reveuz, corrigez et augmentez par luy-mesme*. Lyon: De Tournes, 1549 / in-16

1554

Du Fail, Noël. *Discours d'aucuns Propos rustiques facecieux et de singuliere recreation, de Maistre Leon Ladulfi, Champenois Reveuz et amplifiez par un des ses amys*. Paris: Groulleau, 1554 / in-16

1555

**A.D.S.D. *Les Comptes du monde adventureux ou sont recitées plusieurs belles histoires memorables, & propres pour rejiourir la compagnie, & éviter melancholie.* Paris: Groulleau, Sertenas, 1555 / in-8

1557

***Discours non plus melancoliques que divers, de choses mesmement qui appartiennent à nostre France : & à la fin, La manière de bien & justement entoucher les Lucs & Guiternes.* Poitiers: Marnef, 1557 / in-4

1558

**A.D.S.D. *Comptes du monde adventureux.* Paris: Sertenas, Robinot, Longis-Le Mangnier, 1558.

Des Périers, Bonaventure. *Nouvelles recreations et joyeux devis de feu Bonaventure des Periers Valet de chambre de la Royne de Navarre.* Lyon: Granjon, 1558 / in-4

Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *Histoires des amans fortunez, dédiés à tresillustre Princesse Madame Marguerite de Bourbon, Duchesse de Nivernois, éditées par Pierre Boaistuau.* Paris: Caveiller, Gilles, Prevost, Robinot, 1558 / in-4 / Privilege to Sertenas

1559

Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *L'Heptameron des nouvelles de tresillustre et tresexcellente Princesse Marguerite de Valois, Royne de navarre remis en son ordre, confus au paravant en sa premiere impression: & dedie à tresillustre & tres vertueuse Princesse Jeanne de Foix Royne de Navarre, par Claude Gruget Parisien.* Paris: Prevost, Caveiller, Gilles, Robinot, Sertenas, 1559 / in-4

Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *L'Heptameron des nouvelles de tresillustre et tresexcellente Princesse Marguerite de Valois, Royne de navarre remis en son ordre, confus au paravant en sa premiere impression: & dedie à tresillustre & tres vertueuse Princesse Jeanne de Foix Royne de Navarre, par Claude Gruget Parisien.* Orléans: Gibier, 1559 / in-4

Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *L'Heptaméron des nouvelles remis en son ordre, confus au paravant en sa premiere impression...par Claude Gruget Parisien.* s.l.: s.n, 1559/ in-12

1560

**A.D.S.D. *Les Comptes du monde adventureux ou sont recitées plusieurs belles histoires memorables, & propres pour rejiourir la compagnie, & éviter melancholie.* Paris: Sertenas, 1560. / in-8

**A.D.S.D. *Les Comptes du monde adventureux ou sont recitées plusieurs belles histoires memorables, & propres pour rejiourir la compagnie, & éviter melancholie.* Paris: Longis, Le Mangnier, 1560.

Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *L'Heptaméron des nouvelles de tresillustre et tresexcellente princesse Marguerite de Valois, royne de Navarre: remis en son vray ordre, confus au paravant en sa premiere impression: & dedie à tresillustre & tres vertueuse Princesse Jeanne de Foix Royne de Navarre, par Claude Gruget parisien.* Paris: Prevost, Caveiller, Gilles, Robinot, Sertenas, 1560 / in-4 / privilege to Gilles

Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *L'Heptameron des nouvelles de tresillustre et tresexcellente princesse, Marguerite de Valois, Royne de Navarre remis en son ordre, confus au paravant en sa premiere impression: & dedie à tresillustre & tres vertueuse Princesse Jeanne de Foix Royne de Navarre, par Claude Gruget Parisien.* s.l: s.n, 1560 / in-16

1561

Des Périers, Bonaventure. *Nouvelles recreations et joyeux devis de feu Bonaventure des Periers Valet de chambre de la Royne de Navarre.* Lyon: Rouillé, 1561 / in-4

Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *L'Heptameron des nouvelles de tresillustre et tresexcellente princesse, Marguerite de Valois, Royne de Navarre remis en son ordre, confus au paravant en sa premiere impression: & dedie à tresillustre & tres vertueuse Princesse Jeanne de Foix Royne de Navarre, par Claude Gruget Parisien.* Lyon: Rouillé, 1561 / in-16 (but in Tchmerzine, Vol.4 380, listed as being in-12)

*Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *L'Heptaméron des nouvelles de tresillustre et tresexcellente princesse, Marguerite de Valois, Royne de Navarre remis en son ordre, confus au paravant en sa premiere impression: & dedie à tresillustre & tres vertueuse Princesse Jeanne de Foix Royne de Navarre, par Claude Gruget Parisien.* Paris: Gilles, 1561 / in-16

*Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *L'Heptameron de nouvelles*. Paris: Robinot, 1561 / in-16

1564

Des Périers, Bonaventure. *Nouvelles recreations et joyeux devis de feu Bonaventure des Periers Valet de chambre de la Royne de Navarre*. Paris: Du Pré, 1564 / in-16

1565

Des Périers, Bonaventure. *Nouvelles recreations et joyeux devis de feu Bonaventure des Periers Valet de chambre de la Royne de Navarre*. Paris: Du Pré, 1565 / in-16

1566

**A.D.S.D. *Les Comptes du monde adventureux ou sont recitées plusieurs belles histoires memorables, & propres pour rejiourir la compagnie, & éviter melancholie*. Paris: Marnef, Cavellat, 1566 / in-16

1567

Des Périers, Bonaventure. *Nouvelles recreations et joyeux devis de feu Bonaventure des Periers Valet de chambre de la Royne de Navarre*. Paris: Du Pré, 1567 / in-16

*Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *L'Heptaméron des nouvelles de tresillustre et tresexcellente princesse, Marguerite de Valois, Royne de Navarre remis en son ordre, confus au paravant en sa premiere impression: & dedie à tresillustre & tres vertueuse Princesse Jeanne de Foix Royne de Navarre, par Claude Gruget Parisien*. Paris: Normant, Bruneau, Gilles, 1567 / in-16

1568

Des Périers, Bonaventure. *Nouvelles recreations et joyeux devis de feu Bonaventure des Periers Valet de chambre de la Royne de Navarre*. Paris: Du Pré, 1568 / in-16

1571

**A.D.S.D. *Les Comptes du monde adventureux ou sont recitées plusieurs belles histoires memorables, & propres pour rejiourir la compagnie, & éviter melancholie*. Lyon: Rigaud, 1571 / in-16

*Du Fail, Noël. *Discours d'aucuns Propos rustiques facecieux et de singuliere recreation, de Maistre Leon Ladulfi, Champenois Reveuz et amplifiez par un des ses amys*. Orléans: Gibier, 1571

Des Périers, Bonaventure. *Nouvelles recreations et joyeux devis de feu Bonaventure des Periers Valet de chambre de la Royne de Navarre*. Lyon: Rigaud, 1571 / in-16

1572

Des Périers, Bonaventure. *Nouvelles recreations et joyeux devis de feu Bonaventure des Periers Valet de chambre de la Royne de Navarre*. Paris: Bonfons, 1572 / in-16

Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *L'Heptaméron ou Histoires des amans fortunez des nouvelles de tresillustre & tresexcellente Princesse, Marguerite de Valois Royne de Navarre. Remis en son vray ordre, confus au paravant en sa premiere impression: & dedie à tresillustre & tres vertueuse Princesse Jeanne, Royne de Navarre, par Claude Gruget Parisien*. S.l: Cloquemin, 1572 / in-16

1573

Du Fail, Noël. *Les Ruses et finesses de Ragot, jadis capitaine des gueux de l'hostiere & de ses successeurs. Avec Plusieurs Discours plaisants & recreatifs, pour s'entretenir en tout honneste compagnie*. Paris: Ruelle, 1573 / in-16

1574

Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *L'Heptaméron ou Histoires des amans fortunez des nouvelles de tresillustre & tresexcellente Princesse, Marguerite de Valois Royne de Navarre. Remis en son vray ordre, confus au paravant en sa premiere impression: & dedie à tresillustre & tres vertueuse Princesse Jeanne, Royne de Navarre, par Claude Gruget Parisien*. Paris: Roigny, 1574 / in-16

1575

Des Périers, Bonaventure. *Les Joyeuses Aventures, et nouvelles recreations. Contenant plusieurs Contes & Facetieux Devis. Reveu & augmenté de nouveau*. Paris: Bonfons, 1575 / in-16

1576

Du Fail, Noël. *Les Ruses et finesses de Ragot, jadis capitaine des gueux de l'hostiere & de ses successeurs. Avec Plusieurs Discours plaisants & recreatifs, pour s'entretenir en tout honneste compagnie*. Lyon: De Tournes II, 1576 / in-12

1577

Des Périers, Bonaventure. *Les Joyeuses Aventures, et nouvelles recreations. Contenant plusieurs Contes & Facetieux Devis. Reveu & augmenté de nouveau*. Paris: Bonfons, 1577 / in-16

1578

Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *L'Heptaméron ou Histoires des amans fortunez des nouvelles de tresillustre & tresexcellente Princesse, Marguerite de Valois Royne de Navarre. Remis en son vray ordre, confus au paravant en sa premiere impression: & dedie à tresillustre & tres vertueuse Princesse Jeanne, Royne de Navarre, par Claude Gruget Parisien.* Lyon: Cloquemin, 1578 / in-16

1579

**A.D.S.D. *Les Comptes du monde adventureux ou sont recitées plusieurs belles histoires memorables, & propres pour rejoyuir la compagnie, & éviter melancholie.* Lyon: Rigaud, 1579 / in-16

1580

Du Fail, Noël. *Propos Rustiques de maistre Leon Ladulphi (Noël du Fail).* Orléans: Gibier, s.d. (c.1580) / in-16

1581

Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *L'Heptaméron ou Histoires des amans fortunez des nouvelles de tresillustre & tresexcellente Princesse, Marguerite de Valois Royne de Navarre. Remis en son vray ordre, confus au paravant en sa premiere impression: & dedie à tresillustre & tres vertueuse Princesse Jeanne, Royne de Navarre, par Claude Gruget Parisien.* Paris: L'Angelier, 1581 / in-16

Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *L'Heptaméron ou Histoires des amans fortunez des nouvelles de tresillustre & tresexcellente Princesse, Marguerite de Valois Royne de Navarre. Remis en son vray ordre, confus au paravant en sa premiere impression: & dedie à tresillustre & tres vertueuse Princesse Jeanne, Royne de Navarre, par Claude Gruget Parisien.* Lyon: Cloquemin, 1581 / in-16

1582

**A.D.S.D. *Les Comptes du monde adventureux ou sont recitées plusieurs belles histoires memorables, & propres pour rejoyuir la compagnie, & éviter melancholie.* Paris: Micard, 1582 / in-12

Des Périers, Bonaventure. *Les Joyeuses Aventures, et nouvelles recreations. Contenant plusieurs Contes & Facetieux Devis. Reveu & augmenté de nouveau.* Lyon: Rigaud, 1582 / in-16

Des Périers, Bonaventure. *Nouvelles recreations et joyeux devis de feu Bonaventure des Periers Valet de chambre de la Royne de Navarre*. Paris: Bonneval, 1582 / in-16

1583

Des Périers, Bonaventure. *Nouvelles recreations et joyeux devis de feu Bonaventure des Periers Valet de chambre de la Royne de Navarre*. Paris: Bonneval, 1583 / in-16

1588

Des Périers, Bonaventure. *Nouvelles recreations et joyeux devis de feu Bonaventure des Periers Valet de chambre de la Royne de Navarre*. Paris: Milliot, 1588 / in-12

1592

Des Périers, Bonaventure. *Nouvelles recreations et joyeux devis de feu Bonaventure des Periers Valet de chambre de la Royne de Navarre*. Paris: Bonneval, 1592 / in-12

1595

**A.D.S.D. *Les Comptes du monde aventureux ou sont recitées plusieurs belles histoires memorables, & propres pour rejoyuir la compagnie, & éviter melancholie*. Lyon: Rigaud, 1595 / in-16

1597

Des Périers, Bonaventure. *Nouvelles recreations et joyeux devis de feu Bonaventure des Periers Valet de chambre de la Royne de Navarre*. Lyon: Prunier, 1597 / in-8

1598

Des Périers, Bonaventure. *Nouvelles recreations et joyeux devis de feu Bonaventure des Periers Valet de chambre de la Royne de Navarre*. Paris: Bonneval, 1598 / in-12

Des Périers, Bonaventure. *Nouvelles recreations et joyeux devis de feu Bonaventure des Periers Valet de chambre de la Royne de Navarre*. Rouen: Du Petit Val, 1598 / in-12

Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *L'Heptaméron ou Histoires des amans fortunez des nouvelles de tresillustre & tresexcellente Princesse, Marguerite de Valois Royne de Navarre. Remis en son vray ordre, confus au paravant en sa premiere impression: & dedie à tresillustre & tres vertueuse Princesse Jeanne, Royne de Navarre, par Claude Gruget Parisien*. Rouen: Osmont, 1598 / in-12

Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *L'Heptaméron ou Histoires des amans fortunez des nouvelles de tresillustre & tresexcellente Princesse, Marguerite de Valois Royne de Navarre. Remis en son vray ordre, confus au paravant en sa premiere impression: & dedie à tresillustre & tres vertueuse Princesse Jeanne, Royne de Navarre, par Claude Gruget Parisien.* Rouen: Beauvais, 1598 / in-12

1602

Des Périers, Bonaventure. *Les Joyeuses Aventures, et nouvelles recreations. Contenant plusieurs Contes & Facetieux Devis. Reveu & augmenté de nouveau.* Paris: Menier, 1602 / in-16

1606

Des Périers, Bonaventure. *Nouvelles recreations et joyeux devis de feu Bonaventure des Periers Valet de chambre de la Royne de Navarre.* Rouen: Du Petit Val, 1606 / in-12

1608

Des Périers, Bonaventure. *Nouvelles recreations et joyeux devis de feu Bonaventure des Periers Valet de chambre de la Royne de Navarre.* Rouen: Du Petit Val, 1608 / in-12

1615

Des Périers, Bonaventure. *Nouvelles recreations et joyeux devis de feu Bonaventure des Periers Valet de chambre de la Royne de Navarre.* Rouen: Du Petit Val, 1615 / in-12

Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *L'Heptaméron ou Histoires des amans fortunez des nouvelles de tresillustre & tresexcellente Princesse, Marguerite de Valois Royne de Navarre. Remis en son vray ordre, confus au paravant en sa premiere impression: & dedie à tresillustre & tres vertueuse Princesse Jeanne, Royne de Navarre, par Claude Gruget Parisien.* Paris: Bessin, 1615 / in-12

1616

Des Périers, Bonaventure. *Nouvelles recreations et joyeux devis de feu Bonaventure des Periers Valet de chambre de la Royne de Navarre.* Lyon: Le Brun, 1616 / in-2

1625

Des Périers, Bonaventure. *Nouvelles recreations et joyeux devis de feu Bonaventure des Periers Valet de chambre de la Royne de Navarre.* Rouen: Du Petit Val, 1625 / in-12

Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *L'Heptaméron ou Histoires des amans fortunez des nouvelles de tresillustre & tresexcellente Princesse, Marguerite de Valois Royne de Navarre. Remis en son vray ordre, confus au paravant en sa premiere impression: & dedie à tresillustre & tres vertueuse Princesse Jeanne, Royne de Navarre, par Claude Gruget Parisien.* Rouen: Du Petit Val, 1625 / in-12

* Designates editions that are mentioned by at least one modern critic, but have not been verified by any other source.

** Designates collections that are not explicitly the focus of this study, but are of interest by virtue of their presence during the period of study.

2: LIST OF EDITIONS BY BOOKSELLER

2.A BOOKSELLERS WITH MULTIPLE PRINTINGS

Bonneval, Foucauld de

Des Périers, Bonaventure. *Nouvelles recreations et joyeux devis de feu Bonaventure des Periers Valet de chambre de la Royne de Navarre*. Paris: Bonneval, 1582 / in-16

Des Périers, Bonaventure. *Nouvelles recreations et joyeux devis de feu Bonaventure des Periers Valet de chambre de la Royne de Navarre*. Paris: Bonneval, 1583 / in-16

Des Périers, Bonaventure. *Nouvelles recreations et joyeux devis de feu Bonaventure des Periers Valet de chambre de la Royne de Navarre*. Paris: Bonneval, 1592 / in-12

Des Périers, Bonaventure. *Nouvelles recreations et joyeux devis de feu Bonaventure des Periers Valet de chambre de la Royne de Navarre*. Paris: Bonneval, 1598 / in-12

Caveiller, Jean

+Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *Histoire des amans fortunez, dédiés à tresillustre Princesse Madame Marguerite de Bourbon, Duchesse de Nivernois, édités par Pierre Boistuau*. Paris: Caveiller, Gilles, Prevost, Robinot, 1558 / in-4 / Privilege to Sertenas

+Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *L'Heptameron des nouvelles de tresillustre et tresexcellente Princesse Marguerite de Valois, Royne de navarre remis en son ordre, confus au paravant en sa premiere impression: & dedie à tresillustre & tres vertueuse Princesse Jeanne de Foix Royne de Navarre, par Claude Gruget Parisien*. Paris: Prevost, Caveiller, Gilles, Robinot, Sertenas, 1559 / in-4

Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *L'Heptameron des nouvelles de tresillustre et tresexcellente princesse Marguerite de Valois, royne de Navarre: remis en son vray ordre, confus au paravant en sa premiere impression: & dedie à tresillustre & tres vertueuse Princesse Jeanne de Foix Royne de Navarre, par Claude Gruget parisien*. Paris: Prevost, Caveiller, Gilles, Robinot, Sertenas, 1560 / in-4 / privilege to Gilles

Cloquemin, Louis

Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *L'Heptaméron ou Histoires des amans fortunez des nouvelles de tresillustre & tresexcellente Princesse, Marguerite de Valois Royne de Navarre. Remis en son vray ordre, confus au paravant en sa premiere impression: & dedie à tresillustre & tres vertueuse Princesse Jeanne, Royne de Navarre, par Claude Gruget Parisien.* S.l: Cloquemin, 1572 / in-16

Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *L'Heptaméron ou Histoires des amans fortunez des nouvelles de tresillustre & tresexcellente Princesse, Marguerite de Valois Royne de Navarre. Remis en son vray ordre, confus au paravant en sa premiere impression: & dedie à tresillustre & tres vertueuse Princesse Jeanne, Royne de Navarre, par Claude Gruget Parisien.* Lyon: Cloquemin, 1581 / in-16

De Tournes, Jean I

Du Fail, Noël. *Propos rustiques de Maistre Leon Ladulfi Champenois.* Lyon: De Tournes, 1547 / in-8

Du Fail, Noël. *Propos Rustiques de Maistre Leon Ladulfi Champenois reveuz, corrigez et augmentez par luy-mesme.* Lyon: De Tournes, 1549 / in-16

Du Petit Val, Raphaël

Des Périers, Bonaventure. *Nouvelles recreations et joyeux devis de feu Bonaventure des Periers Valet de chambre de la Royne de Navarre.* Rouen: Du Petit Val, 1598 / in-12

Des Périers, Bonaventure. *Nouvelles recreations et joyeux devis de feu Bonaventure des Periers Valet de chambre de la Royne de Navarre.* Rouen: Du Petit Val, 1606 / in-12

Des Périers, Bonaventure. *Nouvelles recreations et joyeux devis de feu Bonaventure des Periers Valet de chambre de la Royne de Navarre.* Rouen: Du Petit Val, 1608 / in-12

Des Périers, Bonaventure. *Nouvelles recreations et joyeux devis de feu Bonaventure des Periers Valet de chambre de la Royne de Navarre.* Rouen: Du Petit Val, 1615 / in-12

Des Périers, Bonaventure. *Nouvelles recreations et joyeux devis de feu Bonaventure des Periers Valet de chambre de la Royne de Navarre*. Rouen: du Petit Val, 1625 / in-12

Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *L'Heptaméron ou Histoires des amans fortunez des nouvelles de tresillustre & tresexcellente Princesse, Marguerite de Valois Royne de Navarre. Remis en son vray ordre, confus au paravant en sa premiere impression: & dedie à tresillustre & tres vertueuse Princesse Jeanne, Royne de Navarre, par Claude Gruget Parisien*. Rouen: Du Petit Val, 1625 / in-12

Du Pré, Galliot II (with Jean, Pierre, Denis)

Des Périers, Bonaventure. *Nouvelles recreations et joyeux devis de feu Bonaventure des Periers Valet de chambre de la Royne de Navarre*. Paris: Du Pré, 1564 / in-16

Des Périers, Bonaventure. *Nouvelles recreations et joyeux devis de feu Bonaventure des Periers Valet de chambre de la Royne de Navarre*. Paris: Du Pré, 1565 / in-16

Des Périers, Bonaventure. *Nouvelles recreations et joyeux devis de feu Bonaventure des Periers Valet de chambre de la Royne de Navarre*. Paris: Du Pré, 1567 / in-16

Des Périers, Bonaventure. *Nouvelles recreations et joyeux devis de feu Bonaventure des Periers Valet de chambre de la Royne de Navarre*. Paris: Du Pré, 1568 / in-16

Gibier, Eloy

Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *L'Heptameron des nouvelles de tresillustre et tresexcellente Princesse Marguerite de Valois, Royne de navarre remis en son ordre, confus au paravant en sa premiere impression...par Claude Gruget Parisien*. Orléans: Gibier, 1559 / in-4

Du Fail, Noël. *Discours d'aucuns Propos rustiques facecieux et de singuliere recreation, de Maistre Leon Ladulfi, Champenois Reveuz et amplifiez par un des ses amys*. Orléans: Gibier, 1571

Du Fail, Noël. *Propos Rustiques de maistre Leon Ladulphi (Noël du Fail)*. Orléans: Gibier, s.d. (c.1580) / in-16

Gilles, Gilles

+Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *Histoire des amans fortunez, dédiés à tresillustre Princesse Madame Marguerite de Bourbon, Duchesse de Nivernois, édités par Pierre Boaistuau*. Paris: Caveiller, Gilles, Prevost, Robinot, 1558 / in-4 / Privilege to Sertenas

+Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *L'Heptameron des nouvelles de tresillustre et tresexcellente Princesse Marguerite de Valois, Royne de navarre remis en son ordre, confus au paravant en sa premiere impression: & dedie à tresillustre & tres vertueuse Princesse Jeanne de Foix Royne de Navarre, par Claude Gruget Parisien*. Paris: Prevost, Caveiller, Gilles, Robinot, Sertenas, 1559 / in-4

+Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *L'Heptaméron des nouvelles de tresillustre et tresexcellente princesse Marguerite de Valois, royne de Navarre: remis en son vray ordre, confus au paravant en sa premiere impression: & dedie à tresillustre & tres vertueuse Princesse Jeanne de Foix Royne de Navarre, par Claude Gruget parisien*. Paris: Prevost, Caveiller, Gilles, Robinot, Sertenas, 1560 / in-4 / privilege to Gilles

Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *L'Heptaméron des nouvelles de tresillustre et tresexcellente princesse, Marguerite de Valois, Royne de Navarre remis en son ordre, confus au paravant en sa premiere impression: & dedie à tresillustre & tres vertueuse Princesse Jeanne de Foix Royne de Navarre, par Claude Gruget Parisien*. Paris: Gilles, 1561 / in-16

+Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarr. *L'Heptaméron des nouvelles de tresillustre et tresexcellente princesse, Marguerite de Valois, Royne de Navarre remis en son ordre, confus au paravant en sa premiere impression: & dedie à tresillustre & tres vertueuse Princesse Jeanne de Foix Royne de Navarre, par Claude Gruget Parisien*. Paris: Normant, Bruneau, Gilles, 1567 / in-16

Groulleau, Etienne

Du Fail, Noël. *Discours d'aucuns Propos rustiques fececieux et de singuliere recreation de Maistre Leon Ladulfi Champenois*. Paris: Groulleau, 1547 / in-16

Du Fail, Noël. *Discours d'aucuns Propos rustiques fececieux et de singuliere recreation de Maistre Leon Ladulfi Champenois Reveuz et amplifiez par un des ses amys*. Paris: Groulleau, 1548 / in-16

Du Fail, Noël. *Baliverneries, ou Contes nouveaux d'Eutrapel, autrement dit Leon Ladulphi*. Paris: Groulleau, 1548 / in-16

Du Fail, Noël. *Discours d'aucuns Propos rustiques facecieux et de singuliere recreation, de Maistre Leon Ladulfi, Champenois Reveuz et amplifiez par un des ses amys*. Paris: Groulleau, 1554 / in-16

+A.D.S.D. *Les Comptes du monde adventureux ou sont recitées plusieurs belles histoires memorables, & propres pour rejoyuir la compagnie, & éviter melancholie*. Paris: Groulleau, Sertenas, 1555 / in-8

Le Mangnier, Robert

+A.D.S.D. *Comptes du monde adventureux*. Paris: Sertenas, Robinot, Longis-Le Mangnier, 1558.

A.D.S.D. *Les Comptes du monde adventureux ou sont recitées plusieurs belles histoires memorables, & propres pour rejoyuir la compagnie, & éviter melancholie*. Paris: Longis, Le Mangnier, 1560.

Prevost, Benoist

+Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *Histoire des amans fortunez, dédiés à tresillustre Princesse Madame Marguerite de Bourbon, Duchesse de Nivernois, éditées par Pierre Boaistuau*. Paris: Caveiller, Gilles, Prevost, Robinot, 1558 / in-4 / Privilege to Sertenas

+Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *L'Heptameron des nouvelles de tresillustre et tresexcellente Princesse Marguerite de Valois, Royne de navarre remis en son ordre, confus au paravant en sa premiere impression: & dedie à tresillustre & tres vertueuse Princesse Jeanne de Foix Royne de Navarre, par Claude Gruget Parisien*. Paris: Prevost, Caveiller, Gilles, Robinot, Sertenas, 1559 / in-4

+Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *L'Heptaméron des nouvelles de tresillustre et tresexcellente princesse Marguerite de Valois, royne de Navarre: remis en son vray ordre, confus au paravant en sa premiere impression: & dedie à tresillustre & tres vertueuse Princesse Jeanne de Foix Royne de Navarre, par Claude Gruget parisien*. Paris: Prevost, Caveiller, Gilles, Robinot, Sertenas, 1560 / in-4 / privilege to Gilles

Rigaud, Benoît

A.D.S.D. *Les Comptes du monde adventureux ou sont recitées plusieurs belles histoires memorables, & propres pour rejiourir la compagnie, & éviter melancholie.* Lyon: Rigaud, 1571 / in-16

Des Périers, Bonaventure. *Nouvelles recreations et joyeux devis de feu Bonaventure des Periers Valet de chambre de la Royne de Navarre.* Lyon: Rigaud, 1571 / in-16

A.D.S.D. *Les Comptes du monde adventureux ou sont recitées plusieurs belles histoires memorables, & propres pour rejiourir la compagnie, & éviter melancholie.* Lyon: Rigaud, 1579 / in-16

Des Périers, Bonaventure. *Les Joyeuses Aventures, et nouvelles recreations. Contenant plusieurs Contes & Facetieux Devis. Reveu & augmenté de nouveau.* Lyon: Rigaud, 1582 / in-16

A.D.S.D. *Les Comptes du monde adventureux ou sont recitées plusieurs belles histoires memorables, & propres pour rejiourir la compagnie, & éviter melancholie.* Lyon: Rigaud, 1595 / in-16

Robinot, Gilles

+Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *Histoire des amans fortunez, dédiés à tresillustre Princesse Madame Marguerite de Bourbon, Duchesse de Nivernois, éditées par Pierre Boaistuau.* Paris: Caveiller, Gilles, Prevost, Robinot, 1558 / in-4 / Privilege to Sertenas

+Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *L'Heptameron des nouvelles de tresillustre et tresexcellente Princesse Marguerite de Valois, Royne de navarre remis en son ordre, confus au paravant en sa premiere impression: & dedie à tresillustre & tres vertueuse Princesse Jeanne de Foix Royne de Navarre, par Claude Gruget Parisien.* Paris: Prevost, Caveiller, Gilles, Robinot, Sertenas, 1559 / in-4

+Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *L'Heptameron des nouvelles de tresillustre et tresexcellente princesse Marguerite de Valois, royne de Navarre: remis en son vray ordre, confus au paravant en sa premiere impression: & dedie à tresillustre & tres vertueuse Princesse Jeanne de Foix Royne de Navarre, par Claude Gruget parisien*. Paris: Prevost, Caveiller, Gilles, Robinot, Sertenas, 1560 / in-4 / privilege to Gilles

Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *L'Heptameron de nouvelles*. Paris: Robinot, 1561 / in-16

Rouillé, Guillaume

Des Périers, Bonaventure. *Nouvelles recreations et joyeux devis de feu Bonaventure des Periers Valet de chambre de la Royne de Navarre*. Lyon: Rouillé, 1561 / in-4

Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *L'Heptameron des nouvelles de tresillustre et tresexcellente princesse, Marguerite de Valois, Royne de Navarre remis en son ordre, confus au paravant en sa premiere impression: & dedie à tresillustre & tres vertueuse Princesse Jeanne de Foix Royne de Navarre, par Claude Gruget Parisien*. Lyon: Rouillé, 1561 / in-16 (but in Tchemerzine, Vol.4 380, listed as being in-12)

Sertenas, Vincent

+A.D.S.D. *Les Comptes du monde adventureux ou sont recitées plusieurs belles histoires memorables, & propres pour rejoyir la compagnie, & éviter melancholie*. Paris: Groulleau, Sertenas, 1555 / in-8

+Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *Histoire des amans fortunez, dédiés à tresillustre Princesse Madame Marguerite de Bourbon, Duchesse de Nivernois, édités par Pierre Boaistuau*. Paris: Caveiller, Gilles, Prevost, Robinot, 1558 / in-4 / Privilege to Sertenas

+Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *L'Heptameron des nouvelles de tresillustre et tresexcellente Princesse Marguerite de Valois, Royne de navarre remis en son ordre, confus au paravant en sa premiere impression: & dedie à tresillustre & tres vertueuse Princesse Jeanne de Foix Royne de Navarre, par Claude Gruget Parisien*. Paris: Prevost, Caveiller, Gilles, Robinot, Sertenas, 1559 / in-4

A.D.S.D. *Les Comptes du monde aventureux ou sont recitées plusieurs belles histoires memorables, & propres pour rejoyuir la compagnie, & éviter melancholie.* Paris: Sertenas, 1560. / in-8

+Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *L'Heptaméron des nouvelles de tresillustre et tresexcellente princesse Marguerite de Valois, royne de Navarre: remis en son vray ordre, confus au paravant en sa premiere impression: & dedie à tresillustre & tres vertueuse Princesse Jeanne de Foix Royne de Navarre, par Claude Gruget parisien.* Paris: Prevost, Caveiller, Gilles, Robinot, Sertenas, 1560 / in-4 / privilege to Gilles

2.B BOOKSELLERS WITH A SINGLE PRINTING

Beauvais, Romain de

Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *L'Heptaméron ou Histoires des amans fortunez des nouvelles de tresillustre & tresexcellente Princesse, Marguerite de Valois Royne de Navarre. Remis en son vray ordre, confus au paravant en sa premiere impression: & dedie à tresillustre & tres vertueuse Princesse Jeanne, Royne de Navarre, par Claude Gruget Parisien.* Rouen: Beauvais, 1598 / in-12

Bessin, Jacques

Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *L'Heptaméron ou Histoires des amans fortunez des nouvelles de tresillustre & tresexcellente Princesse, Marguerite de Valois Royne de Navarre. Remis en son vray ordre, confus au paravant en sa premiere impression: & dedie à tresillustre & tres vertueuse Princesse Jeanne, Royne de Navarre, par Claude Gruget Parisien.* Paris: Bessin, 1615 / in-12

Bonfons, Nicolas

Des Périers, Bonaventure. *Nouvelles recreations et joyeux devis de feu Bonaventure des Periers Valet de chambre de la Royne de Navarre.* Paris: Bonfons, 1572 / in-16

Bruneau, Cyprien

+Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *L'Heptaméron des nouvelles de tresillustre et tresexcellente princesse, Marguerite de Valois, Royne de Navarre remis en son ordre, confus au paravant en sa premiere impression: & dedie à tresillustre & tres vertueuse Princesse Jeanne de Foix Royne de Navarre, par Claude Gruget Parisien.* Paris: Normant, Bruneau, Gilles, 1567 / in-16

Buffet, Nicolas

Du Fail, Noël. *Baliverneries, ou Contes nouveaux d'Eutrapel, autrement dit Leon Ladulphi.* Paris: Buffet, 1548 / in-16

Cavellat, Guillaume.

+A.D.S.D. *Les Comptes du monde aventureux ou sont recitées plusieurs belles histoires memorables, & propres pour rejoyir la compagnie, & éviter melancholie.* Paris: Marnef, Cavellat, 1566 / in-16

De Tournes, Jean II

Du Fail, Noël. *Les Ruses et finesses de Ragot, jadis capitaine des gueux de l'hostiere & de ses successeurs. Avec Plusieurs Discours plaisants & recreatifs, pour s'entretenir en tout honneste compagnie.* Lyon: De Tournes II, 1576 / in-12

Granjon, Robert

Des Périers, Bonaventure. *Nouvelles recreations et joyeux devis de feu Bonaventure des Periers Valet de chambre de la Royne de Navarre.* Lyon: Granjon, 1558 / in-4

L'Angelier, Abel

Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *L'Heptaméron ou Histoires des amans fortunez des nouvelles de tresillustre & tresexcellente Princesse, Marguerite de Valois Royne de Navarre. Remis en son vray ordre, confus au paravant en sa premiere impression: & dedie à tresillustre & tres vertueuse Princesse Jeanne, Royne de Navarre, par Claude Gruget Parisien.* Paris: L'Angelier, 1581 / in-16

Le Brun, Jacques

Des Périers, Bonaventure. *Nouvelles recreations et joyeux devis de feu Bonaventure des Periers Valet de chambre de la Royne de Navarre*. Lyon: Le Brun, 1616 / in-2

Longis, Jean

+A.D.S.D. *Comptes du monde adventureux*. Paris: Sertenas, Robinot, Longis-Le Magnier, 1558.

Marnef, Enguilbert de

Discours non plus melancoliques que divers, de choses mesmement qui appartiennent à nostre France : & à la fin, La manière de bien & justement entoucher les Lucs & Guiternes. Poitiers: Marnef, 1557 / in-4

Marnef, Jérôme de

+A.D.S.D. *Les Comptes du monde adventureux ou sont recitées plusieurs belles histoires memorables, & propres pour rejiouir la compagnie, & éviter melancholie*. Paris: Marnef, Cavellat, 1566 / in-16

Menier, Pierre

Des Périers, Bonaventure. *Les Joyeuses Aventures, et nouvelles recreations. Contenant plusieurs Contes & Facetieux Devis. Reveu & augmenté de nouveau*. Paris: Menier, 1602 / in-16

Micard, Claude

A.D.S.D. *Les Comptes du monde adventureux ou sont recitées plusieurs belles histoires memorables, & propres pour rejiouir la compagnie, & éviter melancholie*. Paris: Micard, 1582 / in-12

Milliot

Des Périers, Bonaventure. *Nouvelles recreations et joyeux devis de feu Bonaventure des Periers Valet de chambre de la Royne de Navarre*. Paris: Milliot, 1588 / in-12

Normant, Vincent

+Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *L'Heptaméron des nouvelles de tresillustre et tresexcellente princesse, Marguerite de Valois, Royne de Navarre remis en son ordre, confus au paravant en sa premiere impression...par Claude Gruget Parisien*. Paris: Normant, Bruneau, Gilles, 1567 / in-16

Osmont

Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *L'Heptaméron ou Histoires des amans fortunez des nouvelles de tresillustre & tresexcellente Princesse, Marguerite de Valois Royne de Navarre. Remis en son vray ordre, confus au paravant en sa premiere impression: & dedie à tresillustre & tres vertueuse Princesse Jeanne, Royne de Navarre, par Claude Gruget Parisien*. Rouen: Osmont, 1598 / in-12

Prunier, Pierre

Des Périers, Bonaventure. *Nouvelles recreations et joyeux devis de feu Bonaventure des Periers Valet de chambre de la Royne de Navarre*. Lyon: Prunier, 1597 / in-8

Roigny, Michel de

Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *L'Heptaméron ou Histoires des amans fortunez des nouvelles de tresillustre & tresexcellente Princesse, Marguerite de Valois Royne de Navarre. Remis en son vray ordre, confus au paravant en sa premiere impression: & dedie à tresillustre & tres vertueuse Princesse Jeanne, Royne de Navarre, par Claude Gruget Parisien*. Paris: Roigny, 1574 / in-16

Ruelle, Jean I

Du Fail, Noël. *Les Ruses et finesses de Ragot, jadis capitaine des gueux de l'hostiere & de ses successeurs. Avec Plusieurs Discours plaisants & recreatifs, pour s'entretenir en tout honneste compagnie*. Paris: Ruelle, 1573 / in-16

Trepperel, Jean

Du Fail, Noël. *Baliverneries, ou Contes nouveaux d'Eutrapel, autrement dit Leon Ladulphi*. Paris: Trepperel, 1548 / in-16

Unattributed booksellers

Du Fail, Noël. *Baliverneries, ou Contes nouveaux d'Eutrapel, autrement dit Leon Ladulphi*. Lyon: s.n, 1547

Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *L'Heptameron des nouvelles remis en son ordre, confus au paravant en sa premiere impression: & dedie à tresillustre & tres vertueuse Princesse Jeanne de Foix Royne de Navarre, par Claude Gruget Parisien*. s.l.: s.n, 1559/ in-12

Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. *L'Heptameron des nouvelles de tresillustre et tresexcellente princesse, Marguerite de Valois, Royne de Navarre remis en son ordre, confus au paravant en sa premiere impression: & dedie à tresillustre & tres vertueuse Princesse Jeanne de Foix Royne de Navarre, par Claude Gruget Parisien*. s.l: s.n, 1560 / in-16

+ Designates an edition that was printed by more than one of the booksellers listed here.

APPENDIX B
DU FAIL'S VARIANTS IN THE *PROPOS RUSTIQUES*

Table 1: Variants in the 1549 text as compared to the 1547

	Epitre	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII	XIII	Total
M	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	9
G	0	1	0	1	2	4	6	0	1	7	5	0	0	4	41
S	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	4	2	14	3	0	0	0	26
E	0	0	1	0	0	0	6	0	5	4	4	0	0	0	20
C	1	2	1	6	9	5	9	6	16	18	4	3	2	2	81
O	1	0	0	1	3	0	2	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	10
A	0	4	3	3	1	0	4	1	1	1	2	0	0	2	22
Err	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Total variants in Du Fail's 1549 text: 212

(This number does not include the series of orthographic changes made throughout the text as listed in DLB.)

98/212 are Interpolations from 1548 that Du Fail kept in the updated text.

29/212 are Interpolations from 1548 that Du Fail partially kept in the updated text.

Total = 127/212 of Du Fail's variants are derived at least in part from the 1548 interpolated edition.

* DLB's Interpolations list a suppression on p.61 l.1 that is counted in the two tables, but was not listed in DLB's variants. (This should be on page 125.)

Table 2: Interpolations that remain in the Du Fail 1549 edition

	Epitre	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII	XIII	Total
M	1 p		1				1 p	1	1 p	2 +					4 +
										1 p					4 p
G		1		1		1			1	5 +	1			1	9 +
						p				2 p	+				4 p
											1				
											p				
S				1		1	1	3	1	8 +	2				17 +
										1 p					1 p
E							2 +		3	1 +	4				10 +
							1 p			1 p					2 p
C	1	1	1	2	1 +	3	5 +	1 +	9 +	13	3	3	1	1 +	45 +
					2 p	+	2 p	1 p	2 p	+	+			1 p	13 p
						2				2 p	1				
						p					p				
O				1	2				1		1				5
A		1	1	2 +			3 +		1	1 p	1			1 +	10 +
		+	+	1 p			1 p							1 p	7 p
		1	2												
		p	p												
Err															0
															100 +
															31 p

* These figures are higher than the previous figures of total Interpolations included as variants because some interpolations included variants of several types. Each of those types was figured separately into this table. Those occurrences appear in Chapter V p. 39 l.28-29, Chapter VI p. 42 l.15-17, p. 47 l.12-13, Chapter VIII p. 56 l.5, p. 59 l.12-13, Chapter IX p. 66 l.20-22, p. 69 l.8-9, p. 70 l.4-5, p. 70 l.16-18.

*223 additional interpolations are made that are not retained by Du Fail. In all, 131/354 interpolations are used by the author. Adjusting for multiple type interpolations, the number becomes 127/345.

Key : M = modernization; G = addition / correction; S = suppression; E = emphasis; C = clarification or precision; O = spelling, not related to general list; A = addition without clear or precise reason; Err = Errata

ENDNOTES

¹ Due to generic fluidity of the various sub-genres of *short fiction*, we will refer to *tales*, *stories*, *contes* and *nouvelles* almost interchangeably.

² A. J. Krailsheimer notes that the first manuscript of Marguerite de Navarre's collection by Adrien de Thou (1553) was in fact titled *Le Decameron* ("The *Heptaméron* reconsidered" 19). See also Nicole Cazauran and Sylvie Lefèvre, Preface. *Heptaméron. Œuvres complètes* by Marguerite de Navarre, vol. 10, book 1 (2013) xxvii, lxxv, hereafter called Preface, *H* (2013).

³ The *romans de chevalerie* were undergoing a resurgence of popularity at this time as well, with the French translations of the Spanish *Amadis de Gaule* cycle being a clear example of this phenomenon. See Avenir Tchemerzine for a complete list of editions of the *Amadis de Gaule* cycle, as well as the texts included in this study.

⁴ Jeanne-Marie Dureau does a thorough analysis of the introduction of printing presses to France and other European leaders in the printing industry demonstrating the growing role of France in the industry of book production ("Les Premiers ateliers français," 163-175).

⁵ A number of works discuss different laws that were introduced during these two moments of "crisis" in the industry. See, for example, the relevant chapters in volume 1 of *Histoire de l'édition française*, such as those by Annie Charon-Parent and Natalie Zemon Davis. George Hoffman also offers some comments on the subject, especially in "Renaissance printing and the book trade," 384-391. Jean de La Caille's *Histoire de l'imprimerie et de la librairie* provides a thorough collection of laws regarding the industry until 1689.

⁶ Collections of short narrative have, as we note in the introduction, been around for centuries and in many different cultures. We are referring specifically to this moment in the French book industry when an unusually large number of such collections become available. After the sixteenth century, especially this period, the appeal of such collections would wane until the nineteenth century, when the modern short story would be born. Philippe Walter discusses the role of this courtly pastime in the development of short narrative. Renya Salminen takes note of the influence of this pastime on the development of Marguerite de Navarre's *Heptaméron* (Introduction, esp. xxxiv-xxxviii).

⁷ Adrien de Thou's manuscript, now the basis for most re-editions of the work, was never published, and the public was presented only with incomplete or faulty publications until much later. The precise publication history of the *Heptaméron* will be discussed at length in chapter 3 of Part I. See Reyff 5-33; Salminen, xxix-xxx; Cazauran and Lefèvre, Preface, *H* (2013), Book 1, vii-cx.

⁸ Du Fail actually wrote four texts *in toto*. In addition to the two works in this study, there was the *Memoires recueillis et extraicts des plus notables et solennels Arrests du Parlement de Bretagne* (1579), which few consider when analyzing his literary corpus, since this is more of a professional judicial text, and the *Contes et Discours d'Eutrapel* (1585). Emmanuel Philipot discusses the nature of the *Memoires* with some interest (320-326). Interestingly, the title page of the *Contes* indicates a posthumous publication ("par le feu Seigneur de la Herissaye, gentilhomme breton"), but

Du Fail was in fact alive and helmed several re-editions of the text. See, for example, Philipot 375-379.

⁹ I will address some of the difficulties of accepting this data at face value in Part I. One of the most significant issues is, of course, the availability of data, as well as its accuracy.

¹⁰ All translations are mine unless otherwise noted.

¹¹ Nuccio Ordine's study on the sixteenth-century Italian theories on comedy and tales includes Bonciani's text in its entirety 99-135. Ordine's study also includes relevant excerpts from works on larger subjects by Girolamo Bargagli and Francesco Sansovino.

¹² See on this matter Pascale Mounier, *Le Roman humaniste: un genre novateur français. 1532-1564* (2007).

¹³ P.G. Walsh indicates that Augustine was in fact the first to name the work *The Golden Ass* and supports the theory that Apuleius intended to use the title *Metamorphoses*. Introduction xix.

¹⁴ Apuleius claims to base his story on a Greek tale: "[...] for the romance on which I am embarking is adapted from the Greek" 1.

¹⁵ See Etienne Jodelle, *Œuvres complètes*, ed. Balmas, t. I, 92-96.

¹⁶ See Du Bellay, *Deffence et illustration de la langue française*, II, xii, ed. S. de Sacy, 262.

¹⁷ In Horace's words: "Non satis est pulchra esse poemata; dulcia sunt / et quocumque volent animum auditoris agunt" ("Not enough is it for poems to have beauty: they must have charm, and lead the hearer's soul where they will" lines 99-100, *Satires, Epistles, Ars Poetica*, trans. Fairclough, 1991 (1926), 459); "Omne tulit punctum qui miscuit utile dulci, / lectorem delectando pariterque monendo" ("He has won every vote who has blended profit and pleasure, at once delighting and instructing the reader" lines 343-344, *ibid*, 479).

¹⁸ The other genres to which they refer are *fabliaux*, *lais*, *dits*, Aesopic stories, anecdote, *exemplum*, and fables. Each of these genres, according to Luciano Rossi, bears different characteristics that define them as separate and distinct. Tales, however, seem to adopt aspects from each. Hence, the hybrid form. See "Entre fabliau et facétie: La Nouvelle en France au XVe siècle," 2-3.

¹⁹ Cf. Charles de Bourdigné. *La Légende joyeuse ou faits et dictz joyeux de Pierre Faifeu escolier d'Angers* (1532) versus Philippe de Vigneulles. *Les Cent nouvelles nouvelles* (1515). Though Bourdigné is the only verse example I have yet encountered from sixteenth-century France beside such poetic creations as Jean Lemaire de Belges's *Contes de Cupido et d'Atropos*.

²⁰ See above note 6. See also Bonaventure Des Périers *Nouvelles Recreations et joyeux devis*. Again, however, Bourdigné's work is the exception, not the rule.

²¹ Unless otherwise noted, all references to the *Heptaméron* are from the Cazauran and Lefèvre edition of the *Heptaméron* in *Œuvres complètes* (2013).

²² Unless otherwise noted, all references to the *Propos Rustiques* are from the Gabriel-André Pérouse and Guy Demerson edition, 1994.

²³ Unless otherwise noted, all references to the *Nouvelles Recreations et joyeux devis* are from the Kristina Kasprzyk edition, 1980.

²⁴ He writes: “Ouvrez le livre: si ung compte ne vous plait, hay à l’aultre” 15.

²⁵ Again, Charles de Bourdigné proves the exception, not the rule, as he chose to present the “legend” of a single main character in verse form.

²⁶ Pérouse discusses the moral aspects of this collection in his chapter on the *Comptes amoureux*, esp. 84-85. Likewise, in the Introduction to its most current edition, Régine Reynolds-Cornell discusses the moral value of the collection and its place in the *Querelle des Femmes*.

²⁷ See Marie-Claire Bichard-Thomine (*Noël Du Fail: conteur*) for a discussion on the definitions of the generic lexicon and how Du Fail exploits those terms in his titles (74-84). Mireille Huchon suggests that the title of the *Baliverneries* indicates a specific linguistic concern that is reflected in the text: “Les *Baliverneries* sont marquées par un souci sémantique plus pointilleux que dans les *Propos Rustiques*” in “Le Propos linguistique de Noël Du Fail,” 116. Bideaux shows that Du Fail himself explains his choice of title, one that indicates rambling and laughter, in the opening epistle to the text in “Les *Baliverneries d’Eutrapel: Du Fail entre deux livres*,” 76-77.

²⁸ For commentary on sixteenth-century intertextuality and the Bible, see Edwin Duval, “Intertextuality: The Bible,” 54-61 and “Et puis, quelles nouvelles?” esp. 249-254.

²⁹ For a number of discussions that attempt to distinguish oral folklore from its written medieval form, see *Telling Tales: Medieval Narratives and the Folk Tradition*, which also includes a substantial bibliography. I go back to medieval narrative for this part of the discussion because it is an important part of the foundation of all collections of tales; the paragon of course, the *Decameron* straddles the elusive border between the Middle Ages and the Renaissance.

³⁰ Stephen Belcher and Bonnie Irwin’s articles may both be cited as examples of criticism making assumptions about the role of orality in written texts. Irwin, for example, suggests that there is much doubt that the *framed tale* existed in oral forms, while many of the tales themselves likely existed outside of the larger narrative preceding the written form of the work 156. See Belcher, “Framed Tales in the Oral Tradition: An Exploration,” 1-19; Irwin, “Framed (for) Murder: The Corpse Killed Five Times in the *Thousand Nights and a Night*.”

³¹ Krystyna Kasprzyk’s edition notes a number of stories with known oral precedents.

³² See Du Fail citation p.11.

³³ Bichard-Thomine analyzes all forms of language in her study, including Du Fail’s play on orality. Part III deals especially with the general topic, and she notes that Du Fail participated in a larger narrative tradition that places it between the worlds of the oral and the written word: “une écriture qui demeure toujours à la frontière de l’écrit et de l’oral, restituant pour l’espace intime de la lecture l’atmosphère conviviale des conversations de banquet ou des entretiens amicaux. La littérature narrative du XVI^e siècle est tout entière une littérature de parole” 221.

³⁴ Du Fail writes in the opening: “Les Philosophes et Jurisconsultes ont cela assez familier, de descrire l’un contraire par l’autre, [. . .] Au moyen de quoy, puisque les

Propos d'aucuns Rustiques (que je nomme Païsans, Vilains ou Ignobles) nous sont en main, il ne sera, me semble, hors de propos, faire un brief et sommaire Discours du nom et imposition d'iceluy, ce que je feray à beaucoup moindre difficulté, prenant ce que luy est (comme l'on dit) en diametre contraire, qui est Noblesse; non celle de laquelle se sentent et disent estre embelliz et armés un tas de Logiciens et Alkimistes, mais de celle primitive et premier commencement, qu'on appelle de race" 38.

³⁵ Pérouse's study uses this very notion as a means to establish the value of the *nouvelles* in their mimetic cultural representation. Gary Ferguson and David LaGuardia give a fair survey of the critical work done on the *nouvelles* as representations of reality in their introduction to *Narrative Worlds* 4-7. It is important to keep in mind, however, that it took a while for the concepts of Aristotle's *Poetics* to be fully adopted and used with any precision in France: the notion of representation, as we will see, was used by such theorists as Jacques Peletier and Pierre de Ronsard, but in a rather loose fashion.

³⁶ See again citation page 11 from Du Fail.

³⁷ The disputed provenance of the *Discours non plus melancoliques que divers* will be briefly discussed below, in the portion of this introduction on editing.

³⁸ Félix Frank deduces that the author is in fact Antoine de Saint-Denis, who, having been named in documents related to court events with Marguerite d'Angoulême, queen of Navarre, not only knew the author of *l'Heptaméron*, but may have been familiar with her early manuscripts of the as yet unpublished material while writing his own collection ("notice" xi-xv).

³⁹ One could argue that the storyteller begins to fit a certain "type" just as the various characters often fit a certain type: merchant, cuckolded husband, adulterous wife, unhappy young wife, etc.

⁴⁰ Philippe de Lajarte presents a structural study on the effects of the different voices of the storytellers and their role in the hierarchy within the collection in his article ("The Voice of the Narrators in Marguerite de Navarre's Tales.") Also, Nicole Cazauran looks at the influence specific storytellers, as characters within the collection, have on a reader's interpretation of the stories in her book *L'Heptaméron de Marguerite de Navarre*.

⁴¹ A couple of phrases within the construct of the preface that identify this unity include "j'aime & estime les gans favants," "que les Lettre ont accouftumé de faire les meurs des hommes," and "Car il n'y a chose par laquelle on puisse mieus juger du savoir d'un home, que par ses escrits."

⁴² Many studies tend to focus on the authorial preface. See, for example, Herbert Grierson and Sandys Wason, who write: "In a preface, then, we have the interest of a complex reaction to the writer's own feelings, his awareness of his audience, and his subject" (*The Personal Note or First and Last Words from Prefaces, Introductions, Dedications, Epilogues*, 5). Claude Longeon's edition of Etienne Dolet's prefaces places the editor at the heart of the discussion. He notes that Dolet's Humanist proclivities lead him to see himself, the editor, as a liaison between the author, the guardian of the French language and history, and posterity itself: "Dolet s'attache à prouver le rôle intellectuel et moral, mais aussi politique des écrivains, qui sont pour ainsi dire la conscience et la

mémoire d'une nation" (Dolet, *Préfaces françaises*, 17). In a series of studies dedicated to prefaces, Henri Coulet focuses on collections of tales and stories in the seventeenth century. He acknowledges that authors and editors work together to present diverse collections, and that fluidity and diversity in genre allow for a shared role in prefaces ("Préfaces et commentaires du texte dans le récit court," 140-141).

⁴³ Lajarte rejects Booth's, Schmid's and Lintvelt's readings of *author* as one who "represents the deep meaning, the global meaning of the literary work" 172. Instead, he identifies the author under three criteria: "the *role or entity which produces this unique system*" 173; "the *subject of the generic contract*" 174; and "the *subject of the voice or voices in which, outside the work, the author expresses herself in her own name*" 174. This definition allows room for variety in reader-response and in interpretation.

⁴⁴ My use of the feminine reader ("she") does not indicate my own insistence that the reader be a woman. Instead, I choose to reflect the common generic insistence, often supported by the writers themselves, but also as often tongue-in-cheek, that women are the prototypical audience for such collections.

⁴⁵ Apuleius' novel was in fact translated much earlier. See Olivier Pédeflous, "La traduction de *L'Âne d'or* par Guillaume Michel (1517): une contribution à la poétique du roman au XVI^e siècle," 515-535.

⁴⁶ One must note, however, that Du Fail mentions these figures as potential anthropological evidence on human, specifically peasant, behavior.

⁴⁷ See Pérouse's Chapitre Premier: "L'Héritage médiéval : genres littéraires et peintures de vie quotidienne au XV^e siècle" 13-28, for a more detailed discussion.

⁴⁸ See Michel Simonin's article "La disgrâce d'Amadis" for details on the rise and fall of this cycle in French literary culture.

⁴⁹ See chapitre III: *Le Parangon de nouvelles honnestes et delectables* (1531) 69-81 for greater detail.

⁵⁰ See James Hassell (*Sources and Analogues of the Nouvelles Récréations et joyeux devis of Bonaventure Des Périers*. 2 vols, 1957) and the Kasprzyk edition of *Les Nouvelles Récréations et joyeux devis*.

⁵¹ Des Périers uses this exact term in the sentence immediately following this citation: "Sinon que vous me vueillez dire que les nouvelles ne sont pas comme les marchandises : et qu'on les donne pour le prix qu'elles coustent" 16.

⁵² See Bandello, *Due Partie* 35 and Marguerite de Navarre, III, 30. In this tale, a widowed mother refuses to remarry, determined to maintain her chastity and her son's honor. Through a series of unfortunate circumstances that, in both versions, are the result of the mother's physical needs and the son's naïve coming-of-age, the son unknowingly sires a daughter by his mother. The mother sends her daughter/granddaughter to be raised elsewhere while the son is sent off to make his own way for a time, as all responsible young men were to do. The mother is left, in Marguerite's version, to waste away in repentance and sorrow over her guilt. Years later, the son returns with his new wife, who also happens to be his sister/daughter. In Bandello's version, the mother dies of grief and regret, whereas in Marguerite's version, the mother finds herself obligated to suffer in silence because as long as the two lovers know nothing of the truth, they are not culpable

parties to the mother's moral crimes. Thus, the moral value of suffering becomes a central element in Marguerite de Navarre's version.

⁵³ See Peletier, Book I, chapter 3.

⁵⁴ Some of this renewed interest in fabulous narratives reflects the continued influence of the medieval allegorical tradition. They then inherit their place, as it were, as a part of that tradition.

⁵⁵ See Jean Lemaire de Belges's *Illustrations de Gaule et Singularitez de Troye*.

⁵⁶ We remember the previously cited quote: "Le plus gentil enseignement pour la vie, c'est *bene vivere et laetari*" 8.

⁵⁷ Translations of the Latin cited in this study derive directly from the bilingual edition that is being used.

⁵⁸ The French translation is this: "L'invention consiste à trouver les arguments vrais ou vraisemblables, propres à rendre notre cause convaincante" *De Inventione* 63. Note the use of the terms "vrais" and "vraisemblables".

⁵⁹ See Terence Cave for further discussion on the play between *imitatio* and *inventio*, esp. chapter 2 "Imitation," 35-77. He concludes the chapter with: "Imitation theory is more complex in that it recognizes the extent to which the production of any discourse is conditioned by pre-existing instances of discourse; the writer is always a rewriter, the problem then being to differentiate and authenticate the rewriting" (76).

⁶⁰ See Du Bellay, Book I, chapter 8, 215-217.

⁶¹ The text is imitative because Du Fail's *hypernarrator* not only transmits the material he overheard, but carefully constructs the words of the *hyponarrators* according to his faulty but animated (and slightly inebriated) memory and his own needs. His narrative character, Leon Ladulfi, alludes to this when he writes: "Ce que je feis et, par deux ou trois festes subsecutives, les ouy jazer et deviser privément de leur affaires Rustiques, desquels ay fait, par heures rompues et de relaiz, un brief discours, où j'ay eu non moindre peine que à une bonne besogne: car, après avoir ahanné long temps, resvant et devinant ce que je devois dire, estois contraint boire deux ou trois voltes (gracieux compulsoire) pour me rendre la cervelle plus frisque et deliberée [...]" 50.

⁶² Precisely, Du Bellay insists, after Cicero's example, that a poet be familiar with his own natural ability, and that he only imitate those whose talents reflect his own skills: "Avant toutes choses, faut qu'il ait ce jugement de connaître ses forces et tenter combien ses épaules peuvent porter; qu'il sonde diligemment son naturel, et se compose à l'imitation de celui dont il se sentira approcher de plus près" Book II, chapter iii, 237. Given the classical models, which serve as direct sources for the definition of many rhetorical terms, including *imitatio*, Aneau's criticism is weakly defended.

⁶³ Jodelle writes: "Lors il me tint assez long propoz de celivre que l'on te donne maintenant, & **me fit lier ma promesse d'un serment inviolable**, que son Palladien ne se mettroit jamais au monde, sans que je l'accompagnasse, pour faire teste à un chascun, voire & pour garder les plus envenimez d'oser s'affronter à nous deux." (emphasis mine)

⁶⁴ This is not to say that modern editors do not acknowledge the problems inherent in these kinds of self-imposed limitations. It is common practice to identify a base text and to support that choice, by explaining why that text best exemplifies the editor's goals for this new edition. For example, Nicole Cazauran and Sylvie Lefèvre discuss the notion of authenticity as it pertains to each of the central works of this

particular study. They attempt to balance out this impossible task and to familiarize modern scholars with the longest-running base text of the *Heptaméron*, which is not currently the most accepted “authentic” edition, by using the Gruget edition in their two most recent editions. To a certain extent, this study is freed from these constraints simply by the fact that it does deal explicitly with the differences found between editions. However, it is almost to be doubly condemned, as it also compares these differences by starting with the earliest edition available, and, at least in the case of the *Nouvelles Recreations* and the *Propos Rustiques*, assuming that the earliest editions most closely resembled the authors’ intended versions of their collections.

⁶⁵ See, in the Introduction, comments made by Jodelle, DuBellay and others about prose fiction and the treatment of genre, especially pages 30-36.

⁶⁶ General background such as this is covered in numerous studies. See, for example, Martin, “Culture écrite et culture orale” and Hoffmann, “About being about the Renaissance”.

⁶⁷ See Saugrain and La Caille for detailed listings of the laws developed in France during this period.

⁶⁸ Charon-Parent gives interesting details about the main groups (apprentice, companion, master) that worked in the actual print shops and compares them to the booksellers that dealt with administration and sales in her “Le monde de l’imprimerie humaniste”, esp. 271-275. Cf. also Saugrain and La Caille.

⁶⁹ Examples of this may be seen in Simonin’s article “Peut-on parler de politique éditoriale au XVI^e siècle?” Many points from this article will be presented later in this section of the thesis. See also, “La disgrâce d’Amadis” and “De la Prime Fortune Éditoriale des Nouvelles de Marguerite de Navarre.”

⁷⁰ At the time, the provenance of the censored *Cymbalum mundi* was potentially doubtful because it had been published anonymously; the matter of its attribution remains an object of debate.

⁷¹ I am not considering the *Histoires des Amans Fortunez* in this comment, but other works, such as the *Histoire Chelidonienne*, the *Théâtre du monde* and the *Histoires Prodigieuses*.

⁷² In the case of the *Heptaméron*, there are several extant manuscripts, but none from the author’s hand or a known secretary. See Cazauran, *L’Heptaméron de Marguerite de Navarre* 22 and Cazauran and Lefèvre, Preface, *H* (2013), Book 1, xlix-lxxvi. Cf. an interesting discussion on manuscript BnF fr.2155 and Renja Salminjen’s selection of that text for her 1999 Droz critical edition in Cazauran and Lefèvre’s Preface, *H* (2013), Book 1, lvii-lxiii. As for Des Périers, there are no known manuscripts.

⁷³ This question has been debated throughout the centuries. In terms of contemporary interpretation, the question of imitation plays a large role. Pasquier, for example, criticizes Du Fail’s imitation of Rabelais (as cited in Bichard-Thomine 88) and Du Bellay, of course, discusses the purpose and importance of imitation in the *Deffence et illustration de la langue françoise*, but only while offering a warning to others to be cautious of this rhetorical strategy when it comes to poetry. Perhaps more to the point, Claude Gruget’s open criticism of Boaistuau’s reordering and interpolative censoring of the *Heptaméron*, simultaneous with his own decision to eliminate the tales 44, 46, 63, 66 and 72 from his version of the text, points out the very question I pose here. There is,

naturally, no decisive answer, but it remains at the heart of our discussion. For, while I do not choose to judge the authenticity of the works I study, I do intend to evaluate the extent to which the texts might have been changed, where evidence of such changes occur, and when possible, whether or not those changes alter the rhetoric and intent of the original text insofar as it is known. It is therefore a line that I will be “toeing” throughout this study.

⁷⁴ I would like to note here, however, that Lionello Sozzi does give a solid enumeration of the anachronisms and an identification of the likely reasons for which these anachronisms were included in the text in his *Les Contes de Bonaventure Des Périers* 430-433. I will be referring extensively to Sozzi’s enumeration and comments in my own analysis in the next chapter.

⁷⁵ I will discuss academic conclusions on the role of the interpolations in the text in greater detail in the second part of this thesis.

⁷⁶ In order to do this, I must step outside of my self-imposed boundary of only looking at editions of texts that were in fact published during Henri II’s reign. In this case, it is necessary to do so, since the additional tales were not added until after the period in question, but an analysis of these tales will add significant weight to my argument.

⁷⁷ References to Robert Granjon’s role in the publishing industry of mid-sixteenth century France are numerous. Cf. Charon-Parent “Le monde de l’imprimerie humaniste: Paris,” *HEFI*; Davis “Le monde de l’imprimerie humaniste: Lyon,” *HEFI*; and Baudrier II 49-64.

⁷⁸ Lists of the editions of the *Nouvelles Recreations* may be found in numerous bibliographies. Cf. Baudrier; Tchemerzine; Cioranescu, etc. However, I am using Kasprzyk’s citing of 1625 as the end of the long run of the *Nouvelles Recreations* as a popular text, xlix.

⁷⁹ See Martin “Ce qu’on lisait au seizième siècle” *BHR* 224.

⁸⁰ See Chartier and Martin *HEF* I.

⁸¹ This group is also an elite because of the high costs involved in both printing and the handling of legal contracts. In their articles in *HEF* I, Davis and Charon-Parent illustrate the difficulties in achieving master status in either branch of the industry. Most specifically, Charon-Parent contrasts the means afforded by the poorest in the industry and the wealthiest. Of the *compagnons* who wish to become master-printers, she notes that “Un nombre important de compagnons n’accède pas à la maîtrise. Une presse et des caractères coûtent presque une année de salaire, pressiers, compositeurs ou correcteurs doivent travailler dix à douze ans avant d’espérer s’installer [. . .]” (249). At the other end of the spectrum: “Les imprimeurs-libraires accédant à ce niveau de fortune les Estienne, les Bade et leurs descendants, ont assez de capital pour faire fonctionner cinq à six presses et employer jusqu’à vingt-cinq personnes; capables d’imprimer et de vendre leur propre production sans être obligés de conclure une association ni de faire appel à d’autres imprimeurs, ils peuvent, grâce à la bonne marche de leur atelier et à la prospérité de leur commerce, choisir leurs auteurs et leurs textes, et avoir ainsi une politique d’édition.” 252.

⁸² Within the context of our own argument, the *Discours non plus mélancoliques que divers* and the *Comptes du monde aventureux* by A.D.S.D. may serve as precedents.

⁸³ See Davis “Lyon” 266.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.* Davis gives these figures: 22.3% of the total number of editions was dedicated to literature and language, including poetry, emblems, etc.), which is the largest subject group in the inventory. She also shows subject groups as follows: religious texts (19.1%); classical literature (18.9%); history and travel (9.9%); medicine (9.7%); other sciences and professions (8.5%); law (6.3%) and philosophy (5.3%).

⁸⁵ As noted in Kasprzyk “Introduction” vii-viii.

⁸⁶ Kasprzyk alludes to the idea in the first paragraphs of her introduction to the *NR* (vii-viii).

⁸⁷ Davis “Lyon” 259-260.

⁸⁸ Baudrier notes that there is no extant documentary evidence to provide an exact date of his establishment in Lyon. We do know that Granjon worked with a Parisien printer by the name of Fezendat until as late as 1551. Also, Baudrier does clarify that the first printed texts out of Granjon’s Lyon business are dated 1557, which coincidentally corresponds to the first examples of his *caractères de civilité*, which were to ultimately become the most widely used characters in France during the latter half of the sixteenth century. I am suggesting that perhaps Granjon’s time was monopolized, at least in part, by the creation of the new letters and of sufficient sets to put them to use. In addition, such a move from Paris to Lyon would have proved both time-consuming and costly (Vol. 2, 49-51).

⁸⁹ Cf. Roudie and Desgraves 65-67; Martin “Le temps de Robert Estienne” *HEF* I 230-234; Davis esp. 267; Charon-Parent “Le monde de l’imprimerie humaniste: Paris” *HEF* I 237, 242-247.

⁹⁰ Davis furthers the discussion of the importance of the social circles and civic responsibilities played by those in the printing industry, bolstering the assumption that those involved in various aspects of book production knew each other in “Lyon” 275. Baudrier’s work also makes this case by highlighting numerous civil contracts (marriages, the naming of godparents, executors of wills, etc.).

⁹¹ Baudrier tells us that Rouillé’s editions included first the initial privilege as granted to Robert Granjon, succeeded by the following notice: “Ledit Gran-Ion ha fait transport dudit privilege à Guillaume Rouille quant a l’impression de ce present livre et veult et entend que ledit Rouille en vertu dudit transport en puisse ioüir comme à luy mesme l’auoit obtenu en son nom et pour le mesme temps que ledit Robert Gran-Ion en doit ioüir” (Vol. 9 282).

⁹² As cited in Jacob’s edition vii.

⁹³ Cf. Kasprzyk “Introduction” *Nouvelles Recreations* xlvi; Jacob vii-xi. Also, Du Pré did have two previous printings of the text before substantial changes occurred in the addition of nineteen tales to be discussed later. We will note, also, the erroneous assumption that these later editions were printed by Galliot Du Pré, as the name of the *libraire* on the titles indicated, which should correctly be assigned to Galliot II Du Pré and his brothers. See below for further discussion about the use of the Du Pré name in the *Nouvelles Recreations*.

⁹⁴ Baudrier (Vol. 9 13-418) cites no fewer than 135 texts under Rouillé’s name in the period from 1558-1561 alone.

⁹⁵ See Vol. 9 243-316. These pages list the works printed under Rouillé's name from 1558-1567. In 1559, for example, 15 of the 30 texts listed bear a privilege dated in 1558. A few bear privileges dated in 1553. However, in 1561, only 8 of 39 bore a privilege from 1558, a much smaller number. Yet, I can still note that a number of texts bearing earlier privileges were first published in this year, demonstrating the delay that did often occur in bringing a text's edition to fruition. That overall number further decreases in 1567, when only 2 of 21 are dated with a privilege from 1558. However, the privilege information is not given for all of the texts listed. At least 20 of the printed editions from 1561, for example, bear no privilege information. It is unclear whether they were printed without privilege, which is certainly a possibility, or if the information is simply absent. We have to admit that we have inconclusive data on half of the texts published by Rouillé in 1561 and that we do not know how long many of these texts were in his coffers waiting to be printed.

⁹⁶ According to both Baudrier Vol. 2 and Davis 267, Granjon returned to Paris after several years to perfect his design of Greek letters and the *caractères de civilité* that he began using in the 1550's were quickly adopted by the industry as a standard character type.

⁹⁷ See for example, Annie Charon-Parent's *Les métiers du livre au seizième siècle* 27-32, in which she discusses the nature of typical sixteenth-century libraries. Studies she cites clearly indicate that most private collections tended to focus on career-related works: clerics had religious texts, doctors had medical books, lawyers had legal volumes and rhetorical treatises, etc. In many instances, it was in fact the well-educated, but not the noblemen, who held vast collections. They did, also, have certain preferences: "Ces lecteurs témoignent de goûts très conservateurs : esprits sérieux, sans curiosité vraiment originale, ils restent fidèles aux grands textes scolastiques, aux compilations historiques du Moyen-Age; ce sont des amateurs dont la culture est honorable sans être très poussée: ils ont beaucoup de textes latins mais très peu de livres grecs; s'ils s'intéressent à Erasme et à Lefèvre d'Étaples, s'ils recherchent la littérature critique sur les textes sacrés, Ockam, Tateret, Duns Scot gardent leur faveur; ils aiment les nouvelles, les épopées, mais ce sont encore les romans de chevalerie, plus ou moins adaptés qui satisfont leur goût du romanesque." 29-30

⁹⁸ For greater detail on these questions, see chapter 5: "The Montaigne Monopoly" 108-129.

⁹⁹ The exact details of the 1567 and 1568 editions are somewhat fuzzy. Tchemerzine and Jacob both list a 1567 edition. Lacour indicates that the 1568 edition contained only thirty-two additional *nouvelles* and does not indicate when thirty-nine additional tales appeared, but does include them all in his edition (vol. 2 Preface, vi-x). We must operate with the understanding, then, that first thirty-two, then thirty-nine tales were added, after 1567, and under the Du Pré name. Kasprzyk assigns the addition of thirty-nine tales to the 1568 edition, and we will conform to her evidence in this matter.

¹⁰⁰ I will discuss the later booksellers below.

¹⁰¹ According to Tchemerzine's facsimile covers, we may note, for example, that Pierre Prunier's 1597 edition presented the stories as "Augmentees de plusieurs autres nouvelles fort soyenses & recreatiues, non encores veuës ny imprimees par cy deuant,"

and du Petit Val's 1606 edition described them as: "Reueues, corrigées & augmentees de nouveau" (Vol. 2 861)

¹⁰² Baudrier gives several interesting comments about Rigaud's overall work. First, he notes Rigaud's role in the development of "le commerce des livres à bon marché. Malheureusement l'impression et le papier de ses publications se ressentent beaucoup trop des effets de cette innovation" (Vol.3 175). Shortly after this, Baudrier also comments on the types of printers with whom Rigaud typically worked, stating that these gentlemen did not concern themselves with the quality of the end product, but the quantity: "Rigaud remettait l'impression de ses publications à de nombreux imprimeurs généralement plus soucieux du bénéfice que de l'élégance. Ce sont: Antoine et Ambroise du Rhône, Jacques Faure, François Durelle, Jean d'Ogerolles, Benoît Rondette, Jules Delphin, Pierre Roussin, Pierre Roland, Claude Morillon, Jean Poulin dit de Trin, et son pupille et neveu, Pierre Chastaing dit Dauphin, dont, l'unique exception, les œuvres permettent de constater le goût et le talent" (Vol. 3 176).

¹⁰³ The date of 1570 is questionable, as it refers to an edition by Galliot Du Pré that is undated, but likely later than the 1568 edition, since it contains 39, rather than 32 additional tales. The date of 1570 is suggested by Jacob without any substantiation vii-viii. See also Sozzi, *Les Contes de Bonaventure Des Périers* 425-427.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. Pascale Bourgain, "L'édition des manuscrits" *HEF* 1. 56-62. In her description of the role and rites of the author in the manuscript tradition, Bourgain writes: "Le texte d'une œuvre qui se répand reste mouvant; et si le très grand prestige de son auteur n'impose pas un aussi grand respect de la lettre, le texte continue à évoluer parfois dans une profonde méconnaissance des buts originels de l'auteur. Il n'y a pas de propriété littéraire au Moyen Âge" (60). The Gutenberg revolution led to not only a new industry, but to new questions pertaining to the role of the author, and any legal rights he or she might have over the text. However, this transition was at the heart of a number of legal debates during the sixteenth century; hence the series of laws drafted throughout the period, the establishment of privilege and the increased control of the monarchy over such rights.

¹⁰⁵ Hereafter, Introduction, *NR*.

¹⁰⁶ I will go into greater detail on the questions of the *Nouvelles Recreations*' origins in the second part of this study. Yet I will note here that La Croix du Maine doubted that Des Périers could have written the texts at all as early as 1584 in his bibliography of French works. La Croix du Maine's objections, however, seem to stem more from the anachronistic interpolations rather than from the additions. I will address these interpolations in greater detail later as well.

¹⁰⁷ See Lionello Sozzi, *Les Contes de Bonaventure Des Périers*.

¹⁰⁸ Kasprzyk's critique of these additions and editions states, for example: "A partir de l'impression de G. du Pré qui ajoute au texte original 39 nouvelles, certainement apocryphes, tous les éditeurs, quoique conscients de leur caractère postiche, continuent à les insérer à la suite des nouvelles originales. Les effets fâcheux de cette méthode se font sentir surtout dans les travaux lexicographiques; depuis Cotgrave jusqu'à Huguet les *NR* ont été très largement dépouillées et les exemples des nombreux dictionnaires qui les mettent à profit portent aussi bien sur le vrai que sur le faux Des Périers. Avant la présente édition, seule la reproduction phototypique de P. P. Plan (1914) s'en débarrasse

par la force des choses” xlvi–xlix. By contrast, the edition she offers “se propose de donner la reproduction la plus fidèle possible du texte de 1558 avec ses particularités de graphie et de ponctuation” l.

¹⁰⁹ One very clear exception to this general rule is of course, Nicole Cazauran’s article and comments dedicated to the variant editions of the *Heptaméron*. Cf. “Boaistuau et Gruget éditeurs de l’Heptaméron: A chacun sa part” and *L’Heptaméron de Marguerite de Navarre*. See also Cazauran and Lefèvre’s Preface, *H* (2013), Book 1, lxxii–xcviii. Both critics deal extensively with Boaistuau and Gruget as the early editors of the printed collection and make observations about the nature of book culture and editorial practices at this time to which we will frequently refer. While we have not yet brought Noël Du Fail into this discussion, we note that Arthur de La Borderie’s study on the *Propos Rustiques* focuses particularly on the distinction between variants and interpolations and, to a small extent, their effect on the text.

¹¹⁰ I use the modern title *Baliverneries d’Eutrapel*, but the earliest editions are called the *Baliverneries et contes nouveaux d’Eutrapel, autrement dit Leon Ladulfi*. The modern title avoids confusion with Du Fail’s later *Contes d’Eutrapel*.

¹¹¹ c.1520–1591. Emmanuel Philipot, *La Vie et l’œuvre littéraire de Noël Du Fail, gentilhomme breton*, 2–3, 499.

¹¹² For example, in 1878, La Borderie uses the “Texte original de 1547” of the *Propos Rustiques*, while Gabriel-André Pérouse and Roger Dubuis choose to use the 1549 text in 1994, but do take note of at least some of the most striking variants between editions. La Borderie’s critical edition includes the most thorough set of interpolations and variants, included after the presentation of the primary text. For the *Baliverneries d’Eutrapel*, Ernest Courbet uses the 1549 text, which he refers to as the “Texte original” in 1894. Gaël Milin also uses the 1549 edition in 1969 and has a more thorough inclusion of the variants from the 1548 editions. In each case, the editions chosen as base texts are those edited by Du Fail himself, as opposed to the interpolated editions. This contrasts nicely with the earlier discussion surrounding the *Nouvelles Recreations*, because critics do their best to present the “authentic” text as Du Fail had written it. Here, we have certain examples of the author’s intention. I will go further into this discussion in Part II of my thesis.

¹¹³ See the discussion below for details.

¹¹⁴ See note 112, above.

¹¹⁵ Gaël Milin does what he can to at least distinguish between the 1549 De Tours/Du Fail edition and the 1548 interpolated editions, but he does little to address the differences found in the Du Fail-helmed editions of the *Propos Rustiques* and his inability to do so with the *Baliverneries d’Eutrapel*.

¹¹⁶ Marie-Claire Bichard-Thomine gives an elaborate analysis of Noël Du Fail’s rhetorical approach in the *Propos Rustiques*, the *Baliverneries d’Eutrapel* and the *Contes d’Eutrapel* in her work *Noël Du Fail, conteur*. We will refer extensively to this work in the next chapter dealing with Du Fail.

¹¹⁷ Courbet makes a similar observation in his edition of *Les Baliverneries et Contes d’Eutrapel*, Vol. 1 10.

¹¹⁸ Des Périers died around 1543/1544, though we have no definitive date. For Marguerite de Navarre, her demise in 1549 followed Noël Du Fail’s publications, and it

is possible that she spent some time working on the *Heptaméron* up until her death, but it is well known that she was ill during the last couple of years, and that the death of François I propelled her further into the world of solitary reflection, Bible study and prayer. Most presume she did little writing for entertainment, but focused her creative efforts on *Les Prisons*, which would eventually become a poetic triumph. Cf. Kasprzyk, Intro. esp. vi-xx and Jourda, *Marguerite d'Angoulême*, esp. 233-262.

¹¹⁹ As in Tchemerzine, Vol. 3 99.

¹²⁰ As in Tchemerzine, Vol. 3 100.

¹²¹ In Tchemerzine, Vol. 3 105, the Nyverd text is listed alongside the De Tours edition. He notes: "Même édition à Paris, chez G. Nyverd." Also, Milin tells us that many critics accepted G. Nyverd as the editor for the *Balivernerics d'Eutrapel's editio princeps*, based on Du Verdier's bibliography. He explains that only Jacques Nyverd could have produced the text, since neither G. Nyverd was in the industry at that moment. Jacques Nyverd's death in 1548 would also explain how De Tours might have acquired the rights to produce the second edition helmed by Du Fail (xxxv).

¹²² Gabriel-André Pérouse treats neither the *Propos* nor the *Balivernerics* in his *Contes et Nouvelles du XVIe siècle*, claiming that both were too popular amongst modern critics to be treated by his study, but he does choose to focus a chapter on the *Contes d'Eutrapel*, which he claims were not terribly popular in the sixteenth century, but which have earned a nod in more recent criticism. He seeks to fill the gap, as it were. However, I tend to disagree with some of Pérouse's assessment. The *Contes d'Eutrapel*, like its fictional brethren, was edited numerous times during a very brief period, before falling into near obsolescence. Several nineteenth- and early twentieth-century critical works include the *Balivernerics*, but as a part of a whole, either with the *Propos Rustiques*, with the *Contes*, or as part of a complete compilation of Du Fail's fictional narratives. Courbet's 1894 study does not treat the *Propos*, but includes the *Balivernerics* and the *Contes* together. Only two editions of the *Balivernerics* as a stand-alone work appear in the last two hundred years. The *Propos Rustiques* have been edited at least 5 times since 1800, including a Modern French language edition in 1987 by Aline Leclerc-Magnien and Michel Simonin. In contrast, the *Contes d'Eutrapel* have only been edited on their own once. The sum of this evidence indicates that the *Propos Rustiques* are by far the most popular of Du Fail's works and that the *Balivernerics d'Eutrapel* and the *Contes d'Eutrapel* maintain a roughly equal standing in the annals of literary history.

¹²³ Again, referring to the nature of the *Propos Rustiques*, there are numerous studies that demonstrate the influence Rabelais had on Du Fail's work as well as literature in general. Cf. Philipot, *La Vie et l'œuvre de Noël Du Fail*. Also, Gary Ferguson and David LaGuardia, Introduction, *Narrative Worlds: Essays on the Nouvelle in Fifteenth and Sixteenth-Century France*, 15, and Andrée Comparot, "La Réception de Rabelais dans les *Propos Rustiques*."

¹²⁴ Philipot, *La Vie et l'œuvre de Noël Du Fail*, 72-88.

¹²⁵ It is true that the peasantry is a typical subject group for tales, and that Marguerite de Navarre broke certain boundaries by focusing tales on nobility and peasant alike, but in the case of the *Propos Rustiques*, Du Fail stretched the prescribed frame-tale structure by having peasants act as narrators as well as subjects. In other examples such as the *Decameron* or the *Cent nouvelles nouvelles*, nobles are the *devisants*, while

peasants are reduced to character-types present in the stories. The *Baliverneries d'Eutrapel* break numerous traditions with their hyper-dialogical form of story-telling, in which conversational interjections consistently disrupt the flow of the narration. For this reason, the Rabelaisian characterization of Du Fail's style is often based on the *Baliverneries*. However, numerous textual references of the *Propos Rustiques* certainly hearken back to Rabelais.

¹²⁶ De Tournes' Italian edition is the first of Petrarch's sonnets published in the original language in France; the same is true of his edition of Dante. De Tournes eventually developed a reputation for his strong language skills and his ability to publish well-edited, high quality editions in classical and vernacular languages. At the time Du Fail's works were included in the De Tournes' catalogues, the bookseller and printer was only just testing out the full range of his skills. See Davis, "Lyon" in *HEF* I, 265 for more details.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, 263-265.

¹²⁸ Many Reformative materials were in fact printed outside of France in nearby Strasbourg and Geneva, but Lyon still served as a seat for liberal thought in the early manifestations of the movement. See Martin and Febvre's *L'Apparition du livre*, 432-456.

¹²⁹ Davis, "Lyon" in *HEF* I 264.

¹³⁰ See note 219, below.

¹³¹ As with the *Nouvelles Recreations*, further details about the literary value of the texts and their transformations will be addressed in Part II of this thesis.

¹³² We will note later that Du Fail did spend some time in Paris around 1544. We could then speculate that he had written the *Baliverneries d'Eutrapel* before the *Propos Rustiques* and had given them to a Parisian *libraire* in the hope that they would one day be published. The *Baliverneries*, however, include a specific reference to the preceding *Propos Rustiques*: "Quant à l'édition de mes rusticitez, et cecy (mon grand amy) je te confesseray tousjours entre deux portes, et honnestement, estre choses indisposées, mal couchées, mal dressées, sans lime, encore moins de grace: que veux tu d'avantage si le papier souffre tout ?" (Milin 6-7). This, of course, could have been added afterwards, as Groulleau's editions of both came out nearly simultaneously and the first edition of the *Propos Rustiques* does appear to have been printed before the *Baliverneries d'Eutrapel*, but it seems unlikely. Again, such possibilities are strictly speculative.

¹³³ Henri-Jean Martin's various studies point out the inequalities in access to education and books at the time, demonstrating both sides of the argument. The elite had primary access to both and certainly influenced the market as a result. The wives of many noblemen also influenced the market, as they purchased books and established trends within their own circles of friends. Despite the elite's apparent monopoly during this time, the merchants' buying power continued to increase, and possession of books and a library helped to establish one's status in society. Only nicer or culturally more dignified volumes were included in catalogues, but fiction was often present, including both poetry and prose works. See "Culture écrite et culture orale, culture savante et culture populaire dans la France de l'Ancien Régime" and "Ce qu'on lisait au seizième siècle".

¹³⁴ Charon-Parent's study demonstrates that typical printing quantities would range quite dramatically from about 200 copies to 1200 copies. See *Les métiers du livre à Paris*, esp. the table "Condition de travail des imprimeurs" 136-137.

¹³⁵ See the section on Marguerite de Navarre for further discussion on Groulleau's dealings with contemporary *libraires*.

¹³⁶ I find that Gerard interprets as much as he translates here, but in this case, it is useful and I agree with the subtext. Gerard's edition claims that this is a direct translation of the 1958 Lefèvre and Martin text, of which I avail myself in the French. So, there should be no discrepancies in the translation deriving from variant editions, other than those created by the translator's own interpretation of the original text.

¹³⁷ Laws specified the types of punishments, and in some cases, the specific remuneration due upon conviction. Numerous laws dictated the correct obtention and presentation of Privilege. Article LXV of La Caille's *Histoire de l'Imprimerie et de la Librairie* is written as follows: "Defendons à tous Imprimeurs & Libraires de contrefaire les Livres pour lesquels il aura esté accordé des Privileges, ou continuations de Privilege, de vendre & debiter ceux qui seront contrefaits, sous les peines portées par lesdits Privileges, qui ne pourront ester moderées ny diminuées par les Juges: & en cas de recidive, les contrevenans seront punis corporellement, & seront déchûs de la Maistrise, sans qu'ils puissent directement ou indirectement s'entremettre du fait de l'Imprimerie & du commerce des Livres" (*Book II* 91). Article LXVI states specifically that "en cas de contravention, lesdits Livres imprimez hors du lieu de la residence de ceux qui en auront obtenu lesdites Lettres, pourront ester imprimez, vendus & debitez par tous les autres Libraires, comme s'il n'y avoit aucun Privilege accordé," and continues with the "Declaration du 11. Decembre 1547. Ordonnons que cy-après aucuns Imprimeurs & Libraires, n'ayent, sous peine de confiscation de corps & de biens, à imprimer ny vendre aucuns Livres, qu'ils n'ayent esté vûs & approuvez" (*Book II* 97).

¹³⁸ Unfortunately, there is no one collective location for Groulleau's catalogues. My assessment is based on information obtained from the many bibliographies available, including Cioranescu, Tchmerzine and Renouard. Renouard's excellent bibliography is unfortunately not very helpful here, since the work has yet to be completed and has not reached the Groulleau listings. I must also acknowledge Gallica's resources as a rich and growing source of information that supports most of the data found in the above-listed bibliographies. As of 18 September 2012, there are 24 listings under Groulleau's name. The two copies of the *Comptes du monde aventureux* are separate copies from the same printing and must therefore count in the total as one when looking at issues of privilege, leaving us with 23 examples. The original dates of publication for these digitized editions are 1547-1560. Of these 23, 11 are editions of the *Amadis de Gaule* cycle, and the first, fifth and eighth books of the cycle all have at least one re-edition listed here. Several of these, especially those in the *Amadis de Gaule* cycle, were collaborative works that are also listed under other booksellers' names.

¹³⁹ The in-octavo format was also used frequently for portable mass-market editions, but the overall quality and size of Groulleau's in-16 compared to De Tournes' in-octavo demonstrates the effect of counterfeit productions and Martin's point. See the discussion on Marguerite de Navarre's *Heptaméron* below for further information on format.

¹⁴⁰ As in Tchemerzine Vol. 3 99.

¹⁴¹ Speculation regarding the identity of this “friend” will be addressed below.

¹⁴² Milin discusses the different hypotheses regarding the establishment of the 1548 counterfeit texts. La Borderie suspects that Du Fail originally gave the *Baliverneries d’Eutrapel* an Angevine flavor, which Groulleau and the others simply maintained in their editions. Philipot suggests that the counterfeit editions introduced the Angevine flair, which Du Fail corrected in the 1549 De Tours edition. In both cases, however, certain inconsistencies with Noël Du Fail’s overall style, and the variants found in all of the editions of the *Propos Rustiques* have led all critics to concede that a number of interpolations of the *Baliverneries d’Eutrapel* were present in the counterfeit editions. See especially xxxvi-xli.

¹⁴³ The exact phrasing for each of the un-privileged titles is as follows: *Les Abusez, Comedie faite à la mode des anciens comiques, premierement composée en langue Tuscane, par les professeurs de l’Académie Senoise, & nommée Intronati, depuis traduyte en François par Charles Etienne, & nouvellement reveue & corrigée* (1549), *Les Epistres familiares de ma dame Helisenne, de nouveau veuës, & corrigées oultre les precedentes Impressions* (1550), *Le Jardin d’honneur, contenant plusieurs Apologies, Proverbes & dits moraux, avec les histoires et figures. Aussi y sont ajoustez plusieurs Ballades, Rondeaux, Dizains, Huitains et Triolets fort joyeux. Reveu & corrigé oultre les precedantes impressions* (1550), *Les Vies et motz dorez, des sept sages de Grece : ensemble le Miroir de Prudence. Le tout mis en François, avec une brieve, & familiere exposition sur chacune autorité et sentence* (1554), *De l’art d’aymer, translaté de Latin en Francoys, avec plusieurs autres petitz œuvres, le tout mieux que par ci-devant reveu et corrigé* (1556).

¹⁴⁴ Let us remember that privilege is not the same as modern copyright, and that the authors themselves are granted few rights unless they obtain the privilege themselves. At this time, privilege infringement is primarily the concern of the *libraires*. That being said, all booksellers engaged in the open exploitation of an author’s words. The difference between the counterfeiter and the privileged *libraire* essentially comes down to overall production costs. Booksellers do not seek privilege to protect the ideas being printed, but to protect their investments. Authors are frequently brought back into the debate, but they serve a very specific purpose, which is discussed below.

¹⁴⁵ Cf. Hoffmann, *Montaigne’s Career* 84-89 and Hoffmann, “Renaissance Printing and the Book Trade” 137.

¹⁴⁶ Of course, La Croix du Maine’s late-century bibliography is incomplete and he was limited to listing books to which he had access. As there is no commentary about any other edition in the full citation, an excerpt of which is listed below, we must acknowledge that La Croix du Maine might not have been aware of the other editions. He notes: “Leon Adulphi, ou L’Adulphi, qui est un nom contrefait & supposé; car ce n’est qu’une anagramme ou nom retrouvé de Noël Du Faill, ou de Phail, écrit par ph, duquel nous parlerons ci-après. Il a écrit étant fort jeune, un petit Livre plein de facéties & propos joyeux, intitulé Discours d’aucuns Propos Rustiques, facétieux, & de singuliere récréation, imprimé à Paris, l’an 1554, par Estienne Grouleau: lequel Livre a été depuis imprimé sous ce nom, des finesses, ruses, ou tromperies de Ragot, Prince des Gueux, &c.” (Vol. 2, 34-35).

¹⁴⁷ See Milin's critical edition for a complete listing of variants and also pages xxxvi-xlviii for his analysis. Also, Philipot, esp. 240-260.

¹⁴⁸ This is in contrast to the production costs Groulleau must have incurred for his unauthorized editions, particularly that of the *Propos Rustiques*, because extensive changes were made to the texts. Consider the addition of two complete chapters versus the relatively minor changes that were adopted by De Tournes' second, authorized edition of the Du Fail's work.

¹⁴⁹ Courbet gives a detailed outline of each of the images in his edition iv-vi. Milin acknowledges Courbet's study and explains that the De Tours edition is no longer accessible (xxxvi).

¹⁵⁰ Charon-Parent gives specific costs to obtain both wood and copper engraving characters and demonstrates that the additional costs were often included as an additional stipulation within a contract (*Les métiers du livre à Paris* 85-88).

¹⁵¹ Unfortunately, this example is no longer available to us, as it has been lost. Courbet's detailed analysis of the engravings and the La Borderie hand-copied edition serve to testify to the existence of the engraved edition. Milin graciously demonstrates the limited availability of the La Borderie copy to illustrate how he was able to justify his claim to the 1549 De Tours edition in his own critical work (xxxvi).

¹⁵² Several studies evaluate the general time-frame involved in transferring a text from manuscript to print. Jeanne Veyrin-Forrer's account estimates a period of eight to ten months for an average printing ("Fabriquer un livre" 299-300).

¹⁵³ Milin notes the primary characteristics that distinguish the 1548 (Groulleau, Trepperel and Buffet) editions from the 1549 De Tours edition are "l'orthographe, la géographie, les modifications de détail" (xli-xlvii). Milin explains that the geography shifted from Anjou (in the 1548 editions) to Haute-Bretagne (in the 1549 edition). Because the 1548 texts are likely counterfeit interpolations of the *editio princeps*, he suggests that the 1549 locations, which flow better within the text, are actually a return to the original.

¹⁵⁴ Charon-Parent makes the same observation noting that in theory, the compositor would complete a copy which would be presented to the author to make necessary changes before a final draft was issued. However, this practice was time-consuming and costly and fell into near obsolescence. "Il est rare, même après 1550, que l'épreuve soit transmise à l'auteur. [...] Dans le meilleur des cas, l'auteur, s'il habite sur place, corrige rapidement les épreuves qui lui sont fournies, chaque jour, au fur et à mesure de l'impression. Revenue chez l'imprimeur, la copie lui échappe complètement, les corrections suivantes étant trop chères pour être vraiment importantes et relevant entièrement de l'atelier. Aussi l'écrivain se plaint-il souvent de ne pas avoir eu le loisir de revoir son texte" (*Les métiers du livre à Paris* 123). Du Fail was likely not available for this type of immediate on-location correction and so might not have been involved in the orthographic changes made from one edition to the other. The significance of this question will be discussed further in the next part of this thesis.

¹⁵⁵ See Appendix B for details on the specific numbers and kinds of interpolations that Du Fail adopted in his second edition. We will discuss and interpret the details of this data in Part II. In brief, more than half of the changes made by Du Fail between editions derive from the 1548 interpolated edition. However, Du Fail only adopts slightly over

one third of the total in-text interpolations. He does not include the additional chapters, as we have already noted.

¹⁵⁶ It is with great uncertainty that I even attempt to speculate about his time in Avignon. This suggestion is based on Philipot's biography. However, we must note as well that there is speculation about Du Fail having spent time in Orléans and Toulouse during this period, before returning to Rennes, where he would settle permanently (87). Both of these alternate locations, of course, make it seem unlikely that he would have returned through Lyon.

¹⁵⁷ The possible interpretations of Du Fail's theme as presented in Maugin's interpolated edition will be studied more clearly in the next part of this thesis, where I will also analyze the possibility of an intellectual debate of sorts between the editions.

¹⁵⁸ See Nicole Cazauran *L'Heptaméron de Marguerite de Navarre* 21-22. Also, Cazauran and Lefèvre leave the question of origin a greater mystery when they comment in Preface, *H* (2013): "Pas de manuscrit autographe, en effet, et ce n'est pas surprenant pour une reine qui dictait beaucoup et avait ses secrétaires, mais pas même un manuscrit portant une note de sa main, et un bon nombre de copies quasi identiques" (Book 1, x). Marguerite de Navarre might have dictated much of the *Heptaméron*, just as Montaigne did for *Les Essais* (Hoffmann, *Montaigne's Career* 48-55), but there is no extant evidence that Marguerite edited her own work. Are we to believe, then, that the carefully constructed dialogues are in fact early, unaltered drafts? It is more likely that the earliest manuscripts were lost.

¹⁵⁹ Cazauran and Lefèvre treat questions of authenticity when introducing the known editions and manuscripts. In Part II of their Preface, they detail each edition and manuscript, as well as their critical histories. Cazauran, as has been the case for some time, remains skeptical about the authenticity of any of the versions. One sub-section is titled: "Entre les exemplaires: du 'vrai texte' au mythe de manuscrit d'auteur" (Preface, *H* (2013), Book 1, lii). The editors point out that: "[...] une édition proprement génétique est rendue impossible par la contamination généralisée des copies du texte [...]" (Book 1, xciv).

¹⁶⁰ See Cazauran and Lefèvre, who detail production variables of the manuscripts, including paper and scribal information, in order to give as complete a picture as possible Preface, *H* (2013), Book 1, lii-lxxvii, cxiii-cxlviii.

¹⁶¹ It is well known that Marguerite's evangelistic tendencies frequently placed both her and her brother, François I, in the middle of numerous religious debates during the period. More than once, she and François found themselves at odds. He came to her defense regarding the *Miroir de l'âme pécheresse* (1533), which was ultimately censored by the Sorbonne. The Affaire des Placards (1534) forced her into a particularly precarious position and she was temporarily out of favor with the court. She was also known for her role as a literary *mécène* and protector of writers, printers and Reformation leaders (Clément Marot, Étienne Dolet and Jean Calvin, for example). This role earned her both praise and scandal. Meanwhile, her poetry received mixed reviews. Her *Marguerites de la Marguerite des princesses* were quite successful. For this and other reasons, Marguerite de Navarre's name could not fail to evoke a strong reaction from her contemporaries. See Jourda's biography for further details.

¹⁶² See note 161, above. Consider specifically the case of the *Miroir de l'âme pécheresse*, which was printed, censored and reedited later.

¹⁶³ I refer specifically to her *Dernières poésies* in which the now well-known *Les Prisons* is found. Abel Lefranc brought this work to the printed page in 1896.

¹⁶⁴ Leroux de Lincy chose BNF fr.1512 as his base text for the *Heptaméron des nouvelles de très haute et très illustre princesse Marguerite d'Angoulême, Reine de Navarre*. Paris: Société des Bibliophiles Français, 1853-1854. Cazauran and Lefèvre note that his choice was valid at the time, considering his role as a medievalist and his era's editorial criteria. The same manuscript was used by others, with corrections, but as Cazauran and Lefèvre point out: "Malgré les emendations de Le Roux de Lincy, puis de François, le texte du fr. 1512 continue de présenter dans leurs éditions des passages simplement maladroits ou, plus grave, obscurs, voire incompréhensibles" (Preface, *H* (2013), Book 1, lv).

¹⁶⁵ For details on the manuscripts, see Cazauran and Lefèvre Preface, *H* (2013), Book 1, xlix-ci, cxiii-cxlviii; Salminen xi-xxx. Both give extensive, detailed listings. Salminen's work, however, only lists nineteen manuscripts, to the exclusion of the British Library Add. 28255; Cazauran and Lefèvre include this manuscript in the second group of manuscripts originating from South-Western France, which comprises fr.1522 and fr.2155 (Salminen's base manuscript). See note 166, below for a list of the extant manuscripts.

¹⁶⁶ The following are the extant manuscripts, arranged by groupings as defined by Cazauran and Lefèvre, Preface, *H* (2013), Book 1, xcvi: Early, least complete: BNF fr. 1513; Mixed, with a completed first two days: fr. 1514, fr. 1525, Turin LV4; Definitive, most complete draft: n.a. fr. 22018, fr. 1516-1519, fr. 1511, fr. 1515, Berlin Hamilton 425, British Library Add. 28255, fr. 1512, fr. 2155, fr. 1522, fr. 1523, Orléans BM 427, Vatican Reg. lat. 929, New York Pierpont Morgan 242; Adrien De Thou manuscripts: fr. 1520, fr. 1524, Dupuy 726.

¹⁶⁷ Cazauran makes the claim in her *L'Heptaméron de Marguerite de Navarre* 22, for example. We might also note that several other manuscripts, principally Bn fr.1515, BN fr.1520, and BN Collection Dupuy n°736, bear marginalia and notes by De Thou, presumably written while preparing his own manuscript, BN fr. 1524. See Salminen, Introduction, xvii-xxiv; Lefèvre "Note sur les manuscrits et les éditions anciennes de l'*Heptaméron*" 606-610 and "*L'Heptaméron* entre éditions et manuscrits," 445-482; Cazauran and Lefèvre, Preface, *H* (2013), Book 1, xlix-ci for additional details.

¹⁶⁸ With Nicole Cazauran, *L'Heptaméron*, Gallimard, 2000, 608, hereafter known as *Heptaméron* (2000), or in the case of the apparatus: Post-Scriptum, *Heptaméron* (2000). Also, Salminen's recent critical edition also gives a thorough bibliography in the introduction xi-xxviii; and of course, Cazauran and Lefèvre's Champion edition to which we have referred extensively.

¹⁶⁹ Jean Toulet discusses developments and trends throughout the sixteenth century in his article "Les Reliures" *HEF I*. He points out the role of the monogram and other features found in many of the *Heptaméron*'s manuscripts. "Témoignent aussi de l'objet de mode qu'est devenu le livre relié l'élégance simple des modèles de reliures courantes à décor doré qui s'imposent aussi vers 1540. Les bords des plats sont soulignés par un ou deux encadrements de filets et au centre est apposé un motif central d'une

grande diversité, parfois purement ornemental, parfois emblématique et porteur d'une signification générale profane ou religieuse. Plus représentatif de cet investissement personnalisé du livre par le biais de la reliure est le large emploi de marques externes de possession : nom du possesseur en lettres dorées, devises, emblèmes personnels, monogrammes et, enfin armes dont l'usage n'est plus l'apanage des souverains ou des hauts personnages de l'entourage royal" (534). Beautiful bindings then marked quality and prestige, and frequently became used in identifying pieces from private library collections.

¹⁷⁰ If theft truly is responsible for these incomplete versions of the known text, then it is no wonder the original drafts were never found, for being caught with papers stolen from a member of the royal family would surely be cause for extreme punishment.

¹⁷¹ Lefèvre's "Notes sur les manuscrits" 610 and Cazauran and Lefèvre, Preface, *H* (2013), Book 1, cxxx give a number of details about this manuscript, observing the blue leather binding which bears the arms of Louix XIV and the ownership stamp of the Fumée family and an as yet unidentified family. Interestingly, this manuscript appears to be one modeled after De Thou's.

¹⁷² Cazauran and Lefèvre note similarities and differences between the Boaistuau and Gruget editions and several of the available manuscripts. It is their conclusion that both had little time to complete their editions, but a plethora of material to work from Preface, *H* (2013), Book 1, lxxx.

¹⁷³ Jeanne Veyrin-Forrer (282) notes the importance of this practice, and the difficulties which sometimes result from it. She uses comments by Du Bartas regarding his own book, *La Sepmaine*, as an example. Spelling became particularly problematic, since spelling reform was an object of vociferous debate during the mid-century, and professional scribes tended to use spellings to which they were accustomed. Type setters frequently did not question the material they prepared and if several scribes were used, as Du Bartas noted, several different spellings for the same word would result, making reading the text more difficult through its lack of consistency on the printed page. In the case of the *Heptaméron*, we have several manuscripts that reflect several different spelling preferences. See the discussion on spelling in Part II Chapter 2.

¹⁷⁴ Veyrin-Forrer gives a detailed description on the various formats that were used in book production. Briefly, fold and layout of the pages on the interior and the exterior of the paper dictated the format. Printing allowed for a much greater variety of formats and the in-folio and in-quarto were directly taken from the way manuscripts were produced. In addition, the in-folio consisted of one fold in the sheet of paper which produced four pages of text. The in-quarto had two folds to produce eight pages and so forth. Often, several sheets would be placed one on top of the other to produce smaller packets, which were then assembled in the binding process (285-288). Jean Vezin notes that fifteenth-century manuscripts prepared in the in-quarto and in-octavo format have been discovered, demonstrating that scribal tradition had mastered this kind of format preparation before printing, furthering the link between the manuscript tradition and the evolving book industry ("La fabrication du manuscrit" 39).

¹⁷⁵ During the sixteenth century, price was not dictated by labor costs, but by production costs related to materials. This is yet another reason the in-folio and in-quarto were the most expensive formats: more paper was used to produce a text. Charon-

Parent's well-known study, *Les métiers du livre à Paris au XVI^e siècle*, uses R. M. Kingdon's conclusions to state: "Les prix sont établis en fonction de ce nombre et du format; ils dépendent, en effet, non pas du salaire des compositeurs et des imprimeurs, mais de la qualité et du nombre de rames de papier employées" (142).

¹⁷⁶ See Appendix A for complete details.

¹⁷⁷ Other books printed in-octavo include, for example, *Le miroir de treschrestienne princesse M. de France, auquel elle voit et son neant et son tout* (1533) and the *Epistre envoyee au Roy par sa soeur unique la Royne de Navarre* (1543).

¹⁷⁸ Numerous editions of Nicolas Herberay Des Essarts' *Amadis de Gaule* texts were printed as deluxe in-folio editions, despite the criticism that many contemporaries had for literature "romans de chevalerie". The popularity of these works dictated the format selection, as this was indisputably the most significant best-seller of its time. Simonin's introduction to his "La Disgrâce d'*Amadis*" sums up this sentiment: "Pour la première fois depuis l'invention de l'imprimerie, c'est le public qui va, par son enthousiasme puis par sa fidélité, influencer la conception de l'entreprise, aider à convaincre des libraires à l'origine timorés et enfin dicter, par sa nature même, des modifications matérielles, comme le changement de format, ou intellectuelles comme la coloration occultiste ou érotique du texte" (189).

¹⁷⁹ This data considers only editions printed through 1625, as noted earlier in reference to the *Nouvelles Recreations*.

¹⁸⁰ In all, the pattern that evolves during this period is not unlike the current practice of issuing a more expensive hard-cover edition about a year before issuing a book in paperback.

¹⁸¹ We have to note here that many times, re-editions came from other publishing houses. This is not always the case, though, as we just saw with the *Déploration de Vénus*. In the case of our texts of interest, for example, we remember that the *Nouvelles Recreations*' first two editions were printed by Granjon and Rouillé, respectively, and that both were in-quarto. Du Pré introduced this text to the in-16 format. For Gruget's *Heptaméron* two of the first three editions were printed in-quarto, and by essentially the same group of publishers. There was however, an intermediate edition, which may have been counterfeit. It was printed without the name of a *maître-libraire* and in a different format. Finally, Du Fail's *Propos Rustiques* and *Baliverneries d'Eutrapel* present another interesting set of circumstances, which we have mentioned and will discuss in greater detail later. For now, we note that Jean de Tournes printed the first and third editions of the *Propos* in different formats. He was not responsible for the second edition. When viewed all together, it becomes clear that the general strategy of market exploitation was one that varied from book to book and from publisher to publisher, though the pattern of nicer early editions remains intact. I will continue to look into publishing house strategies later in this section of my thesis in order to better understand the individual approach to a text in relation to the larger market.

¹⁸² Ronsard's poetry is an additional example of profit-driven formatting. Until about 1557, the vast majority of his collections were printed in-octavo (roughly 20 of 24 editions of various books of poetry, as listed in Tchemerzine). Starting in 1555, under André Wechel, we begin to see several in-quarto editions, focusing primarily on his *Hymnes* (1555) and dedicatory editions to the king. Wechel was one of the *libraire du roi*

during this time and Ronsard was a *poète du roi*. These fancier editions were usually printed in much smaller numbers and most served a very specific political purpose. What we see then in the whole of Ronsard's work, is that the in-quarto format was not typically intended to appeal to larger groups of buyers, but the in-octavo appears to be a popular format for popular forms of literature by popular authors. There are not many in-16 re-editions, though, until 1560, when G. Buon begins to produce the multi-volume anthologies of Ronsard's poetry. Up until that point, each of Ronsard's volumes is considered "new" by the standards set forth in our earlier discussion and the official re-editions of poetry are in fact Buon's tomes. There is a repetition of strategies that seems to cross various genres and authors.

¹⁸³ Richard Carr's research indicates that Boaistuau's interest in the natural sciences began during a trip to Rome shortly before 1550. Later, in Paris, he "boasts of having learned at this time how to make precious stones" (*Pierre Boaistuau's Histoires Tragiques* 21-22).

¹⁸⁴ BNF fr. 1512 was then the choice manuscript until Yves Le Hir's 1967 edition, which use BNF fr. 1524 as the base text (Cazauran and Lefèvre, Preface, *H* (2013), Book 1, lii-lvii).

¹⁸⁵ In the next portion of the thesis, we will delve more heavily into these intentions, which will contribute to various interpretations of the text's *inventio*. Here, the introductions, letters to the reader, and so forth, in which the editors make themselves known serve to eliminate the kind of editorial anonymity we find in the *Nouvelles Recreations*. As a result, generally, new questions of authorship arise, although some resurface with a different gloss, as we will see.

¹⁸⁶ We will discuss the precise nature of some of these flaws in the next section of this thesis.

¹⁸⁷ Reasonable conclusions can be drawn from the manuscript evidence. It is true that there remains no extant manuscript from the queen's or a known secretary's hand. However, there is more than enough evidence that Marguerite was known to be writing such a collection. Also, several of the manuscripts are completed in the sense that they have seventy-two tales and are in the same order, including the debates and the prologues to each day. So, while the *Heptaméron* will forever remain unfinished, and while some questions about Marguerite's intended final version might arise, many reasonable assumptions about the *inventio, dispositio* of her work may be made.

¹⁸⁸ Richard Carr's interpretation is more extreme, claiming that the text was actually suppressed.

¹⁸⁹ See Simonin, "Notes sur Boaistuau" 9-10 and "De la prime fortune" 708-709. Also, Cazauran, *L'Heptaméron de Marguerite de Navarre* 19. The series of eulogies was titled *Oraison funèbre de la mort de l'incomparable Marguerite, Royne de Navarre* and was originally published shortly after the queen's death in 1550.

¹⁹⁰ Cf. Renja Salminen, Introduction, *Heptaméron*, xxxvi-xxxvii; Brantôme, *Dames Galantes* as a republished excerpt in the 1880 edition of Le Roux de Lincy's *L'Heptaméron des nouvelles de la reine de Navarre*, 136.

¹⁹¹ For their part, the liminary poems that follow the dedicatory epistle (a sonnet to the Duchess of Nevers, and several pieces addressed to the editor himself) only refer to Boaistuau by his title of "Seigneur de Launay."

¹⁹² It is also important to note that the extensive discourse on Marguerite de Navarre's merits, and by extension, those of the Marguerite de Bourbon, the Duchess of Nevers, bears many hallmarks of a traditional dedication.

¹⁹³ I will go into further details on the rhetorical games Boaistuau plays in Part II Chapter 3; see also Cazauran, "Boaistuau et Gruget;" Leah L. Chang, *Into Print: The Production of Female Authorship in Early Modern France*. Cranbury, NJ: Rosemont / Associated University Presses, 2009, 55-56.

¹⁹⁴ La Caille lists this under Title II, Article III: "Declaration d'Henry II. du 27. Juin 1551. Art. I. Est aussi defend à tout Imprimeurs, de faire l'exercice & estat d'Impression, sinon en bonnes Villes & Maisons ordonnées & accoutumées à ce faire, & non en lieux secrets, duquel le nom, le domicile & la marque soient mis aux Livres par eux imprimez, le temps de l'impression, & le nom de l'Auteur: Lequel Maistre Imprimeur répondra des fautes & erreurs faites, tant par luy que sous son nom & par son ordonnance" (*Book 2*, 10).

¹⁹⁵ The curious ambiguity of this title, and in particular, the use of the word "fortunez" will be discussed in greater detail in Part II, chapter 3. For the moment, we have to be aware that at least three interpretations remain possible in the sixteenth century: first, the generally positive meaning of "fortunate," referring to those who have been favored by Fortune; second, albeit much more rarely, the negative connotation (often made more explicit by expressions such as "mal fortuné" or "infortuné") applied to those who have been ill served by Fortune (Greimas, *Dictionnaire du moyen français*, 302); third, the neutral or ambiguous meaning, referring to the fact that Fortune is indeed fickle and may bestow good and bad fate, in any combination, on anyone.

¹⁹⁶ References from the Boaistuau edition are from the BNF's Gilles Gilles copy, available on Gallica's digital database, unless otherwise noted.

¹⁹⁷ See note 144, above.

¹⁹⁸ Michel Simonin details the trip and the presentations in his "Notes sur Boaistau": "Dans sa dédicace [of the *Histoires Prodigeuses*], il fait observer à la Reine qu'il s'est rendu spécialement à Londres pour lui offrir ce texte que personne, avant elle, n'a vu" (11).

¹⁹⁹ See Richard Carr's comments in *Pierre Boaistuau's Histoires Tragiques* 26 and Michel Simonin's "Notes sur Boaistuau" in which he writes: "Puis, tandis que les différents ouvrages entreprennent de brillantes carrières de librairie, le Nantais oeuvre dans le silence à sa traduction de saint Augustin, à un traité de lapidaire, etc: travaux qui verront le sort évité aux nouvelles de Marguerite. Il meurt entre le 4 juillet et le 30 août 1566" (13).

²⁰⁰ Simonin notes the success of this work in his "Notes sur Boaistuau" 7 and highlights the business relationship between Boaistuau and Sertenas in his "Peut-on parler d'une poétique éditoriale au XVIe siècle?" 770-773.

²⁰¹ Simonin uses this spelling variant of the title "fortunés" whereas I use the spelling given in the Gallica's BnF Rés. Y² 734 which is "fortunez".

²⁰² We will discuss Vincent Sertenas and his role in the publication history of the *Heptaméron* in greater detail below. For now, it is his apparent relationship with Boaistuau that is of interest.

²⁰³ Bandello ultimately published four volumes of *Novelle*, but only three were in print by the time Boaistuau's retelling came to life in 1554. However, Boaistuau chose only six of one hundred eighty-six tales from which he could have chosen and he does not present his translation in chronological order. As with the *Histoires des Amans Fortunez*, Boaistuau takes liberties with the original text and reformulates the stories as needed to reflect his own agenda. Boaistuau's literary vision will be analyzed a bit further in the interpretive section of this thesis.

²⁰⁴ The most significant detail of the *Chelidonium* is the change in dedication. After the repudiation of the *Histoire des Amans Fortunez*, the Duke of Nevers relieved Boaistuau from his service. The new edition was dedicated to the Abbé de Saint-Sidoine, secretary to the Cardinal de Lorraine. See Richard Carr's *Pierre Boaistuau's Histoires Tragiques* 23.

²⁰⁵ See Simonin, "Notes sur Boaistuau"; Cazauran "Boaistuau et Gruget éditeurs de l'*Heptaméron*: à chacun sa part" 149; and H. Tudor, "L'*Institution des Princes Chrestiens*: a note on Boaistuau and Clichtove," 103-106. *Institution des Princes Chrestiens* was title that was given to the re-edition of the book. See also Chavy *Traducteurs d'autrefois: Moyen Âge et Renaissance* 222.

²⁰⁶ See Richard Carr's *Pierre Boaistuau's Histoires Tragiques* for detailed analysis and commentary. Examples of shifts include, for example, the exclusion of the Duke of Piedmont's name in what initially appears a formulaic choice, but, upon closer inspection, allows Boaistuau to focus the tale on the inevitability of the outcome (36-37).

²⁰⁷ *Ibid.* Carr specifies that the following tales from the *Histoires Tragiques* correspond to these tales from the *Novelle*: HT I: N II.37, HT II: N I.10, HT III: N II.9, HT IV: N II.12, HT V: N I.42, HT VI: N II.44. 25.

²⁰⁸ Cazauran details many of the changes between the Boaistuau edition and the known manuscripts, particularly De Thou's version in her article "Boaistuau et Gruget éditeurs de l'*Heptaméron*." I will be borrowing heavily from this article for the next set of details.

²⁰⁹ See also Charon-Parent and Kemp clxvii-clxviii for the "Tableau de concordance des nouvelles dans l'édition de Boaistuau de 1558 et de Gruget de 1559" and the "Tableau de concordance inverse."

²¹⁰ Charon-Parent's *Les métiers du livre à Paris* would agree that the *libraires* often held an important role in the development of books for publication, noting that the seller's experience with the book-buyers would give him a very good idea about current tastes in literature (114-116).

²¹¹ The privileges of any number of texts may be cited to show how common such language was, regardless of whether it was the author, editor or *libraire* who obtained the privilege. For example, Nicolas Herberay Des Essarts was granted privilege for the first four books of the *Amadis de Gaule*, one of the biggest best sellers of the sixteenth century. The privilege in the 1541 Second Book states: "Si n'est par le congé & permission du Seigneur des Essars. N. de Herberay, qui les a traduitz, & eu la charge de les faire imprimer par le dict Seigneur." Des Essarts writes more pointedly in the preceding poem to the king: "Deux ans & plus Amadis m'a tenu / En son service, à **grandz coustz & despens**" (emphasis mine). While some other popular texts of the period do not specifically use the term "grands frais", we might also note that many of

the published privileges are in fact excerpts. Cf. Des Essarts, Trans. *Le Second livre de Amadis de Gaule traduit nouvellement de Espagnol en François, par le Seigneur des Essars, Nicolas de Herberay*; Ronsard, *Les amours de P. de Ronsard, ... nouvellement augmentees par lui, et commentees par Marc-Antoine de Muret. Plus quelques odes de l'auteur, non encor imprimees*; Rabelais, *Tiers livre des faitz et dictz héroïques du noble Pantagruel*.

²¹² See Charon-Parent “Le monde de l’imprimerie humaniste: Paris” (*HEF I* 238); Davis “Lyon” (*HEF I* 255, 258); and Charon-Parent *Les métiers du livre à Paris* (57-67). In the first, Charon-Parent notes that privilege obtention required fees for the privilege, for the secretary handling the privilege, and several nicely bound copies of the completed book for the secretary. Davis notes that booksellers were traditionally responsible for the paper and printing costs, neither of which was cheap. Finally, Charon-Parent dedicates a portion of her book to the extensive costs of paper: “Le prix de la chiffe, des feutres et de la colle, le salaire des ouvriers font du papier un produit cher qui représente une part importante du prix de revient d’un livre. Il est difficile de donner une estimation générale du prix du papier; en effet si dans les documents concernant les papetiers, notamment l’inventaire de Guillaume Godard, de nombreux prix sont mentionnés, il n’est fait dans ces estimations aucune différence entre le papier à écrire et le papier à imprimer; aussi ne peut-on savoir combien valait tel ou tel papier réservé à l’impression” (*Les métiers* 60).

²¹³ There are several examples in the *HEF I* and on Gallica. The fanciest embellishments were gold embossed royal coats of arms on the entire front cover. Such costly artwork was reserved for library editions and dedicatory copies.

²¹⁴ Cf. Simonin’s description of the first edition of the first book of the *Amadis* cycle, which was a luxury edition: “le format choisi, l’illustration luxueuse du volume, l’achat de ‘gros romain’ par le typographe, tou ceci correspond à un lourd investissement [...]” (“La disgrâce d’*Amadis*” 198).

²¹⁵ Cazauran notes several references and titles of the collection in her important study *L’Heptaméron de Marguerite de Navarre*. Brantôme refers to the “cent nouvelles” of Marguerite, while Adrien de Thou’s manuscript is titled *Le Décaméron* and has blank pages, supposedly to allow for the addition of the missing tales, should they ever be found.

²¹⁶ For full details on the earliest editions by Boaistuau and Gruget, see Charon-Parent and Kemp (“L’Histoire des premières éditions,” clix-clxvi), who give publication information, bibliographic references and current holdings around the world.

²¹⁷ Simonin details the earliest contracts in “La disgrâce d’*Amadis*”, especially 198-203. For the very first contract, he notes that Des Essarts was responsible for the costs of obtaining the privilege, while Longis and Sertenas were responsible for printing and binding costs, which would have been exorbitant, given the luxurious quality of the edition. Des Essarts was not paid for this translation, but would receive remuneration for later editions.

²¹⁸ See Appendix A for the full-length title.

²¹⁹ See vol. 1, 141; vol. 2, 84-87, 254-256.

²²⁰ See Cazauran and Lefèvre, Post-Scriptum, *Heptaméron* (2000). 49-51; Cazauran, *L’Heptaméron de Marguerite de Navarre*.

²²¹ See Appendix A. Also, Alfred Cartier details the few distinctions that exist between the 1559 and 1560 Gruget copies; the errata from 1559 were corrected and, in keeping with habit to reduce costs, the 1560 edition was more compact. In his view, the 1560 edition was “le plus pur” (218) of the two (“Notes sur les deux éditions de *L’Heptaméron*, [...] 1559 et 1560.”)

²²² This is, in fact, Cazauran and Lefèvre’s justification for using Gruget’s edition as a base for both the Gallimard 2000 (pocket) and the Champion 2013 (critical) editions of the *Heptaméron*. In the latter, they address the question as follows: “Dès l’édition de 2000 donnée en format de poche, nous avons choisi de revenir au texte de l’édition de 1559. Notre décision tenait et tient toujours aux mêmes raisons: la version de Claude Gruget est celle qui a été lue du XVI^e siècle jusqu’au milieu du XIX^e et même au-delà parfois; aucun manuscrit de l’œuvre ne peut prétendre avoir eu une influence aussi longue, ni posséder une autorité telle qu’il s’imposerait comme le texte voulu par Marguerite de Navarre” (Book 1, lxxxii).

²²³ See Donald Stone, Jr., “Observations on the Text of the *Histoires des amans fortunez*,” 201-213. Stone was one of the first to argue that Boaistuau’s variants often have as much merit as any other and should be considered by editors alongside the versions given by Gruget and the manuscripts.

²²⁴ References from the Gruget edition are from the Gallica digitized copy (Sertenas 1559), unless otherwise noted.

²²⁵ Richard Carr, for example, states Jeanne’s role as fact in his *Pierre Boaistuau’s Histoires Tragiques*: “However, Boaistuau mentioned nowhere in the preface the name of the author, and this oversight roused the anger of Jeanne d’Albret who had the edition suppressed and who immediately commissioned Claude Gruget to prepare a new edition of the tales which appeared in 1559 as the *Heptaméron*” (22-23). Carr also refers to this conclusion in the Introduction to his edition of the *Histoires Tragiques* (xxxv-xxxvi), but here, the only evidence given is Gruget’s dedication to Jeanne d’Albret in the *Heptaméron des Nouvelles*. In the former, no supporting evidence is given for this conclusion. Such examples can be found throughout Marguerite de Navarre and *Heptaméron* studies, as this opinion appears to have become generally accepted.

²²⁶ That is not to say that negotiations were always positive. There were frequent antagonisms between the protestant Jeanne and her Catholic cousins, but she remained, throughout, a member of the royal family, a queen in her own right, and the mother to the nearest living heir to the throne should all of Henri II and Catherine de Médicis’ sons die without legal heirs of their own. This of course became the case, as her son, Henri d’Albret de Bourbon, III de Navarre would become Henri IV of France. See David Bryson, *Queen Jeanne and the Promised Land*. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

²²⁷ *Ibid.* 101-114.

²²⁸ *Ibid.* 97-103.

²²⁹ Cazauran and Lefèvre’s recent editions of the *Heptaméron* are based on the Gruget text, but they are careful to include the exempted tales alongside those included in the edition. They also show variants between manuscript Berlin, Hamilton 425 and Gruget’s edition. In this way, they present the Gruget edition under the caveat that it is acceptable in relation to the manuscripts.

²³⁰ Stone's article details many examples where Gruget's text mimics that of Boaistuau. See esp. 205.

²³¹ Bryson's account of Jeanne's conversion to Protestantism includes an interesting analysis of a letter she wrote to Nicolas de Flotard in which Jeanne discusses her father's volatile reactions to certain of Marguerite's evangelistic behaviors. According to Bryson's analysis, she makes it clear that her own conversion simply awaited her father's death, although she did not openly convert until December 1560. As for Marguerite, it has long been known that she walked the narrow path between evangelical Christianity and Protestantism for much of her adult life, though she always adamantly refused to become a Protestant, and a rupture with Calvin in 1545 further entrenched her on the side of the Catholics. This anecdote suggests that even her husband interpreted Marguerite's tendencies as excessive (63-68, 77-82).

²³² Cazauran makes the same observation in "Boaistuau et Gruget Editeurs de *l'Heptaméron*" 161-162.

²³³ Excepting of course the recent Cazauran and Lefèvre editions.

²³⁴ In the early days of Parisian printing (roughly 1470-1520), most editions were geared towards the intimately linked university and ecclesiastical cultures that served as the industry's primary clientele in Dominique Coq, *Les Incunables* 188. Studies of the mid-century demonstrate a remarkable climb in the number of translations produced and sold, showing that the growing readership of the period meant profitable cultural productions in Paris, Lyon and elsewhere. Jeanne-Marie Dureau's estimates for the early period put the total French production as about 14-16% of the European total, or about 4,000 editions, only some of which were translations ("Les premiers ateliers français" 175). In contrast, Davis's statistics on Lyon's Guillaume Rouillé's editions from 1545-1589 show 838 editions by this single publisher, of which approximately 27% were in vernacular languages (this total of course includes original texts and translations) ("Lyon" *HEF* 1 256). Simonin's study again is valuable in that it lists numerous translations helmed by Sertenas ("Peut-on parler d'une politique éditoriale?"). Finally, Jean Balsamo and Simonin discuss the importance of Abel l'Angelier's contribution to the French language, which included both original and translated texts, during the later reigns of Henri III and Henri IV. Balsamo and Simonin make no distinction between the two types in their analysis and thus imply that both types of production are equally valuable (*Abel l'Angelier et Françoise de Louvain* 101-104). See also Charon-Parent, *Les métiers du livre à Paris*, especially 23-53.

²³⁵ According to Simonin's history of Sertenas' catalogue, the bookseller produced a great variety of texts since his debut in 1534, and translations were a large part of that product. Earlier in his career, he primarily had "succès confirmés" printed "[. . .] quelle que soit leur orientation idéologique ou esthétique." Simonin's study demonstrates that Sertenas remained a prudent businessman, first working to establish himself in the market and cushion his financial assets, before gambling on less certain, but potentially more profitable works ("Peut-on parler d'une politique éditoriale? 762-763).

²³⁶ La Croix du Maine believes that Boaistuau translated the *Théâtre du Monde* from a Latin language manuscript that was never published or even produced for

distribution *Les Bibliothèque Françaises de La Croix du Maine et de Du Verdier*, v. 2, 254-256.

²³⁷ Paul Chavy includes Boaistuau in his *Traducteurs d'autrefois*, though he does note the erroneous characterization of the *Chelidonium* as a translation (222-223).

²³⁸ See Simonin, *La disgrâce d'Amadis*, especially 192-193.

²³⁹ Cf. Du Bellay's analysis of translation's uses and limitations – which lead him to promote “imitation” instead – in the *Deffence et Illustration* (I, v, 210-215). According to Du Bellay, the best Latin writers would “devour” and then “convert” the best of the Greek texts and, as a result of this practice, produced beautiful literature that could, along with its own models, serve in turn as inspiration for the French. On the notion and practices of translation at the time, see Glyn P. Norton, *The Ideology and Language of Translation in Renaissance France and Their Humanist Antecedents*.

²⁴⁰ We must note here that the other statements Courbet makes surrounding this one are highly questionable. He speculates that Gruget and Boaistuau were both secretaries to Marguerite de Navarre, and that upon her death, “tous deux se mirent en quête d'une situation équivalente auprès de grands personnages”, and that their role in print production was intended to serve that quest, with Gruget becoming the clear winner when he obtained other secretarial positions to people of much higher status than Boaistuau (277-278). Michel Simonin demonstrates the unlikelihood that both served under the queen, primarily Boaistuau, and thereby puts into question Courbet's subsequent conclusions about Gruget and Boaistuau's motives for writing, but never disputes Courbet's analysis of the two authors' approaches to writing itself (“Notes sur Boaistuau” 5-7). See also Richard Carr, *Pierre Boaistuau's Histoires Tragiques*, 21-22.

²⁴¹ See Simonin, “Peut-on parler d'une politique éditoriale ?” Also, Charon-Parent, *Les Métiers du livre à Paris*, esp. 106-110.

²⁴² A cursory review of Tchemerzine's references and cross-references contained in the published tomes of Philippe Renouard's bibliography gives a very good indication of just how busy Benoist Prevost was, and for how many different booksellers he worked.

²⁴³ Known in French as the *libraires* or *imprimeurs du Roi* this elite group of *maître libraires* were given term-licenses that could be renewed at the king's discretion. Each was required to run the printing of royal documents (acts, ordinances, etc.) and received a series of benefits in return, including an annual stipend, for example. Most significantly, any text newly printed by one of these *imprimeurs du Roi* was not to be reproduced for at least five years. This interdiction provided further legal support for the most successful *maître libraires*. As Charon-Parent points out, the practice was designed to satisfy the growing needs of the increasingly centralized monarchy and simultaneously weed out the ever-growing counterfeit book practice which threatened the economy of the book trade. Unfortunately, the practice was not very successful in this second respect, as it was difficult to regulate the market outside of Paris. The fate of Noël Du Fail's works in the hands of Jean de Tournes and Etienne Groulleau also suggests that market regulation within Paris also had its limitations despite some small success. See Charon-Parent *Les métiers du livre à Paris* 50-53.

²⁴⁴ See Renouard, *Imprimeurs & Libraires parisiens du XVIe siècle* v.5, 249-250. Let us remember as well that Bonfons produced 1572, 1575 and 1577 editions of the *Nouvelles Recreations*, the latter of which differ drastically from preceding volumes. In

Tchemerzine, *Bibliographie d'éditions originales et rares d'auteurs français XVe – XVIIIe siècles*, vol. II, 860-872.

²⁴⁵ Simonin provides several examples, most notably Boaistuau's comments in subsequent editions of the *Chelidonium*, and he questions Sertenas' motivations. "Il reste que Sertenas consent au reproche. Faute d'avoir pris connaissance du texte qui le vise? Par indifférence à sa propre image, au nom d'un intérêt commercial qui lui dicte d'encourager le rafraîchissement du volume afin de mieux le débiter? Dans tous les cas, c'est une mentalité à défaut d'une éthique qui se dessine, et qui n'est pas pour nous surprendre" ("Peut-on parler d'une politique éditoriale?" 779).

²⁴⁶ Simonin comments on the presence of "à fort peu près la même équipe" in both editions of Marguerite's collection and reminds us that Sertenas was a master of editorial policies: "Compromis dans l'aventure Boaistuau, Sertenas entre en coulisse; il ne cesse cependant d'y mener la danse" ("De La Prime Fortune" 711). See also his "Peut-on parler d'une politique éditoriale?" Charon-Parent and Kemp concur in their assessment of the booksellers: "Bien que ce privilège soit au nom d'un autre imprimeur-libraire, Gilles Gilles, au lieu de Sertenas, les libraires impliqués sont à peu près les mêmes; l'imprimeur parisien Benoist Prevost a travaillé pour Jean Caveiller, Gilles Gilles, Gilles Robinot, Vincent Sertenas, et pour Eloi Gibier à Orléans" (cli). Note that Gibier, while not directly part of this discussion, also has editions of the *Heptaméron des nouvelles*, printed at roughly the same time, and distinguished solely by the city of origin.

²⁴⁷ Veyrin-Forrer cites several examples that indicate an average period of nine to ten months to print and assemble a full printing of books. She cites one example in which the exercise was completed in about six weeks, but several printers were used ("Fabriquer un livre" 299-300). In the case of the *Heptaméron des Nouvelles* and the *Histoires des Amans Fortunez*, while there is a group of booksellers paying for and profiting from the collection, extant copies appear to have been printed by Benoist Prevost, the preferred printer of most of these *libraires*. We do not have evidence that Prevost contracted out for these two jobs, and the likelihood then is that at least several months passed after the privilege was granted and before the *Histoires des Amans Fortunez* was available for sale.

²⁴⁸ See Cazauran, "Boaistuau et Gruget"; Stone, "Observations"; and Part II for further details.

²⁴⁹ The text would normally have to have been completed before this date, because privilege is not granted without a manuscript copy for presentation, and the secretary granting privilege had to have time to review the edition, at least partially, before signing off on the privilege (Charon-Parent, *Les métiers du livre à Paris*, 104-106).

²⁵⁰ Extant editions of the *Histoires des Amans Fortunez* do not include, unfortunately, the colophon that is found in the *Heptaméron des nouvelles*. Our hypotheses are based on generic knowledge of the process and on the average length of production.

²⁵¹ See Davis, "Le monde de l'imprimerie humaniste: Lyon" *HEF I*, 258-260 for more on contracts between *libraires* and printers in the sixteenth century.

²⁵² We might also note that the "Prologue" of the text in the Gruget edition is in an italicized font while that of the Boaistuau edition is not. This is again, however, a

minor distinction in presentation. Finally, each table is unique, because the description for each tale was written by each of the editors. Adrien de Thou's primary manuscript (BN fr.1524) also has a summary of each tale, but none of the working manuscripts have a summary known to have been written by Marguerite de Navarre.

²⁵³ Changes were frequently made to this final page, anyway, as errata were often discovered during the printing process and in order to correct mistakes without having to dispose of the valuable paper and resources that had already been used, an "errata" page would follow on the verso side of the title page, or another page early in the text. In the case of the Boaistuau edition, this is found on the verso side of the letter to the reader, or the fourth folio sheet. No such page separate page exists in the 1559 Gruget edition, but errata are noted at the bottom of the preliminary sonnets (20).

²⁵⁴ See volume 4, pages 359-387, especially 375-381 for examples of Marguerite de Navarre's works (listed here as Marguerite de France) and more precisely, for the different copies of the *Heptaméron* in its variant editions. See also Charon-Parent and Kemp's lists of current extant holdings ("L'Histoire des premières éditions" *H* (2013), Book 1, clix-clxvi).

²⁵⁵ Please see Appendix A for a detailed listing of these editions.

²⁵⁶ For example, both the 1571 Eloi Gibier (Orléans) and the 1573 Jean Ruelle (Paris) editions of the *Propos Rustiques* are based on Groulleau's 1554 edition.

²⁵⁷ We will use the term "original" throughout this chapter to refer to the collection of ninety tales that were included in the *editio princeps* and subsequent editions until 1567 and that are generally considered to be Des Périers' work. Arguments surrounding the text's authenticity will be summarized below.

²⁵⁸ Let us not forget that more paper means a higher cost that is passed on to the consumer. If he is likely to pay the higher price for a book because it is popular, the bookseller will often find a way to exploit that to his advantage. So, while booksellers would often look for ways to reduce the costs involved with production, they would also gamble a bit on books they believed would sell regardless of cost. This explains the nicer editions of the *Nouvelles Recreations* and of the *Heptaméron* (and the *Histoires des Amans Fortunez*) that were initially printed. Let us also remember that "newer" editions were quite popular for sale, and encouraged people to make a purchase when they would have otherwise borrowed from a friend.

²⁵⁹ There are still many more tales in the *Nouvelles Recreations*, according to Hassell's and Sozzi's research, that seem to have oral origins.

²⁶⁰ Again, I do not wish to determine authenticity in this study, but the question is important in understanding how we might view the later interpolated editions. I will simply enumerate a few of the key points here, as Sozzi's study thoroughly details the polemic surrounding authorship of the *Nouvelles Recreations*. For full details, see *Les contes de Bonaventure Des Périers*, 423-448.

²⁶¹ See also Kasprzyk's very concise, yet detailed summary of the speculation on the *Nouvelles Recreations*' authorship (Introduction, *NR* 1980 vii-xx).

²⁶² *Ibid*, xvi.

²⁶³ This is in keeping, of course, with the genre's tradition of adapting familiar stories. See Introduction, 14-18.

²⁶⁴ See Sozzi, 87-226.

²⁶⁵ See Hassell, *Sources and Analogues*, vol. 2, 145-165, especially 152-153, where he contrasts Poggio's and Des Périers' works, and 153-155, in which he compares Bourdigné's and Des Périers' renditions of the Pierre Faifeu story (Chapter 21 and Tale 23, respectively).

²⁶⁶ Louis Lacour concedes that certain considerations about Peletier's potential co-authorship of the tales are plausible, but unlikely, and his unscientific conclusion is that Peletier and Denisot were perhaps both editors of the *Nouvelles Recreations*, but not authors (Introduction, *NR* 1856, vol. 1, lxxii-lxxxiii).

²⁶⁷ See Part I, 74. Notably, the title page of each of these editions claimed the familiar "*Reveu & augmenté de nouveau.*"

²⁶⁸ Hereafter known as *Apologie pour Herodote* or the *Apologie*. As listed in Sozzi, the apocryphal tales that derive from this two volume text are Tales 92, 93, 96, 99, 101, 103, 104, 106, 107, 108, 109, 111, 112, 113, 114, 116, 117, 118, 120, 121 (427).

²⁶⁹ I have not discussed the *Recueil des Plaisantes et Facétieuses Nouvelles* until now because this is not in fact the first appearance of this text. It originally appeared as a rewriting of the *Cent Nouvelles nouvelles* under the title *Les Facetieux Devitz des Cent Nouvelles nouvelles, tres-recreatives et fort exemplaires* by M. de La Motte Roullant and published by Jehan Réal (Paris 1549). La Motte Roullant, like many of our editors here, made significant changes to the text, which underwent further transformations from edition to edition. He added numerous tales himself for totals of, respectively, 108 and 109 tales, and substantially edited the original, as indicated by his title. The *Recueil* appeared in two editions in the same year, one out of Antwerp, Belgium and another out of Lyon and contained, respectively, 95 and 97 *nouvelles*. Pérouse suggests that the producers of these editions simply cut La Motte Roullant's work. Later editions make more dramatic changes and introduce interpolations, while furthering the cuts to La Motte Roullant's version. For full details of this collection's publication history, see Pérouse, *Nouvelles Françaises du XVI^e siècle* 106-113.

²⁷⁰ Again, as listed in Sozzi: 94, 95, 98, 119, 123 and 97, 100, respectively (426-427).

²⁷¹ "Tous ces textes ne sont que des transcriptions pures et simples, dépourvues de toute originalité" (Sozzi, 427).

²⁷² Appended tales are numbered consecutively, starting with Tale 91. The arrangement of tales after 1567 and 1568 did not change, as the seven newest stories were simply added on after the initial thirty-two. This means that Tale 122 is the last of the 1567 edition, and Tale 129 is the last of the 1568 and subsequent editions.

²⁷³ All citations to the appended tales are from Jacob's edition, unless otherwise noted. Translations of these tales and of the original collection are from the La Charité edition of *Novel Pastimes and Merry Tales*, as they are all included, unless otherwise noted.

²⁷⁴ The chapter begins: "La prochaine feste, qui fut de saint Vincent, jour fatal pour les Vignerons, & Capettes: de sorte, que si l'espine y degoute, est aux uns signe de bonne vinée, & aux autres de double portion: Maistre Huguet demeuré malade, vindrent ses deux nevez Fiacre Sire, & Thibaud Monsieur, bons garçons, & ayants toute leur jeunesse couru l'eguillette, & la Poule; pour suplier au default de leur once, & suyvre les propoz encommencez." (*Propos Rustiques*, La Borderie edition, 165-166)

²⁷⁵ Pérouse and Dubuis note of these first few sentences that the time period is the long-ago past, but that there are certain unrealistic, “voire carrément fabuleu[x],” elements, which would further distance this interpolated version of the added chapter from the main text of the *Nouvelles Recreations*. See *Propos Rustiques* 79, note 1.

²⁷⁶ The following tales make specific references to François I’s reign: 92, 98, 101, 116, 120, 125, and 126. Tale 117 is placed during Henri II’s reign, further moving the collection into a more modern time period.

²⁷⁷ See *Propos Rustiques* 79, note 1.

²⁷⁸ This seemingly loose connection becomes more plausible below as we examine the relationships between the different players in this literary drama.

²⁷⁹ The exact number seems to change according to different standards. Bénédicte Boudou claims that thirteen of the initially added thirty-two tales derived directly from the *Apologie pour Herodote (Mars et les Muses dans L’Apologie pour Hérodote d’Henri Estienne – hereafter Mars et les Muses – 50)*. Sozzi and Lacour each claim twenty (427 and vol. 2, Preface xvii-xviii). Several of these tales appear in other sources of which Des Périers had also availed himself (Tales 96, 99, 113, and 114). Whether or not the editor directly derived these from Estienne’s example, each appears in the *Apologie pour Herodote* and as an appended tale. Given the presence of the other stories, we can presume that the editor was at least aware of the connection.

²⁸⁰ Boudou and Ristelhuber give detailed accounts of the complex history of this text and its subsequent series of suppressions in their editions of the *Apologie pour Herodote*. See Boudou, Introduction, *Apologie pour Herodote* (hereafter Introduction, AH 2007) 63-77 and Ristelhuber, Introduction, *Apologie pour Herodote* (hereafter Introduction, AH 1879) v-xlvi.

²⁸¹ Boudou notes that this edition, which is an inexact copy of the original text, was evidently prepared hastily and contains several errors (Introduction, AH 2007, 64).

²⁸² See Boudou’s edition, vol. 2, 1113.

²⁸³ Individual tales might be found by way of a series of tables. Ravot was the first to include such tables in his counterfeit edition of the *Apologie pour Herodote*, which Estienne adapted and corrected later. They were placed after the *Avis au Lecteur*, at the beginning of the first volume. They consist of an alphabetical listing of primary figures and characters that are encountered and are noted by their page numbers, rather than chapters. In the table, Des Périers is listed only once. See Boudou’s edition, vol. 2, 999-1035.

²⁸⁴ In this Chapter, the exact citation reads as follows: “J’ay ja parlé ci-dessus (en traitant de ceux qui s’estoyent desfaits eux-mesmes) de Bonaventure Des periers auteur du detestable livre nommé *cymbalum mundi*, comment nonobstant la peine qu’on prenoit à le garder (à cause qu’on le voyoit estre desesperé) fut trouvé s’estant tellement percé de son espee qu’il avoit appuyee le pommeau contre terre, que la pointe entrée par l’estomach sortoit par l’eschine” (636).

²⁸⁵ Unless otherwise noted, citations from the *Apologie pour Herodote* come from the Boudou edition.

²⁸⁶ Robert Estienne was, until his exile, one of the most renowned Parisian booksellers, earning the title of *imprimeur du roi*, and specializing in Greek texts. It was primarily his role in the publication of vernacular Bibles that forced his flight from

France, and this was an extension of his own Reformist views. See Martin, “Le temps de Robert Estienne” 230-235.

²⁸⁷ The inheritance of his father’s presses and business was contingent upon his continued settlement in Geneva (Boudou, *Mars et les Muses dans l’Apologie pour Hérodote d’Henri Estienne* - hereafter *Mars et les Muses* - 23).

²⁸⁸ Boudou frequently presents Estienne’s arguments against both men in. See *Mars et les Muses*, 50-51, for example.

²⁸⁹ *Ibid.* 289-290.

²⁹⁰ *Ibid.* 330-332.

²⁹¹ Kasprzyk’s earlier reading of Estienne agrees with this assessment: “[...] il a tendance à lire les œuvres narratives avec les yeux d’un moraliste et d’un polémiste” (476).

²⁹² Kasprzyk rightly notes certain elements of Estienne’s writing that evoke Montaigne, especially when discussing a need to study diversity of moral and customs. As she also points out, however, he does so “sans pourtant atteindre à l’objectivité et au relativisme de l’auteur des *Essais*. Le fanatisme religieux et le tempérament moralisateur d’Estienne limitent manifestement ses horizons” (“Henri Estienne conteur” 472).

²⁹³ Cazauran points out that, unlike most other borrowed stories, Estienne almost always names his source when a tale is taken directly from the *Heptaméron*, and that his references to her are positive and reverent (“Henri Estienne, lecteur de *L’Heptaméron*,” 395).

²⁹⁴ For a more extensive discussion on Marguerite de Navarre’s, Des Périers’ and Rabelais’ understanding and application of the term *nouvelles*, see Duval, “Et puis, quelles nouvelles?” especially 246-249.

²⁹⁵ *Ibid.* Duval shows similarities between Marguerite de Navarre, Des Périers and Rabelais in their understanding of *nouvelles*, even when their approaches to the genre differ, and this includes Des Périers’ *Cymbalum Mundi*. This similarity would counter Estienne’s convictions in favor of Marguerite de Navarre and in opposition to the others. “Readers of Rabelais, Des Périers, and Marguerite would surely have understood the implications of the resemblance that Marguerite’s own protégé Des Périers had made it impossible to ignore: namely, that the *nouvelle*-hungry French, like the curious Athenians, are interested only in the vain and the variegated wisdom of men, not in the immutable wisdom of God” (248). As we have seen, Estienne accused both Rabelais and Des Périers of distancing their audiences from God.

²⁹⁶ For a more detailed study of the theoretical implications of Marguerite de Navarre’s and Des Périers’ work, specifically viewed through Erasmus and Rabelais, see Cave, chapter 3 “Interpretation,” 78-124.

²⁹⁷ Cazauran makes a similar observation: “Mais, dans la fidélité de certaines transcriptions, comme dans les infidélités de sa réécriture, Henri Estienne nous laisse apercevoir dans sa pratique ce qu’il n’a pas dit dans son plaidoyer pour son ouvrage – qu’il aimait les histoires pour les histoires et qu’il avait pour celles qu’il répétait la complaisance d’un conteur tout prêt à rire ou à trembler avec ses lecteurs” (“Henri Estienne, lecteur de *L’Heptaméron*,” 409).

²⁹⁸ This situation is not so different from Ravot’s preparation of a hastily-prepared counterfeit edition, which also came out in 1567.

²⁹⁹ Henri-Jean Martin juxtaposes the two booksellers as opposite ends of the spectrum of sixteenth-century thought. See “Galliot Du Pré,” in *HEF I*, vol. 1, 244. For a general account of Galliot Du Pré’s editorial policies, see Parent, *Les Métiers du Livre à Paris* 217-251.

³⁰⁰ See Kasprzyk, *Nouvelles Récréations*, Note 2 (13). See also, Hassell, vol. 2 (147).

³⁰¹ Aristotle makes that distinction clear in his *Poetics*, when he specifically opposes Tragedy and Comedy: “Tragedy acquired also its magnitude. Discarding short stories and a ludicrous diction, through its passing out of its satiric stage, it assumed, though only at a late point in its progress, a tone of dignity; and its metre changed then from trochaic to iambic. [...] we cannot say the same of Comedy; its early stages passed unnoticed, because it was not as yet taken up in a serious way” (13-15). See also the Introduction, pages 30-36, on “rhetoric, poetry and fiction.”

³⁰² See Introduction, notes 17 and 18.

³⁰³ See Introduction (8) and Note 11.

³⁰⁴ We will provide only a cursory glance at Estienne’s writing and argument as presented in the *Apologie pour Herodote*, as that will distract from our focus. Also, we do not wish to claim that Estienne’s work opposed Des Périers’ in every way. Estienne was, as we have noted, an erudite student of the classics and a successful bookseller, printer and writer, his writing is not entirely foreign to Des Périers’. For the most thorough analysis of Estienne’s approach to writing, see Boudou, *Les Mars et les Muses*.

³⁰⁵ See Cicero’s *De oratore*, II, 216-291.

³⁰⁶ See, for example, *Lire les Nouvelles Récréations et joyeux devis de feu Bonaventure Des Périers*, in which editor Dominique Bertrand notes that the *Nouvelles Recreations* are the subject of a “nouvelle vague d’études” (“Des *Nouvelles Récréations* qui ne ‘sont pas comme des marchandises:’ falsification cynique de la ‘valeur’” 15); Véronique Montagne and Marie-Claire Bichard-Thomine, eds. *Bonaventure Des Périers, conteur facétieux*; John Harris, “The Arrangement of Stories in Des Périers’ *Nouvelles Récréations et Joyeux Devis*”; Emily Thompson, “The Querelle in the Marketplace: Bonaventure Des Périers and the Fishwife’s Rhetoric.” Both the Harris and Thompson articles will be referred to frequently in this chapter.

³⁰⁷ The five parts, as noted for example in both *De Oratore* and in *De Partitione Oratoria*, are *inventio*, *dispositio*, *elocutio*, *actio* and *memoria* (these constitute the “first division of theory” in *De Partitione Oratoria*, that of the “speaker’s personal resources,” which are all interrelated, and enable the orator to address the other two divisions: the speech itself and the question or subject to be addressed 313).

³⁰⁸ Des Périers enumerates the body parts that should be engaged in laughter: “Et dequoy? De la bouche, du nez: du menton, de la gorge, et de tous noz cinq sens de nature. Mais ce n’est rien qui ne rit du cuer” (14). The most important part, then, is the one that governs emotions, and needs to be healed.

³⁰⁹ Sozzi enumerates numerous references to Erasmus’ works in the *Nouvelles Recreations*, often alongside Rabelaisian influences (100, 104, 113, 126, 197, 220, 380, 383, 385, 387-8, 393, 394, 399, 400, 405, 410, 420, 434, 441).

³¹⁰ Hassell concedes in his Appendix that there could be a strong allusion to tale 39 of the *Cent Nouvelles nouvelles*, but does not refute the possible validity of his earlier conclusions.

³¹¹ Metzger-Rambach's characterization of the fool continues thus: "La sottise et vanité du personnage contribue au comique du récit, il modifie aussi l'image du *fol* en lui donnant un éclairage négatif qui apparaît dans plusieurs nouvelles. Le *fol* donne matière à être ridiculisé [...]" (123).

³¹² She suspects that the connection made by Hassell and Lacour is erroneous, and that the plaisantin tale has stronger links to a traditional, commonly circulating tale, rather than court gossip. She also notes several additional possible source origins (*Til Eulenspiegel*, the *Discours non plus melancholiques que divers*). See the *Nouvelles Recreations*, 19, note 8.

³¹³ Estienne also engages his classical education throughout the text, and especially in his "Au lecteur," which establishes his own contract with the reader. I will not fully detail this contract here, but would like to point out that it is presented in a much lengthier and more detailed fashion than Des Périers' "Première nouvelle en forme de préambule" and that the Greco-Roman influence is clear from the beginning (the first word is "Thucydide"). Ciceronian thought also abounds and the argument is more explicit, intentional and deliberate, with Estienne adopting the *persona* of a moralist. See Boudou, *Mars et les Muses*.

³¹⁴ Likewise, in *De Oratore II*, Cicero states that "*prima est enim quasi cognitio et commendatio orationis in principio, quaeque continuo eum qui audit permulcere atque allicere debet*" ("the opening passage contains the first impression and the introduction of the speech, and this ought to charm and attract the hearer straight away" vol. 1, 438-439)

³¹⁵ Kasprzyk enumerates many of the proverbs and expressions in her edition of the *Nouvelles Recreations* (336-341). See also James Hassell, *Sources and Analogues of the Nouvelles Récréations et Joyeux Devis of Bonaventure Des Périers*, and "The Proverb in the Short Stories of B[onaventure] Des Périers"; Krystyna Kasprzyk, "Un exemple de comique subversive: l'emploi du proverbe dans les *Nouvelles Récréations* de B[onaventure] Des Périers"; Véronique Montagne, "Proverbes, blasons et expressions imagées dans les *Nouvelles Récréations*."

³¹⁶ Hassell's *Sources and Analogues* lists at least five brief references derived from various oral sources, including, as we have noted, potential gossip surrounding François I's court fool, Triboulet, who died in 1537. For the first *nouvelle*, see vol. 1, 29-31 and vol. 2, 166-167. See also Lionello Sozzi, *Les Contes de Bonaventure Des Périers*, especially 85-226. We may note that Sozzi tends to provide further sources for many of the tales, and Hassell later opts in favor of many of those relationships in volume 2.

³¹⁷ Ian McFarlane analyzes the shift from author to narrator, or, more specifically in his view, to *devisant*. However, McFarlane does not see Des Périers as engaging with the reader quite the same way I do. He suggests that because the text does not, like the *Heptaméron*, have a series of *devisants* who openly disagree and dialogue with one another, it is instead dependent upon "un lecteur muet qui serve de repoussoir au narrateur" ("Le personnage du narrateur dans les 'Nouvelles Récréations'" 318). Arnould, in contrast, suggests that McFarlane takes his analysis a bit too far, and that the narrator often imitates dialogue with his reader, who becomes a sort of implied

interlocutor. All writing is performance, and representation of the “real” yields to representation of narration: “il n’est pas la véracité de cette narration, mais la ‘bonne grâce’ avec laquelle elle s’accomplit et produit ses effets sur l’auditoire, le centre de gravité du recueil se déportant ainsi franchement de son contenu vers l’échange qu’il permet entre auteur et lecteur, à plus proprement parler, entre un conteur et un auditeur appelé à entrer dans le jeu de la narration jusqu’à devenir lui-même conteur” (“Le joyeux devis des *Nouvelles Récréations* 32). For Laurence Gaudin, this character emerges from the beginning: “Le préambule ne constitue seulement pas une préface, quelques pages où l’auteur développe un discours en marge de son activité de conteur, mais un texte où s’impose la figure du narrateur” (“La Fonction structurale des adresses au lecteur dans *Les Nouvelles récréations et joyeux devis* de B. Des Périers”).

³¹⁸ Few studies on the nature of laughter and humor exist; Aristotle’s treaty is lost to us (we only know of it because he mentions it in his *Poetics*), but Cicero, as mentioned above, deals with the subject in book II of his *De Oratore*, where he distinguishes between jokes *in verbo* and *in re*, based on words or based on things: the play on “entrée” is an example of the former, more precisely of what Cicero calls *ambiguum* (a word with two meanings, 253); a joke *ex ambiguo* can be funny when it is unexpected, and delivered, as is the case here, with a feigned naïveté. In the modern era, Henri Bergson addressed more broadly the many questions of what is funny, and why. This example of Des Périers’ semantic play falls under the rubric of the interference of series, or, as Bergson explains it, when two possibilities exist, but the audience knows which one is authentic, even though the other is offered as a viable option. See “Le rire,” 432-436.

³¹⁹ The last sentence is a good example of what Cicero calls a joke *in re*, playing not on words but, ironically, on things: the wise are nowhere to be found. The effect is reinforced by an allusion to a famous anecdote concerning the philosopher Diogenes, who was using a lamp in broad daylight to “find a man.”

³²⁰ Des Périers’ mastery of dialogue with the reader and within the tales themselves has been acknowledged elsewhere. See, for example, Mathilde Thorel, “L’art de la parole vive: le dialogue dans les *Nouvelles Récréations*”; Kasprzyk, “Des Périers et la communication”; and, again, Arnould, “Le joyeux devis des *Nouvelles Récréations*.”

³²¹ Later, we will discuss how this type of connection reinforces Des Périers’ arrangement of the collection, as seen in Harris’ article.

³²² Cicero complements equal parts training and natural ability with such sagacity: “*omnique in re posse quod deceat facere artis et naturae est, scrire quid quandoque deceat prudentiae*” (“in every case while the ability to do what is appropriate is a matter of trained skill and of natural talent, the knowledge of what is appropriate to a particular occasion is a matter of practical sagacity” 168-169).

³²³ “On ne sçauroit dire [...] si ledit maistre luy fut mieulx gaudy de ceulx qu’il avoit conviez, pour avoir parlé latin à sa chambriere” (74).

³²⁴ See Emily Thompson’s assessment of the Regent’s errors: “The Regent has not only forgotten to take into consideration the audience he is trying to sway, but he has made a poor display of memory, one of the five essential parts of rhetoric” (5).

³²⁵ A rare case in the appended tales, as this one appears to have no clear literary origin and, as edited by Jacob, has several variants in different editions.

³²⁶ This part of our study focuses on the rhetorical strategies used by Des Périers and his interpolators, and on two of the subjects proposed by the text's *invention*: laughter as a necessity, and open interpretations. Many of the instances found herein address other topics pertinent to sixteenth-century discourse, such as the *Querelle des femmes*. As we will see, Des Périers provides tales that, depending on one's inclination, could be interpreted for or against women, clergymen, etc. So, while the *Querelle des femmes* is a theme that remains in the background throughout much of the collection, we will not profess to determine, once and for all, Des Périers' views on this subject, but will simply acknowledge its presence in the text.

³²⁷ For interpretation in Des Périers, see Ian McFarlane, "Le personnage du narrateur"; Jean-Claude Arnould, "Le joyeux devis" and "La part sombre des *Nouvelles Récréations*." For interpretation in Marguerite de Navarre, see Michel Jeanneret, "Modular Narrative and the Crisis of Interpretation"; Philippe de Lajarte, "The Voice of the Narrators in Marguerite de Navarre's Tales"; Nicole Cazauran, *L'Heptaméron de Marguerite de Navarre*, especially 69-102.

³²⁸ Consider the contrast of this approach to reading and interpretation to Estienne's: "Or ay-je esperance que cest œuvre estant mis à chef apportera aux lecteurs du plaisir conjoint avec prouffit. Et non seulement ils tireront prouffit de la lecture de chacune histoire en particulier (duquel je parleray tantost) mais aussi apprendront par iceluy à conformité d'icelles, et l'analogie (si Françaises peuvent porter ce mot). Et par consequent ils apprendront à parler avec plus grand respect des historiographes anciens. Aussi par mesme moyen seront enseignez de ne laisser passer rien de notable par devant leurs yeux ou à travers leurs oreilles, sans estre remarqué, pour s'en servir en temps et lieu" (vol. 1, 133). Estienne encourages readers to commit to a moral reading of all stories, but he makes it clear throughout each chapter exactly what reading is correct.

³²⁹ Again, see McFarlane, Gaudin and Arnould "Le joyeux devis."

³³⁰ Arnould gives numerous other examples in "Le joyeux devis."

³³¹ See Gaudin, "La Fonction structurale des adresses au lecteur dans *Les Nouvelles récréations et joyeux devis de B. Des Périers*," 189-191.

³³² See the whole of Sozzi's discussion on the structure of the individual narratives (254-258). He proposes that the very tone of the entire collection supersedes structural restraints and that devising a strict narrative structure would impede that. He believes that the author of the *Nouvelles Recreations* "adopte une nouvelle écriture narrative, conçue sous le signe de la souplesse et de l'aisance. [...] En réalité, l'esprit unitaire du recueil reside justement dans son allure directe, dans cette franche cordialité, cette amiable privauté entre l'auteur et son auditoire" (254-255).

³³³ The variety Des Périers provides makes the already challenging notion of classification even more complicated. Sozzi provides an interesting note on the disparity between his and Kasprzyk's classifications of the endings (254, note 50).

³³⁴ Vladimir Propp's study, of course, focuses on fairy tales, but certain aspects of his study do treat tales in the larger sense, and much of what he analyzes in the sub-genre is, to an extent, applicable to the corpus as a whole.

³³⁵ Sozzi gives a more detailed list of the types of endings provided in the collection as a whole (I only wish to provide a few examples here); see 256-258. In addition, Arnould, expanding on Sozzi's work, elaborates on the variety of endings and

on the narrative interventions that frequently take place in several of the narratives (“Le joyeux devis”).

³³⁶ Bergson theorizes that comedy often requires exactly this sense of community, or an “écho,” if you will. “Si franc qu’on le suppose, le rire cache une arrière-pensée d’entente, je dirais presque de complicité, avec d’autres rieurs, réels ou imaginaires” (389-390).

³³⁷ In Tale 126, the young man is a young gentleman, learns his lesson and is able to correct his behavior. Thieves appear in various forms in several of the added tales, and some are punished by hanging (93, 107, 111). Tale 108 shows a reversal of this theme when an innocent man is hanged in place of the real thief who was working with a magistrate. Not all thieves are thus punished; in Tale 96, the thief tricks the cobbler and gets away with it. These examples show, in general, a reversal of Des Périers’ system of upward and downward mobility as discussed in Jean-Pierre Siméon, “Classes sociales et antagonismes sociaux dans les *Nouvelles Récréations et joyeux devis* de Bonaventure Des Périers.”

³³⁸ This tale appears in Chapter 15 of the *Apologie pour Herodote*, which is the chapter from which our editors borrow the most tales (nine of the twenty): “Des larrecins de nostre temps.”

³³⁹ Tale 94 is found in the *Recueil des plaisantes nouvelles*, Poggio’s *Facéties*, and the *Cent Nouvelles nouvelles* (Jacob note 1, 325).

³⁴⁰ This story is also found in the *Recueil des Plaisantes Nouvelles* (Jacob, note 1, 333).

³⁴¹ This is from Chapter 16 of the *Apologie pour Herodote*.

³⁴² Roger Dubuis’ study of the *nouvelles* as a genre elucidates this problem. See *Les Cent Nouvelles nouvelles et la tradition de la nouvelle en France au moyen âge*, especially 104-108.

³⁴³ See *De Oratore*, II, 218; and above page, 181.

³⁴⁴ Sozzi references twenty-eight tales of this type. See 244-245 and notes 17, 18.

³⁴⁵ We do not wish to study all of Harris’ examples, but he also demonstrates a similar link between Tales 18 and 19 (of which 19 contains two anecdotes, the first of which functions as an intermediary), and also in Tales 23 to 27.

³⁴⁶ The appended tales which come from Chapter 15 are: 93, 96, 104, 107, 111, 113, 114, 118, and 120. Tales 96, 113 and 114 also have other literary origins.

³⁴⁷ See 312-313, note 2.

³⁴⁸ The brief text I have left out is as follows: “Et si se songe que s’il ne se prenoit qu’à l’amy, son mal ne sortiroit pas hors de sa souvenance, voyant tousjours aupres de soy la beste qui auroit fait le dommage: et puis elle seroit toute preste et appareillée à refaire un aultre amy: Car une personne qui ha mal fait une fois (si c’est mal fait que cela toutesfois) est tousjours presume mauvaise en ce genre la de mal faire” (312). There is a distinct analogy being made between the cheating wife, absorbed by her own sexual desire and the thirsty ass, blinded by his needs. There is also a reprisal of the prominent Rabelaisian theme of thirst. I have not discussed Rabelais’ influence on the overall text, but it is important to note that Des Périers’ work is often considered an off-shoot of the Rabelaisian school. For further discussion on the theme of animals in Des Périers, see Bénédicte Boudou, “Les animaux dans les *Nouvelles Récréations*”; Thompson, “Une

merveilleuse espèce d'animal: Fable and Verisimilitude in Bonaventure des Périers's *Nouvelles Recreations et Joyeux Devis*." For discussion on Rabelais in Des Périers, see again Sozzi, Hassell and Kasprzyk.

³⁴⁹ For a discussion on the geographic importance of Des Périers' collection and its insistence on being "French," see Tom Conley, "Des Périers on Speed."

³⁵⁰ Cf. Perrault, *Contes*, 217-232.

³⁵¹ "Le marchand, entendant assez bien où tendoit le gentilhomme, qui le mocquoit, l'en remercia gracieusement, comme celuy qui n'eust jamais pensé tel bien luy devoir advenir" (400).

³⁵² See, for example, Arnould, "Le joyeux devis."

³⁵³ See Sozzi's insistence on the importance of the sonnets as framing devices that function to create a "unité de fond du recueil" (241).

³⁵⁴ For this reason, I will refer to the groups as the "Du Fail editions" and the "Groulleau editions," in the plural, respectively. Both men contributed to the texts in very different ways, Du Fail as the original author and Groulleau as the first *libraire* to print the material as counterfeit. However, it is important to note that each helmed, in his own way, an edition of each text that served as the primary edition for each group. I will also occasionally refer to the different booksellers (Jean De Tournes and Pierre De Tours) who were responsible for the Du Fail editions in order to clarify my arguments.

³⁵⁵ The first two Groulleau editions contained both chapters in their entirety. However, most other editions in this group contained only part of the first chapter, as noted in *La Borderie* 164-165.

³⁵⁶ See Appendix A and bibliographies provided by Dubuis and Pérouse, Milin, *La Borderie*, etc.

³⁵⁷ See Part I, 78-80 and note 121.

³⁵⁸ I use De Tournes' name here, as that is what is listed in Tchemerzine vol. 3 101 and Pérouse and Dubuis 32. However, it would have been very difficult for Jean de Tournes to act as *libraire* for any edition in 1576 since, according to Davis' records, the bookseller died in 1564 of the plague (268). Some studies (cf. Bideaux 74) choose to not even mention this edition to avoid questions about its problematic provenance. *La Borderie* does include this edition in his bibliography, taking Brunet at his word, but acknowledges that he knows of no extant copy (xv). According to Alfred Cartier's bibliography, Jean II de Tournes, the son, operated the business from the time of his father's death until 1585, when he fled to Geneva to open another print shop and boutique (Vol. 1, 18-22). Cartier also lists the work in Vol. 2, 576. I will call it the De Tournes 1576 edition in order to be consistent with published listings, but we concede that it was not, in fact, De Tournes I's work and that if this book ever existed, we know of no extant copy.

³⁵⁹ As noted in Part I, Jean de Tournes' original edition of the *Propos Rustiques* was in-octavo, while the subsequent editions of both were in-16. Also, the actual size of these editions also corresponds with the general formats: De Tournes' in-octavo edition measures 180 mm long x 104 mm wide and Groulleau's 1548 edition is 110 mm long X 68-69 mm wide. De Tournes turns to a smaller, in-16 format for the second edition and at 120 mm long x 70 mm wide is comparable to, but still larger than, Groulleau's work. Groulleau makes his second 1554 edition slightly wider at 111-112 mm long X 75 mm

wide (La Borderie iv-xi). Details for the first edition of the *Baliverneries d'Eutrapel* are unknown.

³⁶⁰ In the case of the *Baliverneries*, there is no extant copy of the original Du Fail edition. Comparisons may be made between the second Du Fail edition (1549) and the Groulleau 1548 edition, but we cannot determine the original text with any degree of certainty. This situation forcibly limits the scope of comparisons we may make between editions of the *Baliverneries*.

³⁶¹ See the discussion in Part I, 97-99.

³⁶² Nina Catach details various opinions on the matter in her *L'Orthographe française à l'époque de la Renaissance*. See especially Chapter 2, part 2 (108-127) and Chapter 3 (143-206) as well as Appendix I "Déclarations d'imprimeurs et d'auteurs" (273-294).

³⁶³ I will be relying heavily on Catach's above-cited work and Susan Baddeley, *L'Orthographe française aux temps de la réforme* for this section of my study.

³⁶⁴ Charon-Parent, *Les métiers du livre à Paris* (123). See also Hoffmann's previously cited work.

³⁶⁵ *Ibid.* Charon-Parent points to the same issues, citing Catach's work in particular; she notes that it is extremely rare for an author to be involved in the composition and therefore spelling of a text, even after 1550. She claims that the best-case scenario for an author's involvement is if he lives on site, correcting each page as it is completed (122-123).

³⁶⁶ See Part I, 84-85.

³⁶⁷ La Borderie details the spelling changes between the Du Fail editions of the *Propos Rustiques*, but again, does not detail the spelling of the Groulleau editions, simply stating that the variants and the inclusion of the two chapters, with their original spellings give "une idée suffisante du système d'orthographe de l'interpolateur" (114-117, 135). Milin gives only a rough outline of the systems in the Groulleau 1548 and the Du Fail (De Tours) 1549 editions (xli-xlii) of the *Baliverneries d'Eutrapel*.

³⁶⁸ Philipot also notes that four of Maugin's works (primarily translations) appeared for the first time in Groulleau's editing house, including the *Palmerin d'Olive* (1546), in which Maugin identifies himself as "Le petit Angevin" for the first time (234-235). See also Part I, 97.

³⁶⁹ I am using the 1554 edition simply because it is the one at my immediate disposal. Most modern critical editions of the *Propos Rustiques* discount the Groulleau editions to a large extent and do not provide many variants from those editions. I do not have access to the 1548 edition. A stronger comparison might be made if I had access to both, but I must trust La Borderie (135) and Philipot (222-223) at their word when they indicate that the 1548 and 1554 editions are duplicates. The 1554 edition does at least serve as an example of Groulleau's orthographic style.

³⁷⁰ Note that chapters were not numbered in the original editions; this is an editorial interpolation introduced by Dubuis and Pérouse for "clarity" that we will continue here (47).

³⁷¹ Cf. in particular page 89 for examples taken from several books, including the *Amadis de Gaule* cycle.

³⁷² It is important to note that Milin did not have direct access to the Groulleau text, but relied on S.-W. Singer's 1815 critical edition. Philipot did have access to the original, and claims it was a "faithful" reproduction (xxxv).

³⁷³ Catach notes that the same updates were applied to the 1548 *Quart Livre* and the 1548 collective edition of Rabelais' works (159). See also Mireille Huchon, *Rabelais Grammairien* for extensive discussion on the spelling variants and presentation of all of Rabelais' work, especially 58-62.

³⁷⁴ *Ibid.* Catach states: "Il reste que Rabelais a refusé les améliorations proposées ici par E. Dolet et qui auraient pu donner à ses œuvres le même nouveau départ (et à la même époque) qu'elles avaient octroyé à celles de Cl. Marot" (158). She claims further that the choice was made in agreement with his "imprimeur attitré" (159) as part and parcel to the text. Huchon notes that spelling and punctuation changes were introduced by correctors with each new edition, but that the percentage of changes were, on the whole, rather negligible (affecting only about 3% of the text). See, for example, 50-57.

³⁷⁵ See again Catach's discussion on spelling in Rabelais' work (153-160).

³⁷⁶ In Catach's *L'Orthographe* (in the *Que sais-je?* series), she notes the importance of scribal learning via the Church and its conservative impact on spelling reform, as many of the previously increasing changes were viewed as deriving from the Reformist camps and therefore, heretical (22-23, 28-29). In her *L'Orthographe française à l'époque de la Renaissance*, she notes that official documents were "encore sous l'emprise des anciennes écritures" (185). Susan Baddeley demonstrates the evolution of spelling in the French language in relation to these three powers. In Chapter 2 (39-59) of her *L'Orthographe française au temps de la Réforme*, she shows how each group recognized the importance of language choice as early as the late fifteenth century. Accordingly, the monarchy's establishment of an *imprimeur du roi* shows that it acknowledged the printing industry's potential influence on those powers, and attempted to reverse it, while exerting its own influence. In Chapter 11 (327-379), Baddeley illustrates how the different power structures attempted to control instruction, which was considered a major signifier of Reformist behavior (one had to be literate to read the Bible, which was, of course, a key tenant of the Reformation). She clarifies also that the correlation of modernized orthography and Reformative writing was particularly strong in the 1530s and 1540s. However, the period shortly after François I's death "fut particulièrement favorable aux débats sur la langue et aux nouveautés" ("was particularly favorable to debates about language and new theories" 382). The texts we examine here, then, fall squarely in this tenuous period in-between perceptions about spelling.

³⁷⁷ Catach goes into great detail about the different sets of characters that were produced to accommodate spelling reforms. The focus remains most particularly on Claude Garamond and Robert Granjon, the most well-known character engravers of the century. See especially 207-220.

³⁷⁸ Baddeley summarizes De Tournes' spelling evolution, including his 1553 engagement of Jacques Peletier, which led to the most radical of De Tournes' changes in orthography (201-204). In the mid-1540s, just preceding the publication of Du Fail's *Propos Rustiques*, De Tournes did in fact lean towards some simplification of spelling, but not to the extent Groulleau did, as outlined by Catach (*L'Orthographe française* 88-91).

³⁷⁹ Bichard-Thomine defines this contract as one that is “absolument original: il ne s’agit pas seulement de faire ressentir le choc d’une rencontre entre le savant et le facétieux – comme c’était déjà le cas dans le *Gargantua* –, mais d’amener le lecteur à cautionner un projet mimétique que l’on pourrait traduire [...]” (*Noël Du Fail, conteur* 32). Throughout her discussion, she also places Du Fail’s contract and style in direct contrast to those of Bonaventure Des Périers in the *Nouvelles Recreations et Joyeux Devis*. A few other elements of her observations will arise during our discussion here.

³⁸⁰ Pérouse’s analysis in “Le Dessein des *Propos Rustiques*” agrees with this assessment and points to desirable qualities that would appear to be inherent to peasants: “Si notre auteur se propose de parler des paysans (de les faire parler), c’est semble-t-il, parce qu’ils sont, jusque sous nos yeux, les témoins d’un âge primitif dont ils perpétuent les beautés, la sagesse et la vertu” (139).

³⁸¹ Bichard-Thomine points out just how rare it is, in this genre, to allow peasants the role of agency in their own stories. She contrasts this with Marguerite de Navarre’s *Heptaméron*, where peasants figure frequently as the subjects of tales, but are not the tellers of those tales (*Noël Du Fail, conteur* 22).

³⁸² *Ibid.* Bichard-Thomine completely agrees with Pérouse’s two-fold reading of the text. “Le didactisme de l’entrée en matière répond enfin à une autre intention: donner un fondement sérieux à une œuvre qui pouvait être classée, dans le contexte d’une époque florissante en contes à rire, parmi la littérature facétieuse” (28). She concedes, initially, that this could reveal Du Fail’s uncertainty about his own writing – is he trying to legitimize his work or is this structure a truly intentional and careful construction? In either case, the resulting text still presents a serious subject that is dissimulated by a comedic veneer. Our own reading here fully accepts the dual nature of the *Propos Rustiques*, but from a slightly different angle.

³⁸³ Examples from the period can be found in abundance. In some instances, books were published anonymously, as is the case with the *Discours non plus melancoliques que Divers*, possibly written by Des Périers. In other cases, such as the *Comptes du monde aventureux* by A.D.S.D, only initials were used. In still other examples, authors and even interpolators were identified by clues, such as the “Angevin” responsible for the interpolations found in both the *Propos Rustiques* and the *Balivernerries d’Eutrapel*. Finally, there is an undeniable parallel between Du Fail’s Leon Ladulphi and Rabelais’ Alcofribas Nasier, which helps to establish the tone of the text from the title page on. The technique of cryptic authorship is therefore ubiquitous to sixteenth-century practice, and unsurprising. On the parallels and distinctions between such examples, see Bichard-Thomine, *Noël Du Fail, conteur*, 38-39.

³⁸⁴ Bichard-Thomine examines how Noël Du Fail uses Leon Ladulphi’s character-narrator to distance himself from the text. She shows that Du Fail’s approach, while certainly influenced by Rabelais’ *Pantagruel* and *Gargantua*, engages with the reader on a different level. In this way, Du Fail reflects tradition and hearkens back to other works, but in his own way (*Noël Du Fail, conteur* 38-39). In addition, she claims that Du Fail’s intertextuality is not only literary, but cultural and directly related to oral tradition, which drives the frame for this collection (32-33).

³⁸⁵ Pérouse claims that the narrative frame structures the compilation of “descriptions, [...] portraits ou [...] amplifications de moraliste” as a collection of tales.

He also notes that the interplay between fiction and reality comes to bear in the characterizations that often correspond to actual local people (*Nouvelles françaises* 313-314).

³⁸⁶ Aspects of this come up throughout Bichard-Thomine's look at the reader's contract (20-37), as well as in her analysis of the overall narrative structures of the text (150-161). In each case, "true" stories are "painted" into the text by "real" *devisants* who have now been characterized by a narrator, who is also a characterization of the author himself. Verisimilitude, then, is a central component of the *Propos Rustiques*, just as it is with other collections in this genre.

³⁸⁷ Du Fail opens the text with a firm statement that the technique he is using here is an established means of discovering greater knowledge. The first few lines are as follows: "Les Philosophes et Jurisconsultes ont cela assez familier, de descrire l'un contraire par l'autre, en baillant par iceluy plus seure et solide congnoissance que s'ilz laissoyent l'ombre d'iceluy pour de prime face traiter leur supposé sujet" (38). The choice of "Philosophes et Jurisconsultes" is an interesting one which not only suggests high intellectual and rhetorical origins for this kind of writing, but refers to authors who are historically truth-seekers, whether in a theoretical context, or in the specific realities of the law. At the same time, the *a contrario* argument is used by forensic orators and politicians, in a manner that establishes likelihood or verisimilitude rather than logical truth. Citing this argument from the very beginning identifies what follows as a rhetorical construction. Truth and knowledge, on the one hand, and their rhetorical presentation on the other are thus as inextricably linked in Du Fail's work as they are in classical writing. However, we must also remember that the relationship between rhetoric and philosophy is undetermined and has been debated thoroughly from its inception. Plato sees the two as mutually disparate approaches – philosophers seek the truth and rhetoric can only dissimulate it; Aristotle views each as a function of the other. As for Du Fail's playful invocation of reality, it serves as a means to justify fiction, but demonstrates the underlying, more serious intention of the text.

³⁸⁸ Wayne Booth's study, *The Rhetoric of Fiction*, is essential to understanding the role reality and verisimilitude play in all types of fiction, and he frequently compares modern twentieth-century perspectives on this question to medieval and early modern ones. His opening analysis of the narrator's role in the *Decameron* (9-16) is especially useful, as is the second chapter: "True novels must be realistic" (22-64). In the latter he discusses the evolving modern perspective in which verisimilitude, and the extent to which it is actually possible, becomes the Holy Grail of authorship. By comparison, the still essential verisimilitude of earlier works serves as a tool to engage the reader, but readers and authors accept that the reality being presented is being transmitted via an authorial and rhetorical filter. The rhetorical focus is more about seeking a form of truth in persuasion (is this story believable?) or interpretation (what does this story mean?) than about establishing an omniscient perspective and seeking literal truth in the representation of actions (what happened?).

³⁸⁹ See Martin, "Ce qu'on lisait au seizième siècle."

³⁹⁰ Marguerite de Navarre plays on the idea that rhetoric and reality are inherently tied together, but often play against one another. As Parlamente proposes to tell tales based in reality, she notes, regarding the courtly project of a French *Decameron*: "Et

promirent lesdites dames, et Monseigneur le Daulphin avecques elles, d'en faire chacun dix et d'assembler jusques à dix personnes de ceulx et celles qu'ilz pensoient plus dignes de racompter quelque chose, sauf ceulx qui avoient estudié et estoient gens de lectres: car Monseigneur le Daulphin ne vouloit que leur art fust meslé, et aussie de peur que la beaulté de la rethorique fist tort en quelque partie à la vérité de l'histoire" (11). Booth's study demonstrates that modern narrative, by comparison to Early Modern and Classical narrative, attempts to present "[its] own brand of reality" (42). In his discussion of the *Decameron*, Booth shows that narrative authority guides the reader, no matter who is telling the story, and that rhetoric is viewed as a "showing" art, while "telling" is often considered "inartistic" (8-16). The appearance of reality takes on different levels of usefulness, but is in each case, a tool by which the author presents his own perspective to the reader.

³⁹¹ The clergy is of course, the third class (actually, considered the second "estate"). This class is not ignored by either text, and as we will see, clergymen make numerous appearances in both works, but Du Fail's/Ladulfi's opening remarks specifically oppose the noble and peasant classes. Also, both nobility and peasantry are represented as voices for the *Propos Rustiques*. Ladulfi represents nobility and the *devisants* are peasants. In this sense, then, the clergy are a peripheral group and the "society" constructed here is effectively represented by two classes, with individual clerics belonging to one or the other. We will see that the interpolated editions of both texts include more pointed references to them as they are openly mocked by members of the other two classes.

³⁹² See Bichard-Thomine (379-380) for a look at the etymological and theoretical origins of the word in Du Fail's world.

³⁹³ Du Fail would not have been unfamiliar with such violence. According to Philipot, he participated in the Italian campaign from 1543-1544 (71-72). Philipot's biography is primarily based on a reading of the *Contes d'Eutrapel*, and entire sections are not supported by extant evidence. However, as a member of even a small noble family, military service would have been appropriate, and Philipot's reading of the text is believable. Also, Courbet's earlier reading of the *Contes d'Eutrapel* indicates that Du Fail did participate in military service, but left early in the campaign, around the middle of 1544. He continues: "La paix de Crépy (18 septembre 1544) vint rendre à la vie studieuse Noël Du Fail, qui du reste ne pouvait faire campagne que comme volontaire, quand les lieutenants du roi, delà les monts, réclamaient des renforts, & que de jeunes gentilshommes étaient autorisés à prendre du service" (xxviii-xxix). In either case, noblemen of the sixteenth century are familiar with military campaigns, and Du Fail's knowledge would be based on his social milieu as much as any experience.

³⁹⁴ See Pérouse and Dubuis, *Propos Rustiques*, note 29, page 43.

³⁹⁵ The findings in this article support, to some extent, Du Fail's anthropological vision of civilization and violence. They also serve to show that those in power react when threatened, or that those establishing their power do so by violent means.

³⁹⁶ A modern reader might be inclined to notice the tension within the idea of violence as a precursor to the establishment of civilization. "Civilization" as meaning "not primitive" is a concept that evolved in the eighteenth century. The cultural definition of the word continues to evolve as some thinkers see in it a justified sense of superiority,

while others see the concept in a negative light. Surely, a truly “civilized” society would reject bloodshed as a means to power and the establishment of social classes via violence is not a successful example. However, such a reading would be anachronistic and could not have been understood by a contemporary sixteenth-century reader, nor intended by the author.

³⁹⁷ “Roger Bontemps” was a nickname used frequently to indicate a person who was always out to have a good time, often inebriated and typically unproductive. The use of the nickname here elicits popular, rather than learned, expressions, and gives an air of verisimilitude to the framing device. Further, Ladulfi suggests that characterizations are appropriate, simply by using one immediately. See Dubuis and Pérouse, note 10, page 49.

³⁹⁸ Cazauran’s “La Première manière de Noël Du Fail” is again useful here, as she points out the ironic juxtaposition Huguet’s possession of old books and treatment by the others as a venerable wise man whose appearance evokes ridicule as a “Roger bon temps” scratching his nose. Her point is that Ladulfi’s rhetoric encompasses variety in society and that at all times in the text, Du Fail’s realism is counterbalanced by comedic or unrealistic elements.

³⁹⁹ The bourgeoisie falls, by definition, into the “vilain” class, and Ladulfi is absolutely correct in his social divisions. We are seeing in this example the beginnings of a centuries-long debate that challenges the social structure inherited from the feudal past. The portion of text examined here demonstrates the blurred lines of what is perceived to be a set system.

⁴⁰⁰ One cannot of course neglect the obvious Rabelaisian correlation to Nasier’s writing techniques, which also consist of honoring drink in Pantagruelian fashion. He writes, for example: “L’odeur du vin, ô combien plus est friant, riant, priant, plus celeste et delicieux que d’huile ! Et prendray autant à gloire qu’on die de oy que plus en vin aye despendu que en huyle, [...]” (*Gargantua* 61). However, here we must emphasize the parallels between the noble narrator and the peasant *devisant* who are apparently distinguished primarily by their mode of communication: the narrator writes while the peasant tells. Is it that the act of writing produces a more civilized, more worthy member of society? If so, this example puts the class structure to question and redefines “nobility.” Or is the writer just an imitator of thought? Anselme’s actions must have taken place before Ladulfi’s, but are forcibly presented in a different order, as if the act of narration reversed reality and allowed the imitator to become the originator. In the last tale, “De Gobemousche,” oral transmission is a strictly feminine domain (the mother’s) and limits social mobility. By sending his son Guillaume to school, Gobemousche intends to assure that the boy acquires the masculine, written skills, and necessarily loses the former. Pérouse and Dubuis interpret this story in very much the same manner (see *Propos Rustiques*, note 14, page 150). In this way, the young man may now ascend to a successful position in his region, where few are educated. His success remains limited, however, by the inherent limitations of the region itself and is presented in an amusing light. The fact that so few are educated serves him well, because most of the people, like his mother, cannot judge him objectively. As a result, Guillaume only fulfills the modest potential for success that his education has provided and remains a potential target for ridicule. We can see here how Du Fail blurs the lines of class structures and society, and, at the same time, tries to maintain them.

⁴⁰¹ On the Flameaux-Vindelles and Mistoudin chapters, see Richard-Thomine (who calls them the “deux récits ‘purs’ du recueil”), *Noël Du Fail, conteur*, 157-161. The town rivalry recounted in this series of chapters is interesting in that it presents the peasants as being just as violent as the noblemen. Violence is not then a quality unique to nobility, but transcends all classes and sexes. Of course the comedy in these chapters is based on the assumption that the violence of peasants is ridiculous and inherently parodical, precisely because they are not noblemen. Yet, readers may ask if noblemen are noble in the first place, not because of some merit inherent in their use of violence, but simply because they won fights, which were originally no more dignified than the rustic “battles” people find laughable today. As Du Fail’s prefatory letter explains, primitive men “ordinairement se combattoient à beaux coups de poing, de bastons, de pierres, s’entretrainsoient par les cheveux à escorcheul [...] En ces combats les plus fors avoyent l’avantage, au moyen duquel les foibles estoient contrains faire entredeux aux cavernes, & se separer pour le mieux [...]” 7) If this is so, the case for social mobility strengthens implicitly, as different members of society might “win,” in the same haphazard fashion, any new struggles that develop.

⁴⁰² Richard-Thomine analyzes the narrative structure of the *Propos Rustiques*, illuminating Du Fail’s depiction of “un tableau des mœurs” (150-161). She also considers the polyphonic ending of the *Propos Rustiques* as an integral part of their entire body: it is for her, “à la fois [...] une philosophie et [...] une esthétique,” which elicits a theatricality in the dialogues (236-242)

⁴⁰³ The concept of a single day is highly suspect in this text as well. The flow of the stories from one to the other, as well as the ending of the tales with the departure of the *devisants* indicate one day only. However, Ladulfi states in the beginning, explaining “D’où sont prins ces Propos Rustiques,” that he acquired these stories “par deux ou trois festes subsecutives” (50). As we will discover, this inconsistency is exploited by the interpolator in the introduction to the added chapters.

⁴⁰⁴ Or “polyphonie,” as Richard-Thomine calls it, in the disjointed, fading series of words we hear as the *devisants* take their leave (237).

⁴⁰⁵ As cited in Courbet, Notice: “Il traite de coquins les vieux qui font toujours l’éloge du temps jadis” (lxxiv and Note 2). Also, Bideaux demonstrates the transition from *Propos Rustiques* to *Baliverneries*, and highlights the satirical outlook that begins in the first book and is fully played out in the second. The intentional irony becomes overt farce in its various manifestations.

⁴⁰⁶ Most modern readings of the *Propos Rustiques* claim that Du Fail’s work clearly supports contemporary sixteenth-century class structures and that his œuvre as a whole favors the nobles over the peasant class. Cf. La Borderie, Milin, Pérouse, Philipot, etc. However, the *Propos Rustiques* are the most ambiguous in this respect, while the *Baliverneries d’Eutrapel* and the much later *Contes d’Eutrapel* tend to be more insistent in their support of class distinctions. It is possible that he used the other works to clarify that perspective.

⁴⁰⁷ Two very different intertextual examples come to mind. First, Rabelais’ Panurge is willing to treat any topic and is introduced in *Pantagruel* as a hyper polyglot with exceptional skills but one who, farcically, does not apply them in a constructive or practical manner. Second, Cicero’s Crassus, in the *De Oratore*, is a renowned orator who

is asked to discuss the matter of rhetoric (oratory) and to share his thoughts on the views of Greek philosophers about this field. In this example from the *Propos Rustiques*, we see again the juxtaposition of serious and comedic elements as analyzed by Cazauran (“La Première Manière de Noël Du Fail”). Huguet thus takes on aspects of both personalities.

⁴⁰⁸ See note 13 in Pérouse and Dubuis’ edition (150). See also Leclercq-Magnien (53).

⁴⁰⁹ Most studies on Du Fail agree with this assessment. See Philipot, especially 224-226.

⁴¹⁰ Examples of similar strategies that allow an interpolator to claim authorship have existed since classical literature. We saw some minor geographical changes in the *Nouvelles Recreations et Joyeux Devis*, but those do not perform the same function.

⁴¹¹ See Appendix B: Tables of Du Fail variants. As to the difference, Philipot states only that he also used La Borderie’s edition to examine the variants, and he does not identify any more numbers than the ones cited here. It is possible that there is a minor miscount or that Philipot used a slightly different criteria to count the changes. The exact reason for the difference is impossible to identify, since Philipot did not chart out his data. However, the difference is minor (127 to 128) and has not real impact on the analysis of the data.

⁴¹² See Part I, especially pages 76-79 and 93-96.

⁴¹³ It is certainly true that the shorter, less significant variants would not have required much time, especially given the somewhat sloppy nature of some of the interpolations as pointed out in multiple critical editions. La Borderie doesn’t hesitate to criticize Maugin’s work: e.g. for Chapter 1, 14, l. 9-10 – “ ‘[...] pource que les plus anciens & reputez de plus *sainement* & meilleur conseil.’ - *Sainement*, au lieu de *sain*, est une faute évidente qui n’est pas dans les édit[ions] de 1547 & de 1549; cependant toutes les édit[ions] modernes (1732, 1842, 1874) l’ont reproduite” (137); for Chapter 1, 15, l. 8-10 – “ ‘Et celuy (dy-je) qui avecq’ ce grand bonnet *de Milan* enfoncé en la teste, tient ce vieux livre. Celuy (*respond il*) qui se gratte le bout du nez *d’une main & la barbe de l’autre!* Celuy proprement...’ – A ce compte-là, maître Huguet aurait eu trois mains, l’une occuper à gratter son nez, l’autre à gratter la barbe, la troisième à tenir son livre. Cette sottise appartient exclusivement à l’interpolateur; [D]u Fail a eu grand soin d’en purger son édition de 1549; on ne comprend pas que M. Assézat l’ait reproduite dans son texte” (137-138); for Chapter 4, 30, l. 29 – “ ‘Avecq’ la corde de *Richard* tendue.’ – *Richard* représente ici *aurichal*; pour couper court à ce non-sens, [D]u Fail inséra dans l’édit[ion] de 1549 un terme explicatif: ‘avec la corde *de fil d’archail* ;’ ce qui n’a pu empêcher cette sottise de se perpétuer d’édition en édition jusqu’à celle de 1874 exclusivement, [...]” (141); for Chapter 5, 36 “Dans l’édit[ion] de 1548, le titre de ce chapitre est ainsi conçu: de Robin *le Clerc, compagnon Charpentier de la Grand’ Dolouère* » – titre qui prouve bien l’étourderie de l’interpolateur, car dès les premières lignes du chapitre on voit que ce Robin n’était point un charpentier mais un laboureur” (143).

⁴¹⁴ Philipot goes so far as to claim that Maugin and Du Fail are “friends” (189). It would be possible to consider that Philipot was sarcastically playing on the titular reference in the Groulleau editions to one of the author’s “amys,” but the note given by

Philipot suggests that the creative geographic changes that occurred between editions in the *Propos Rustiques* were very much developed as a game between the two.

⁴¹⁵ Bideaux is quite convinced that the rejection is absolute as he writes: “C’était là clairement faire savoir qu’entre la fin de ce chapitre et les *Baliverneries*, Du Fail désavouait tout ce qui avait été publié sous son nom.” (“This clearly amounted to letting it be known that Du Fail rejected all that had been published under his name and appeared between the end of the last chapter [of the *Propos Rustiques*] and the *Baliverneries*.” 75)

⁴¹⁶ The data from this portion of my work derives from numerous sources. The primary focus is the *Propos Rustiques*. The La Borderie edition, based on the 1548 version, and with variants, will serve as my primary source of data for edits and interpolations. If no additional information is given, all citations here are from this edition of the text, though they are edited to modern scholarly norms. Other sources for comparison include the 1555 Groulleau edition found on Gallica and the Pérouse and Dubuis edition of the 1549 version.

⁴¹⁷ All variants from other editions (specifically Groulleau’s 1548 and Du Fail’s 1549 ones) are derived, unless otherwise noted, from La Borderie’s work and are indicated by the use of italics and bold letters.

⁴¹⁸ The text in italics is present in the 1547 and 1549 editions, but has been suppressed in the 1548 and 1555 Groulleau editions.

⁴¹⁹ This last sentence is ambiguous, as the “luy” may refer either to the husband (“getting himself what he needed”) or to the wife (“receiving what she needed from him”) (Dubuis and Pérouse, 75, note 23).

⁴²⁰ It is interesting that Philipot would make such a comment. On the next page, he would introduce Maugin’s emphasis on anticlerical humor, slang and a shift in perspective on bourgeois merchants (251-253). I believe he is simply noting that the vast majority of interpolations do not produce such profound shifts in perspective.

⁴²¹ We have to note here the important stylistic variant that occurs in this text. The 1548 edition changed “femmes de ceux de Flameaux” to “Flamiennes,” which Du Fail retained in 1549. This is a clear example of Du Fail selecting the occasional clever stylistic correction and integrating it into his own revisions. See La Borderie, 127, 157; Pérouse and Dubuis, 117 note 69.

⁴²² This is considered one of the most misogynistic episodes of the *Propos Rustiques*, and I will not digress to engage in the many studies on Du Fail’s misogyny. See, for example, Andrée Comparot, “La Réception de Rabelais dans les *Propos Rustiques*”; Gabriel Pérouse, “A propos de Lupolde: un mot sur les personnages de Noël Du Fail”; C. Dedeyan, “Noël Du Fail et les femmes,” and “L’idéal masculine de Noël Du Fail dans les *Propos Rustiques*”; as well all of the major studies on Du Fail listed in the works cited.

⁴²³ The passage imitates, to some degree, Chapter 18 of *Pantagruel*, “Comment un grand clerc de Angleterre vouloit arguer contre Pantagruel, et fut vaincu par Panurge.” In Rabelais’ episode of pantomime, words are forbidden as a rule of the “debate” – the challenge is to argue without words. The debate is settled, with Panurge as the clear victor, but without any clarity as to how that determination was made. In Du Fail’s, words are essential as descriptors of the pantomime, but to what effect? They show

Pierre's arrogance and status as a puffed up braggart, but they do not, in the end, win him the battle. In this example, pantomime and verbal mimicry serve no end, other than to elevate the speaker's self-importance. Both authors study language – and its relationship to non-verbal expression – extensively in their work. Bichard-Thomine observes: “Les coutumes de paroles ont autant – sinon plus – d'intérêt à ses yeux que les mœurs et la vie privée. Si l'on privilégie, dans la lecture attentive des trois recueils, la langue qu'ils utilisent, on voit s'esquisser chez notre auteur une véritable théorie du langage, à tel point qu'il faudrait parler *des langages* de Noël Du Fail, plus que de sa langue ou de son style” (*Noël Du Fail, conteur* 315). For further discussion on Rabelais in Du Fail's work and on this episode, see Andrée Comparot, “La Réception de Rabelais dans *Les Propos Rustiques*”; Michel Rousse, “Noël Du Fail et le Théâtre: De l'art de voir à l'art d'écrire”; and Marie-Claire Bichard-Thomine, *Noël Du Fail, conteur*, especially 236-237, 303-316, 354-369.

⁴²⁴ Text that was suppressed in the Groulleau editions is placed in italics. Text that was modified or added in those editions is in bold.

⁴²⁵ La Borderie's assessment is that Maugin was a careless interpolator. However, this example might also be viewed as an overt exaggeration, intended to emphasize the same comedic elements and unrealistic presentation of the *devisants* that Cazauran points out in “La Première Manière de Noël Du Fail.”

⁴²⁶ He specifically writes: “Ce fait, entre beaucoup d'autres, démontre jusqu'à l'évidence que Du Fail est entièrement étranger à l'édit[ion] des *Propos Rustiques* de 1548, & par conséquent aux variantes & additions de ce texte, qui sont de véritables interpolations” (150).

⁴²⁷ See Bichard-Thomine for discussion on both characters' language and speech. Of Lubin, in particular, she notes that he is “capable d'un parfait mimétisme linguistique” (*Noël Du Fail, conteur* 263, 318-319).

⁴²⁸ Marie-Claire Bichard-Thomine would argue that the references to animals found in this example (and expanded in the interpolated edition) are less the reflections of a fabulist's culture than of an oral tradition born of both misogynistic tendencies and the realities of a country life. The peasants are thus confined to their unsophisticated, country-based origins and unable to truly move into other social positions (“Comparaisons et Métaphores Animales”).

⁴²⁹ We should note here that Thenot, in Chapter 7, knows how to read and can be found in his house “estudiant en de vieilles fables d'Aesope” (51); Huguet himself likes to read from them, among other “vieux livres,” during local “festes” (15).

⁴³⁰ For example, Maugin adds two explicit enumerations to Chapter 6: first, the list of “besteries” modern lovers must accept to have any success with the ladies (“Devez ester serviteurs deux ou trois ans, **vous accomodans à toutes les inepties, sotises, besteries, nyaisetez, chaairdries, resverries, mignardises, lourderie, ignorances, & asneries, pleurer quand on pleure, & rire quand on rit**, perseverants en vostre grand' folie, à fin qu'on cognoisse vostre constance [...]”) (46, 146); second, a long line of insults was added to Huguet's speech (“De la honte **qu'auriez & mespris** qu'elle a de vostre personne, & puy allez vous y froter & **vous fiez en tells coquines, putes, maraudes, lorpидons, & brigandes, qui desrobent l'un, pour piller l'autre.**”) (47, 147).

⁴³¹ Bichard-Thomine discusses Tailleboudin and his condition as a “gueux” in *Noël du Fail, conteur*” (320-321). She also cites several articles in the development of her discussion; see Robert Aulotte, “Les gueux dans la littérature française du XVI^e siècle”; Andrée Comparot, “Le burlesque dans les *Propos Rustiques* de Noël Du Fail.”

⁴³² According to Pérouse and Dubuis, “rebillaré” is a difficult term that could mean one of two things: “re-awakening of Easter’s joy,” or slang for the doubling of alms the Sunday after Easter, but, in this case, the use of the prefix is unclear (note 42, 102).

⁴³³ La Borderie tells us that “Sire” actually refers to “riches marchands,” with particular reference to its use in the *Contes d’Eurapel* (240).

⁴³⁴ There is also a clearly misogynistic tone to Maugin’s version.

⁴³⁵ The accusation remains couched in the “vilain’s” naïveté; as he recounts a visit from “messire Jean,” he says the following: “aussi me sentant bien heureux qu’il daignast venir chez moy, je lui presentois une selle pour se mettre à l’aise, disois à cette bonne demoiselle qu’elle luy dependist une poyre de Sarteau, ce qu’elle faisoit, le luy presentant de je ne sçay quelle mine là, que je ne trouvois mauvaise pour lors: mais tant y a que depuis j’ay bien pensé (et est vray cela) que c’estoient adjournemens de fesses” (21). The cuckold frames the story with his suspicions – likely correct – about his wife’s adultery with the cleric, whose behavior is, like the other two characters’, simply in keeping with “type,” and plays on conventions found throughout the genre. The curious exchange of the fruit may be a playful initiation of the “fruit as a test for chastity” motif (see Stith Thompson vol. 3 motif H434, 413) in which the fruit, typically an apple, ceases to shine when virginity is lost. All this is framed by the preceding text, in which the peasant explains his wife’s voracious sexual appetite. All of the characters are the butt of the joke, but none so much as the cuckold himself.

⁴³⁶ Note from the Cazauran article “Noël Du Fail, écrivain.” Philipot notes as well the “sires” is an honorific appellative for bourgeois, not noblemen (230).

⁴³⁷ See pages 244-246.

⁴³⁸ La Borderie faithfully reproduces the word “diversity,” but it is an obvious typo for “university.”

⁴³⁹ Thibaud seems to have studied in Paris, just as Maugin did; the use of “Sirap” for “Paris” occurs throughout this chapter.

⁴⁴⁰ In the latter half of the chapter, Thibaud accuses Fiacre of having fled to Lyon, even after his studies in Paris (which they should have discouraged), and which is proven by Fiacre’s having “dit trois motz du jargon de la Dane [sic] Pernetta!” (172), an obvious reference to Pernette du Guillet and the Lyon school of poetry.

⁴⁴¹ Several of the comments could be interpreted as traditional descriptions of the effects of love. However, they are rife with double-entendre, as when Huguet exclaims: “Mon Dieu! que de peines à celuy qui commence à aymer! Il n’en peult manger sa soupe, sans angresser sa jaquette. Ah Amour! quand je pense en vostre assiete, je conclu qu’il y fault entrer par Nature, & pousser en B dur: Car le mol n’y vault rien.” (“My God! What suffering comes to he who begins to love! He cannot eat his soup without messing up his jacket. Ah Love! When I think of your position, I conclude that one must enter through Nature and push a hard B, for a flat one is worth nothing.” 167)

⁴⁴² See Philipot’s analysis 228.

⁴⁴³ I will not study here in any depth the difference between the earlier and later interpolated editions. However, an interested reader can simply note that the second, bawdier part of the song and the entire second chapter are eliminated in the later editions. The changes that those elements produce in the text are thus eliminated. Because the beginning of the interpolated chapter is retained, however, the ironic effects of the switch to youth as *devisants*, of the play on bourgeois and noble appellations and of the selection of the folly of love as a “higher” and more modern topic remain in place.

⁴⁴⁴ In Du Fail’s editions of the *Propos Rustiques* and Cicero’s *De Oratore*, younger members of the group encourage the older members to speak. In Du Fail, Anselme and the others request that Huguet tell what he knows of the past (19). In Cicero, Sulpicius begs Crassus to speak (68-73). In both, the elder does not speak upon the first request, but must be implored to do so. Also, both groups are seated under a tree (Cicero 20-23, Du Fail 14). Du Fail’s imitation implies yet again that his text has a strong rhetorical basis and that the fictionalized characters in the collection are about to discuss a matter of importance that does, in fact, contain some truth.

⁴⁴⁵ Like so many of the themes Maugin focuses on in his interpolations, commentary on the negative relationship between country and city folk is interspersed throughout Du Fail’s text, and numerous characters, especially, for example, the Thenot du Coing / Tailleboudin contrast of Chapters 7 and 8 elaborate on this theme. Denis Baril details its development in his “La Peur de la ville chez les paysans des contes de Noël Du Fail” and makes several comparisons to Des Périers’ treatment of the same. Maugin’s treatment of this particular theme shifts from the perceived “better” mores upheld by country folk to the vulgarity of the character who claims to profess that very standard.

⁴⁴⁶ “Cunaud” probably refers to Cunault, a small town in Anjou, in today’s Maine-et-Loire.

⁴⁴⁷ Villedieu is another small town in the same region.

⁴⁴⁸ “Base text,” of course, refers to the modern practice of selecting a primary text from which to create a critical edition and in which any editorial changes are clearly identified for the reader. Such a concept would have been anachronistic for these editors. Boaistuau and Gruget obviously used several of the available manuscripts as a starting point for their own editions, and stated that some changes were made to the original, but did not indicate to the reader exactly what had been changed. For our purposes, then, the manuscript tradition does not serve as an “edition” per se – none were precisely published at the time under these standards – but it does help us to identify both editors’ changes and manipulations to the available text and thus to more accurately define their literary visions regarding the *Heptaméron*.

⁴⁴⁹ Numerous problems are attributed to the manuscripts, as well, and the fact that the collection remains incomplete, with no known manuscript in the author’s hand, makes it impossible to determine what a “perfect” edition could be. Editors today are forced to confront many of the same problems encountered by Boaistuau and Gruget and we are not interested in determining the “best” edition, but in comparing the two original ones, each for their own value and to their own effect.

⁴⁵⁰ See Part I, chapter 3, especially 118-122 and 139-146.

⁴⁵¹ Editions of the *Nouvelles Recreations* include a brief letter to the reader by “l’Imprimeur,” Robert Granjon, but no clear apparatus from the editor, who was not

named, but was likely Jacques Peletier, and nothing from the later editors who compiled the added tales. For the *Propos*, Maugin, “l’Angevin,” gives only a *dixain* to indicate his point of view about the author’s edition.

⁴⁵² Also cited in Cazauran and Lefèvre, Preface, *H* (2013), Book 1, lii-liiii.

⁴⁵³ Cazauran and Lefèvre, Preface, *Heptaméron* (2000) 50; and Preface, *H* (2013) Book 1, xcv.

⁴⁵⁴ See Part I, note 159.

⁴⁵⁵ See Part I, 139-146 and 149-151.

⁴⁵⁶ Chavy, *Traducteurs d’autrefois: Moyen Age et Renaissance*, vol. 1, 650.

⁴⁵⁷ Crassus acknowledges, in this sense, that translation could, when applied correctly and judiciously, add to the growth of the orator’s native language: “*Postea mihi placuit, eoque sum usus adolescens, ut summorum oratorum graecas orationes explicarem. Quibus lectis hoc assequebar, ut, cum ea, quae legerem graece, latine redderem, non solum optimis verbis uterer, et tamen usitatis, sed etiam exprimerem quaedam verba imitando, quae nova nostris essent, dummodo esent idonea*” (“Afterwards I resolved, – and this practice I followed when somewhat older, – to translate freely Greek speeches of the most eminent orators. The result of reading these was that, in rendering into Latin what I had read in Greek, I not only found myself using the best words – and yet quite familiar ones – but also coining by analogy certain words such as would be new to our people, provided only they were appropriate” *De Oratore* I, 155; ed. cit., 106-107). One of the most important considerations is the quality of the orators’ works being chosen, for, as he explains in the passage preceding this one, reading/copying bad examples leads to bad production. See also Antonius’s similar opinion in *De Oratore* II, 90-92.

⁴⁵⁸ Cicero (via Antonius this time, *De Oratore* II) claims that skills are developed through practice and the imitation of good models, and that, ultimately, each new generation of orators will contribute to the art in its own way. At first, early Greek orators all spoke in a certain manner, and “*Non potuisset accidere ut unum esset omnium genus, nisi aliquem sibi proponerent ad imitandum*” (“Their uniformity of style could never have come about, had they not kept before them some single model for imitation” *De Oratore* II, 93; vol. 1, 266-267). Later on, models multiplied and newcomers were able to take their art much further than their predecessors. Antonius also admits, however, that “*esse tamen multos videmus, qui neminem imitentur et suapte natura, quod velint, sine cuiusquam similitudine consequantur*” (“indeed we see that there are many who copy no man, but gain their objects by natural aptitude, without resembling any model” (II, 98; 270-271). But those are the exception, not the rule, according to which *imitatio* and *exercitatio* should prevail. Invention occurs when the matured natural and artificial skills of an orator come together, and he is able to build on his predecessors’ best qualities to create his own unique way. See the entire passage, 264-271.

⁴⁵⁹ Imitation remained a central component to all writing theory, and one that Du Bellay of course discussed extensively. See below for the latter’s understanding of the concept, and of its relation to translation. See note 457, above. See also Cave, especially chapter 2, 35-77.

⁴⁶⁰ Norton explains the subtle distinctions of Du Bellay’s translation theory. “Some translators, Du Bellay stresses, imagine they can capture this presence through

absolute phrasal transcription [...] thereby obviating the need for repatriation. The result is a prototype of the Pierre Menard fantasy, a notion that translation is carried out in an alien tongue, but always within the absolute configuration of the source text [...]. This fantasy, however, is calculated around a flaw because the translation can never hope to reproduce the invention itself. What it can, and indeed, must do is to begin the invention over again, to rewrite, rephrase, and optimally, reinvent the presence of the source text, a process altogether different from the illusion of a mirrored invention” (256).

⁴⁶¹ Cicero discusses *imitatio* in the *De Oratore*, but it is always subordinated to other functions, and as a means of achieving success therein. Hence, *imitatio* is ever-present in Cicero’s treatise and a natural part of invention, even though the “ideal” balance between the two is elusive and, perhaps, unattainable. As Francis Goyet had shown in his edition of the *Deffence* (Du Bellay, *Œuvres complètes*, Vol. I), Du Bellay owes much of his own approach of this issue to Cicero.

⁴⁶² These are diverse interpretations of Cicero, for whom, as we have noted, imitation is an important part of invention. See Cave, 35-77.

⁴⁶³ See Part I, 135-140.

⁴⁶⁴ See also Cave, from which Norton borrows heavily.

⁴⁶⁵ See Valérie Worth, “‘C’est étranger naturalisé’: Du Bellay traducteur de Virgile.” Worth compares Du Bellay’s translation to those of Louis Des Masures (1560) and Octovien de Saint-Gelais (1509), whose approaches vary, and in the context of the *Deffence*. She suggests that the exercise forces Du Bellay to refine his own understanding of translation (493).

⁴⁶⁶ *Art poétique*, I, vi; see also Part I, 136-139.

⁴⁶⁷ There were hermeneutical differences amongst the most active members of the ever-changing Pléiade, and Gruget’s work itself was never discounted, but lauded. We may add that Ronsard refers to Gruget in an ode from 1553’s *Les Amours* (Cazauban, “Boaistuau et Gruget, éditeurs” 149).

⁴⁶⁸ For this chapter, references to the Gruget edition are from Cazauban and Lefèvre, eds. *H* (2013), unless otherwise noted.

⁴⁶⁹ As we saw, Du Bellay’s own sense of the connection between imitation and glory was differently nuanced: he acknowledged that all good writing derives from *imitatio* (*Deffence*, Book 1, chapter vii-viii, 214-217), and suggested that translators are those who lack the natural ability and relentless ambition to metamorphose *imitatio* into *inventio*, and that translation is precisely the means by which the less talented might seek some form of glory.

⁴⁷⁰ “Cause, que pour le rendre digne de son auteur, aussi tost qu’il fut divulgué, je recueilly de toutes parts les exemplaires, que j’en peu recouvrer, escrits à la main, les verifiant sur ma copie: & feis en sorte, que je le reduysy au vray ordre qu’elle avoit dressé” (*H* (2013) Book 3, 1177).

⁴⁷¹ As we will see, some vestigial elements of the days’ opening and closings remained in the *Amanz Fortunez*, but none respected the ten stories per day structure, and they were not presented as a distinct framing unit of the collection.

⁴⁷² See also Part I, 134.

⁴⁷³ Cazauban and Lefèvre’s critical edition in the *Œuvres complètes* details all of the occurrences and does provide many of the variants in Boaistuau’s edition for easier

comparison. We will be relying heavily on these notes and variants throughout this chapter.

⁴⁷⁴ Other names are removed in the Boaistuau and Gruget editions and these only serve as examples. We may also cite *Nouvelle* 40 (the Count), *Nouvelle* 58 (Marguerite, Henri II's sister, and the Duchesse de Montpensier).

⁴⁷⁵ Cf. Boaistuau, ed. *Histoires des Amanz Fortunez*, *Nouvelle* 62, f. 166 r^o.

⁴⁷⁶ See Cazauran and Lefèvre, *H* (2013), Volume 10, Book 3, notes 1-3, 1002-1003.

⁴⁷⁷ Cazauran refuses in her article to give a complete list of similarities between Gruget and Boaistuau: “[...] je pourrais ici citer à nouveau toutes les variations en marge des manuscrits déjà relevées dans les *Histoires des amants fortunez*” (“Boaistuau et Gruget” 163), but the later edition by Cazauran and Lefèvre thoroughly indicates the variants between the editions and the manuscripts.

⁴⁷⁸ Cazauran and Lefèvre, *H* (2013), Volume 10, Book 3, notes 1, 3, 4, 1007.

⁴⁷⁹ Cazauran and Lefèvre give no reason for the suppression. See *H* (2013), Volume 10, Book 3, note 2, 1015.

⁴⁸⁰ Jourda gives a detailed but condensed history of the poem's condemnation as a reprisal for the “Affaire des Placards” (81-94).

⁴⁸¹ Galliot Du Pré was friends with Augereau, who had before been in trouble for his selections; the former obtained Augereau's stock upon his death. Only the *Miroir* “ne figure pas dans l'inventaire” (Charon-Parent, *Les Métiers du Livre* 236).

⁴⁸² Salminen, whose edition is based on the manuscripts, does not indicate the variants from the printed editions, nor does she note these passages for their evangelical/reformist tone. We rely on Cazauran and Lefèvre's editions and on copies of the Gruget and Boaistuau editions available to us through Gallica.

⁴⁸³ Cf. *Amanz Fortunez*, f. xvii r^o.

⁴⁸⁴ See Cazauran and Lefèvre, *H* (2013), Volume 10, Book 3, note 8, 809 and *L'Heptaméron* (2000), note 3, 626.

⁴⁸⁵ See Salminen, note Prologue 39, 672-673; Cazauran, *L'Heptaméron de Marguerite de Navarre* 28-33.

⁴⁸⁶ See Cazauran and Lefèvre, *H* (2013), Book 3, notes 1, 3, 6, 8, 10, 13; 987-990.

⁴⁸⁷ *Ibid.* Book 3, note 2; 987-988.

⁴⁸⁸ The inevitability of the ending is noted in the heading by Gruget, copied from his Table: “Trois meurtres advenuz en une maison: à sçavoir, en la personne du seigneur, de sa femme, et de leur enfant, par la meschanceté d'un Cordelier” (Volume 10, Book 2, 348 and Volume 10, Book 1, clxxi).

⁴⁸⁹ Cf. *Amanz Fortunez*, f. 58 v^o.

⁴⁹⁰ See Cazauran and Lefèvre, *H* (2013), Volume 10, Book 3, note 14, 924-925. They give a detailed explanation of this theme and its occurrence in Marguerite's other work.

⁴⁹¹ See Cazauran and Lefèvre, *H* (2013), Volume 10, Book 3, notes 2, 3, 10 and 12, 1010-1011. We will discuss some of Boaistuau's stylistic changes to this *Nouvelle* later.

⁴⁹² For discussion on Marguerite de Navarre's appropriation and transformation of the Boccaccian frame, see Cazauran, *L'Heptaméron de Marguerite de Navarre*, 70-78.

⁴⁹³ Cazauran credits P. A. Chilton for championing this project, and Suzanne Hanon and especially an un-named group of linguists from Clermont-Ferrand for their 1991 study. See “Sur *L’Heptaméron*: Enquêtes d’authenticité (Trois nouvelles “Gruget”).”

⁴⁹⁴ See also Cazauran and Lefèvre, *H* (2013), Book 3, notes, especially 858-862, 987-991, 994-995.

⁴⁹⁵ Cazauran noted, for example, the frozen packet of feces in *Nouvelle 52*, as indicative of scatological humor that is found within the *Heptaméron*. See “Boaistau et Gruget,” 162.

⁴⁹⁶ “Tripière” primarily means tripe-seller, but I believe, as do Cazauran and Lefèvre (Book 3, 862), that Simontaut is playing with another, idiomatic meaning here (according to Oudin: “femme qui a les tétins fors gros”).

⁴⁹⁷ See 172-173 and note 295, above.

⁴⁹⁸ See *L’Heptaméron* (2013), Book 3, *Nouvelle 44*, notes 1, 3, 6, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15; 987-991.

⁴⁹⁹ The debate is three times as long as the story. See Book 2, 558-561.

⁵⁰⁰ It appears that Monsieur de Sedan does so out of respect for the truth: “voyant qu’il n’avoit point dissimulé la verité, jura qu’il en auroit deux, et les feyt porter à son couvent” (Book 2, 559). The “truth,” which drives the woman to the madness of anger, was, according to the friar, that “tant qu’il y aura femme fole ou sottte au monde nous ne mourrons point de faim” (Book 2, 558). The above statement is elliptical about Monsieur de Sedan’s exact understanding of the incident, and the reader is uncertain if he was simply amused, in full accord with the friar’s opinion, or even apologetic for his wife’s uncontrolled outburst. His role in the tale, then, is to simply act as a witness, and to provide a control for the wife’s behavior and for the household obligations when she is inclined to renounce them. We are also reminded that he is the final authority for all household decisions, even when the wife often bears the responsibility. Her authority is thus an illusion that can be revoked at any time.

⁵⁰¹ See note 498, above, especially Book 3, note 10, 989.

⁵⁰² The brother attempts reconciliation and proposes an approved marriage, but her response is that “il luy avoit donné un si mauvais disner, qu’elle ne vouloit plus soupper de telle viande, et qu’elle eseroit vivre en sorte, qu’il ne seroit point l’homicide du second mary” (Book 2, 509). She spends the remainder of her days a hermit and retains her faith in God, so that she is ultimately honored by society, and her brother’s heritage comes to ruin: “si eseroit elle en celuy, qui estoit vray juge, et qui ne laisse nul mal impuni, avec le seul amour duquel elle vouloit user le demeurant de sa vie en son hermitage: ce qu’elle fait. Car jusques à la mort, elle n’en bougea, vivant en telle patience et austerité, qu’après sa mort chacun y couroit comme à une sainte. Et depuis qu’elle fut trespassee, la maison de son frere alla tellement en ruine, que de six fils, qu’il avoit, n’en demeura un seul, et moururent tous fort miserablement [...]” (Book 2, 509).

⁵⁰³ Geburon points this out: “[...] car je trouve bien estrange, veu que ce seigneur n’estoit son pere ny son mari, mais seulement son frere, et qu’elle estoit en aage, que les loix permettent aux filles de se marier à leur volonte, comme il osa exercer telle cruauté” (Book 2, 511). See also Book 3, 975, note 16 and Book 3, 907-908, note 9.

⁵⁰⁴ See Book 3, 907-908, note 9.

⁵⁰⁵ Cazauran and Lefèvre make the same observations. See Book 3, 992-993, note 1.

⁵⁰⁶ See *Nouvelles* 23, 31 and 48, for example.

⁵⁰⁷ See Part I, 122-127.

⁵⁰⁸ See Part I, p. 119, and note 200: *Chelidonium* mixes up partial translations from Clichtove (as shown by H. Tudor, art. cit.) with other material. Can we see in this example, perhaps, an illustration of Boaistuau's peculiar views on the roles of *translatio*, *imitatio*, and *inventio*, with "traduction" covering and allowing all kinds of creative liberties? The question would need to be explored elsewhere.

⁵⁰⁹ See Part I, 127.

⁵¹⁰ See above, 274-275.

⁵¹¹ See above, 273.

⁵¹² In *De Oratore*, Book II, 264-271, Cicero names the great orators of different periods, to show that *imitatio* plays an important role, but "natural gifts" and contemporary influences (another form of imitation) also determine personal style and approach.

⁵¹³ Belleforest's relationship with Boaistuau will be discussed further below. For greater details, see Simonin, *Vivre de sa plume au XVI^e siècle ou la carrière de François de Belleforest* (hereafter *Vivre de sa plume au XVI^e siècle*).

⁵¹⁴ "Que si les anciens Romains eussent été aussi negligents à la culture de leur langue, quand premièrement elle commença à pulluler, pour certain en si peu de temps elle ne fût devenue si grande. Mais eux, en guise de bons agriculteurs, l'ont premièrement transmuée d'un lieu sauvage en un domestique: puis afin que plus tôt & mieux elle pût fructifier, coupant à l'entour les inutiles rameaux, l'ont pour échange d'iceux restaurée de rameaux francs et domestiques, magistralement tirés de la langue greque, lesquels soudainement se sont si bien entés et faits semblables à leur tronc, que désormais n'apparaissent plus adoptifs, mais naturels" (207-208).

⁵¹⁵ We may also note that Boaistuau was acknowledged in this multi-faceted way in another of the preliminary pieces by Gabriel De Lyvene, who was linked to Belleforest (Simonin, *Vivre de sa plume au XVI^e siècle* 41). He calls Boaistuau: "Fidele traducteur, & auteur studieux" (line 7), praises him for having "corrigé, & reveu," (line 9) the text of the *Histoires des Amans fortunez*, and concludes: "Tu profites en tout ou ton esprit s'applique / Ou soit ce pour traduire, escrire, ou corriger" (lines 13-14, f. vii r°).

⁵¹⁶ He writes: "lors que cest œuvre me fut présenté pour lui servir d'esponge, & le nettoyer d'une infinite de fautes manifestes, quie se retrouvent en une copie escrite de main [...]" (f. x r°). Here, he clearly blames the presence of such errors on the stage of production, rather than on the author.

⁵¹⁷ "Celui donc qui voudra faire œuvre digne de prix en son vulgaire, laisse ce labour de traduire, principalement les poètes, à ceux qui de chose laborieuse et peu profitable, j'ose dire encore inutile, voire pernicieuse à l'acroissement de leur langue, emportent à bon droit plus de molestie que de gloire" (Book 1, chapter vi, 214).

⁵¹⁸ Despite his choice to work with prose fiction, Boaistuau was still highly revered, and considered by many to be an "orator," in part because of the variety of texts that he worked with (Carr, Introduction. *Histoires Tragiques* ix-x).

⁵¹⁹ This philosophy refers back to Cicero, and the notion that time, culture and individual experience all change the reading of any text, further impeding successful translation.

⁵²⁰ Conley believes, as I do, that the *Amans Fortunez* is an early version of the “rhetorical purpose” Boaistuau applied to the *Histoires Tragiques* (“The Graphics of Dissimulation: Between *Heptameron* 10 and *l’histoire tragique*” 78-79).

⁵²¹ There would be a total of six volumes from Belleforest, each with multiple editions. (Simonin, *Vivre de sa plume au XVI^e siècle* 234-307).

⁵²² Sertenas, we recall, helmed all of Boaistuau’s work. He was also the *libraire* for much of Belleforest’s and Gruget’s work.

⁵²³ Belleforest’s approach continued to shift, and by the fourth volume, the “translator” became an outright author, including stories of his own devising: “*Le Quatriesme tome des histoires tragiques, parties extraictes des œuvres Italiennes du Bandel, & partie de l’invention de l’Auteur François*” (Simonin, *Vivre de sa plume au XVI^e siècle* 248). See also, Campagne 92-93.

⁵²⁴ Ever the prudent businessman, Sertenas was working on obtaining privilege for the *XVIII Histoires Tragiques* upon his death in 1562; it was granted to his widow, under his name, in 1563 (Simonin, *Vivre de sa plume au XVI^e siècle* 235-237).

⁵²⁵ See Part I, 129-131.

⁵²⁶ See Conley, “Nouvelle et point de fuite: Pierre Boaistuau, *Histoires Tragiques* (1559), 2-3.

⁵²⁷ Campagne lays out the four-part structure as follows: an argument, which contains a moral; the narration, which includes the transgression; an “exemplary punishment”; and the conclusion, which includes a “moralizing exhortation” (93).

⁵²⁸ See note 195, above.

⁵²⁹ See the above discussion on Gruget for examples.

⁵³⁰ Gruget did not correct Boaistuau’s error, and the transition at the end of *Nouvelle 5* appears in the different editions as follows:

- in Boaistuau / Gruget: “Oisille se prenant à rire de la veoir courroucée, luy dict: encores moins on faict sonner la tabourin de ce qu’ilz ont faict & accordé. Parlamante dict: Je voy bien que Simontault a desir de parler, parquoy je luy donne ma voix: car apres deux tristes nouvelles, il ne faudra à nous en dire une, qui ne nous fera point plorer. Je vous remercie dict Simontault” (*Amanz Fortunez*, f. 20 r^o and *H*(2013), Book 1, 69-70).

- in ms Berlin Hamilton 425: “Oisille se prenant à rire de la veoir courroucée, luy dist: ‘Encores moins ont faict sonner le tabourin de ce qu’ils ont faict et accordé.’ Geburon dict: ‘Je voy bien que Nomerfide vault parler, parquoy je luy donne ma voix afin qu’elle discharge son cueur sur quelque bonne nouvelle.’” (*H* (2013), Book 1, 69-70).

⁵³¹ Cazauran and Lefèvre note the same error (*H* (2013) Book 1, 69-70; Book 3, note 24, 841).

⁵³² Gruget, who had replaced *Nouvelle 11* with a different one, likely his own, does borrow from the end of the manuscript *Nouvelle 11* to correctly introduce *Nouvelle 12*, but since the announced *devisant* is the same in both the manuscript and Boaistuau’s edition, and since he restores *Nouvelle 12* to its original place, there is no confusion.

⁵³³ Boaistuau’s *Nouvelle 19* ends as follows: “Nomerfide respondit si vous voulez que ma faulte soit rabillée, je donne ma voix à Dagoucin, lequel est si sage, que pour

mourir ne diroit une follie. Dagoucin la remercia de la bonne estime qu'elle avoit de son bon sens. Et commença à dire l'histoire que j'ay deliberé vous raconter pour vous faire veoir comment toutes les choses, qui ont apparence de sainteté ne sont pas saintes. Et pource j'ay envye de vous raconter un miracle, qui ne fera moins à la louenge d'un prince fidelle, que au deshonneur d'un meschant ministre d'eglise" (*Amanz Fortunez*, f. 82 r^o-v^o), to be compared with Gruget's *Nouvelle* 11: "Puis que me faictes participer à vostre coulpe, dist Nomerfide, je m'adresseray à tel qui reparera notre imperfection presente. Ce sera Dagoucin, qui est si sage que pour mourir ne voudroit dire une follie. Dagoucin la remercia de la bonne estime qu'elle avoit de son bon sens. Et commença à dire: 'L'histoire que j'ay deliberé vous raconter, est pour vous faire veoir comment amour aveuglist les plus grands et honnestes cueurs, et comme une meschanceté est difficile à vaincre par quelque benefice que ce soit'" (*H* (2013), Book 1, 159-162), and finally, with the manuscript / Gruget end of *Nouvelle* 32: "Mais je voudrois sçavoir à qui ma dame Oisille donnera sa voix. – Je la donne, dist elle, à Simontault, lequel, je sçay bien, n'espargnera personne. – Autant vault, dist il, que me mettiez assus que je suis un peu medisant. Si ne lairray-je à vous monstrier, que ceux que l'on disoit mesdisans, ont dict verité. Je croy, mes dames, que vous n'estes si sottes de croire en toutes les nouvelles que l'on vous vient compter, quelque apparence qu'elles puissent avoir de sainteté, si la prevue n'y est si grande, qu'elle ne puisse estre remise en doubte. Aussi sous espece de miracles y a bien souvent des abus: et pource j'ay envie vous en raconter un, qui ne sera moins à la louënge d'un prince fidele, qu'au deshonneur d'un meschant ministre d'Eglise" (*H* (2013), Book 2, 453).

⁵³⁴ "Et apres un bon & long respos, dont elle disoit qu'une heure avant minuict valloit mieux que trois apres, se partit ceste compagnie, mettant fin au premier discours & recit d'histoires. Le matin ne sceut la compagnie si tost venir en la salle qu'ils ne trouvassent ma dame Oisille, qui avoit plus de demie heure auparavant estudié la leçon qu'elle devoit lire" (*Amans Fortunez* f. 42 v^o-43 r^o).

⁵³⁵ See 283-284, above on the excised description of Oisille.

⁵³⁶ Boaistuau does not create a table for the *Histoires Tragiques*, but does include summaries that precede each of the six tales. Bandello also included summaries before each of his stories, but Boaistuau's work is almost entirely independent of Bandello's.

⁵³⁷ See Huchon, *Rabelais grammarien*.

⁵³⁸ See Simonin, "Ronsard et la poétique des *Œuvres*."

WORKS CITED

-
- A.D.S.D. *Les Comptes du Monde Adventureux*. Paris: Étienne Groulleau, 1555. 2 vols. Ed. Félix Frank. Paris: Alphonse Lemerre, 1878. Print.
- Antoine de Bourbon, King of Navarre (1518-1562); Jeanne d'Albret, Queen of Navarre (1528-1572). *Lettres d'Antoine de Bourbon et de Jehanne d'Albret*. Ed. Eugène Achille Lacroix de Vimeur, comte de Rochambeau (1836-). Paris: Renouard, 1877. University of Alberta Libraries, Open Alliance Ebook Collection. Web. 31 May 2012.
- Apuleius. *The Golden Ass*. Trans. and Ed. P. G. Walsh. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994. Print.
- Aristotle. *On the Art of Poetry*. Ed. and Trans. Ingram Bywater. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1909. Print.
- Arnould, Jean-Claude. "Le joyeux devis des *Nouvelles Récréations*." *Lire les Nouvelles Récréations et joyeux devis de feu Bonaventure Des Périers*. Ed. Dominique Bertrand. Clermon-Ferrand: PU Blaise Pascale, 2009. Print. 23-37.
- . "La part sombre des *Nouvelles Récréations*." *Bonaventure Des Périers, conteur facétieux*. Ed. Véronique Montagne and Marie-Claire Thomine-Bichard. Paris: PUF, 2008. 62-72. Print.
- . "L' 'Auteur' invisible: Les *Nouvelles récréations et joyeux devis de feu Bonaventure des Périers*, de Robert Granjon." *Conteurs et romanciers de la Renaissance: Mélanges offerts à Gabriel-André Pérouse*. Ed. James Dauphiné and Béatrice Périgot. Paris: Honoré Champion, 1997. 27-37. Print.
- Baddeley, Susan. *L'Orthographe française aux temps de la Réforme*. Geneva: Droz, 1993. Print.
- Balsamo, Jean and Michel Simonin. *Abel l'Angelier & Françoise de Louvain (1574-1620)*. Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance 358. Geneva: Droz, 2002. Print.
- Bandello, Matteo. *Le novelle*. 4 vols. Alexandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, 1992-. Print.
- Baril, Denis. "La Peur de la ville chez les paysans des contes de Noël Du Fail." *La Nouvelle française à la Renaissance*. Ed. Lionello Sozzi. Geneva: Slatkine, 1981. 513-523. Print.

-
- Baudrier, H.L. and J. *Bibliographie Lyonnaise, recherches sur les imprimeurs, libraries, relieurs et fondeurs de lettres de Lyon au XVIe siècle (Lyons, 1895)*. Paris: F. de Nobelé, 1964. Print.
- Belcher, Stephen. "Framed Tales in the Oral Tradition: An Exploration." *Fabula* 35 (1994): 1-19. Print.
- Bergson, Henri. "Le Rire: Essai sur la signification du comique." *Œuvres*. Intro. Henri Gouthier. Ed. André Robinet. Paris: PUF, 1963 (1899, 1924). 381-485. Print.
- Bertrand, Dominique. "Des *Nouvelles Récréations* qui ne 'sont pas comme les marchandises:' falsification cynique de la 'valeur'." *Lire les Nouvelles Récréations et joyeux devis de feu Bonaventure Des Périers*. Ed. Dominique Bertrand. Clermon-Ferrand: PU Blaise Pascale, 2009. Print. 9-19.
- Bichard, Marie-Claire (see Marie-Claire Bichard and Marie-Claire Thomine). "Comparaisons et Métaphores Animales dans l'oeuvre narrative de Noël du Fail." *Noël du Fail, écrivain*. Ed. Magnien-Simonin, C. Paris: J. Vrin, 1991. 97-110. Print.
- Bichard-Thomine, Marie-Claire (see Marie-Claire Bichard and Marie-Claire Thomine). *Noël du Fail, conteur*. Paris: Honoré Champion, 2001. Print.
- Bideaux, Michel. "Les *Balivernerries d'Eutrapel*: Du Fail entre deux livres." *Noël du Fail Écrivain*. Ed. C. Magnien-Simonin. Paris: J. Vrin, 1991. 73-85. Print.
- Boaistuau, Pierre. *Histoires Tragiques*. Ed. Richard A. Carr. 1559. Mayenne: Société des Textes Français Modernes, 2008. Print.
- Boccaccio, Giovanni. *Decameron*. Florence: Le Lettere, 1999. Print.
- . *The Decameron*. Trans. Guido Waldman. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1993. Print.
- Booth, Wayne C. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. Chicago: U Chicago P, 1961. Print.
- Boudou, Bénédicte. Introduction. *Traité Préparatif à l'Apologie pour Herodote*. By Henri Estienne. Geneva: Droz, 2007. Vol. 1. 9-81. Print.
- . *Mars et les Muses dans L'Apologie pour Hérodote d'Henri Estienne*. Geneva: Droz, 2000. Print.

-
- Bourdigné, Charles de. *La Légende joyeuse ou faits et dictz joyeux de Pierre Faifeu escolier d'Angers*. 1532. Ed. Francis Valette. Geneva: Droz, 1972. Print.
- Bourgain, Pascale. "L'édition des manuscrits." *Histoire de l'Édition française*. Vol. 1. Paris: Promodis, 1982. 49-75. Print.
- Brantôme, Pierre de Bourdeille, seigneur de. *Extraits de Brantôme: Marguerite de Navarre*. In *L'Heptaméron des nouvelles de la Reine de Navarre*. Eds. Le Roux de Lincy and Anatole de Montaignon. 4 vols. (1880) Geneva: Slatkine, 1969. Print. Vol. 1, 131-148.
- Bryson, David. *Queen Jeanne and the Promised Land: Dynasty, Homeland, Religion and Violence in Sixteenth-Century France*. Leiden: Brill, 1999. Print.
- Campagne, Hervé Thomas. "Marguerite de Navarre and the Invention of the *Histoire Tragique*." *Approaches to Teaching Marguerite de Navarre's Heptaméron*. Ed. Colette H. Winn. New York: MLA, 2007. 91-96. Print.
- Canadé Sautman, Francesca, Diana Conchado and Guiseppa Carlo Di Scipio, Eds. *Telling Tales: Medieval Narratives and the Folk Tradition*. NY: St. Martin's P, 1998. Print.
- Carr, Richard A. Introduction. *Histoires Tragiques*. By Pierre Boaistuau. Paris: Société des Textes Français Modernes, 2008. ix-lxxxvii. Print.
- . *Pierre Boaistuau's Histoires Tragiques: A Study of narrative form and tragic vision*. North Carolina: Chapel Hill, 1979. Print.
- Cartier, Alfred. *Bibliographie des éditions de De Tournes, imprimeurs Lyonnais*. 2 vols. Ed. Marius Audin. Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1970. Print.
- . "Notes sur les deux éditions de *L'Heptaméron*, [...] 1559 et 1560." *Bulletin du Bibliophile* (1883): 214-221. Web. 23 March 2012.
- Castiglione, Baldassare, count. *Il cortegiano, or the courtier: written by the learned Conte Baldassar Castiglione, and a new version of the same into English. Together with his other celebrated pieces, as well Latin as Italian, ... To which is prefix'd The life of the author*. Trans. and Eds. H. Slater, F. Noble, W. and T. Payne, T. Wright, and J. Duncan. 2nd Ed. London, 1742. *Eighteenth Century*

Collections Online. Web. Gale. Rutgers State University of New Jersey. 25 Feb. 2014

Catach, Nina. *L'Orthographe*. Paris: PUF, 1978. Print.

---. *L'Orthographe française à l'époque de la Renaissance (Auteurs – Imprimeurs – Ateliers d'imprimerie)*. Geneva: Droz, 1968. Print.

Cave, Terence. *The Cornucopian Text: Problems of Writing in the French Renaissance*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1979. Print.

Cazauran, Nicole. "Sur *L'Heptaméron*: Enquêtes d'authenticité (Trois nouvelles "Gruget")." *Variétés pour Marguerite de Navarre (1978-2004)*. Paris: Champion, 2005 (2004). 539-556. Print.

---. "Sur trois récits de l'*Heptaméron*: de l'importance des arrière-plans." *Variétés pour Marguerite de Navarre (1978-2004)*. Paris: Champion, 2005 (2003). 519-538. Print.

---. "Boaistuau et Gruget éditeurs de l'*Heptaméron*: A chacun sa part." *Travaux de littérature* 14 (2001): 149-169. Print.

---. "Henri Estienne, lecteur de *L'Heptaméron*." *Variétés pour Marguerite de Navarre (1978-2004)*. Paris: Champion, 2005 (1988). 393-409. Print.

---. Preface. *L'Heptaméron*. By Marguerite de Navarre. Paris: Gallimard, 2000. 7-51. Print.

---. "La Première Manière de Noël du Fail." *Noël du Fail, écrivain*. Ed. Magnien-Simonin, C. Paris: J. Vrin, 1991. 35-47. Print.

---. *L'Heptaméron de Marguerite de Navarre*. Paris: SEDES, 1976. Print.

---. and Sylvie Lefèvre, Preface and Eds. *Heptaméron*. Books 1-3. *Œuvres complètes*. By Marguerite de Navarre. Ed. Nicole Cazauran. Vol. 10. Paris: Champion, 2013. vii-cx. Print.

---. and Sylvie Lefèvre. Post-Scriptum. *L'Heptaméron*. By Marguerite de Navarre. Paris: Gallimard, 2000. 7-51. Print.

-
- Charon-Parent, Annie (see also Annie Parent). "Aspects de la politique éditoriale de Galliot Du Pré." *Le Livre dans l'Europe de la Renaissance*. Eds. Pierre Aquilon, Henri-Jean Martin and François Dupuigrenet Desrousilles. Tours: Promodis, 1988. 209-218. Print.
- . "Le Monde de l'imprimerie humaniste: Paris." *Histoire de l'Édition Française: le livre conquérant*. Eds. Roger Chartier and Henri-Jean Martin. Vol. 1. Paris: Promodis, 1982. 236-253. Print.
- and William Kemp. "L'Histoire des premières éditions des 'nouvelles' de Marguerite de Navarre: Éditions imprimées et exemplaires significatifs, 1558-1561." *Heptaméron. Œuvres complètes*. By Marguerite de Navarre. Nicole Cazauran and Sylvie Lefèvre, Eds. Vol. 10. Paris: Champion, 2013. Book 1, cxlvix-clxviii. Print.
- Chartier, Roger and Henri-Jean Martin, Eds. *Histoire de l'Édition Française: le livre conquérant*. Vol. 1. Paris: Promodis, 1983. Print.
- Chavy, Paul. *Traducteurs d'autrefois: Moyen Âge et Renaissance*. 2 vol. Paris: Editions Champion-Slatkine, 1998. Print.
- Chenevière, Adolphe. *Bonaventure des Périers: sa vie, ses poésies*. Paris: Plon, 1886. Print.
- Chay, Paul. *Traducteurs d'autrefois: Moyen Age et Renaissance: dictionnaire des traducteurs et de la littérature traduite en ancien et moyen français (842-1600)*. Geneva: Slatkine, 1988. Print.
- Cicero. *De Oratore. De Partitione Oratoria*. 2 vols. Trans. E. W. Sutton. Ed. H. Rackham. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1967. Print.
- . *De Inventione. De Optimo genere oratorum. Topica*. Ed. and Trans. H.M. Hubbell. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1949. Print.
- Cioranescu, Alexandre and Verdun L. Saulnier. *Bibliographie de la littérature française du seizième siècle*. Paris: Klincksieck, 1959. Print.
- Comparot, Andrée. "La Réception de Rabelais dans les *Propos Rustiques*." *Noël du Fail: écrivain*. Ed. C. Magnien-Simonin. Paris: J. Vrin, 1991. 63-72. Print.

-
- Conley, Tom. "Des Périers on Speed." *Narrative Worlds: Essays on the Nouvelle in Fifteenth and Sixteenth-Century France*. Ed. and Intro. Gary Ferguson and David LaGuardia. Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2005. 35-58. Print.
- . "The Graphics of Dissimulation: Between *Heptameron 10* and *l'histoire tragique*." *Critical Tales: New Studies of the Heptameron and Early Modern Culture*. Ed. John D. Lyons, Mary B. McKinley. Philadelphia: U Pennsylvania P, 1993. 65-81. Print.
- . "Nouvelle et point de fuite: Pierre Boaistuau, *Histoires Tragiques* (1559). *Le Roman à la Renaissance: Actes du Colloque international dirigés par Michel Simonin, Université de Tours, Centre d'études supérieures de la Renaissance, 1990*. Ed. Christine de Buzon. Lyon: RHR, 2012. Web. 22 August 2014.
< <http://www.rhr16.fr/ressources/article/afficher/17>>
- Constant, Jean-Marie. "Un groupe social ouvert et dynamique: la noblesse provinciale de l'ouest au XVI^e siècle." *Noël du Fail Écrivain*. Ed. C. Magnien-Simonin. Paris: J. Vrin, 1991. 11-22. Print.
- Coq, Dominique. "Les incunables: textes anciens, textes nouveaux." *Histoire de l'Édition Française: le livre conquérant*. Eds. Roger Chartier and Henri-Jean Martin. Vol. 1. Paris: Promodis, 1983. 177-194. Print.
- Coulet, Henri. "Préfaces et commentaires du texte dans le récit court." *Préfaces Romanesques*. Ed. Mladen Kozul, Jan Herman, Paul Pelckmans, Kris Peeters. Paris: Peeters Louvain, 2005. 133-150. Print.
- Courbet, E. "Jeanne d'Albret et *L'Heptaméron*." *Bulletin du Bibliophile* 227 (1904): 277-290. Web. 24 February 2012.
- . Notice. *Les Baliverneries et les Contes d'Eutrapel*. Noël du Fail. Vol. 1. Paris: Alphonse Lemerre, 1894. Nabu Public Domain Reprints. i-lxxix. Print.
- Davis, Natalie Zemon. "Le monde de l'imprimerie humaniste: Lyon." *Histoire de l'Édition Française: le livre conquérant*. Eds. Roger Chartier and Henri-Jean Martin. Vol. 1. Paris: Promodis, 1983. 255-277. Print.
- Dédéyan, Charles. "L'idéal masculin de Noël Du Fail dans les *Propos Rustiques*." *Annales de Bretagne*, 54 (1947): 60-82. Web. 19 March 2014.

-
- . "Noël Du Fail et les femmes d'après les propos rustiques." *Annales de Bretagne*, 51 (1944): 206-217. Web. 19 March 2014.
- Des Essarts, Nicolas de Herberay, Trans. *Le Second livre de Amadis de Gaule traduit nouvellement de Espagnol en François, par le Seigneur des Essars, Nicolas de Herberay*. Paris: Janot, 1541. *Gallica, Bibliothèque numérique, BNF*. Web. 18 May 2012
- Des Périers, Bonaventure. *Nouvelles Récréations et joyeux devis: I-XC*. Ed. Krystyna Kasprzyk. Paris: Honoré Champion, 1980. Print. (1558)
- . *Novel Pastimes and Merry Tales*. Trans. Raymond C. La Charité and Virginia A. La Charité. Valencia: UP Kentucky, 1972. Print.
- . *Le Cymbalum Mundi, précédé des Nouvelles récréations et joyeux devis de Bonaventure Des Périers*. Ed. P. L. Jacob, bibliophile. Paris: Adolphe Delahays, 1858. Print. (1558)
- . *Œuvres Françaises de Bonaventure Des Périers*. Ed. Louis Lacour. 2 vols. Paris: Jannet, 1856. Print.
- . *Les Nouvelles Recreations et Joyeux Devis de feu Bonaventure Des Périers, valet de chambre de la Royne deNavarre*. Lyon: Rouillé, 1561. *Gallica, Bibliothèque numérique, BNF*. Web. 23 March 2012.
- . *Les Nouvelles Recreations et Joyeux Devis de feu Bonaventure Des Périers, valet de chambre de la Royne deNavarre*. Lyon: Granjon, 1558. *Gallica, Bibliothèque numérique, BNF*. Web. 23 March 2012.
- Les Discours non plus melancoliques que divers*. Lucs & Guiternes: Enguilbert de Marnef, 1557. Microform.
- Dolet, Etienne. *Préfaces françaises*. Ed. Claude Longeon. Geneva: Droz, 1979. Print.
- Du Bellay, Joachim. *La Deffence et Illustration de la Langue françoise*. Ed. S. de Sacy. Paris: Gallimard, 1975. Print.
- Dubuis, Roger. *Les Cent Nouvelles nouvelles et la tradition de la nouvelle en France au moyen âge*. Grenoble: PU Grenoble, 1973. Print.

-
- Du Fail, Noël. *Propos Rustiques*. Lyon: Jean de Tournes, 1549. Ed. Gabriel-André Pérouse and Roger Dubuis. Geneva: Droz, 1994. Print.
- . *Les Propos Rustiques*. Ed. Arthur de la Borderie. Geneva: Slatkine, 1970. Print.
- . *Propos Rustiques*. Paris: Estienne Groulleau, 1554. *Gallica, Bibliothèque numérique, BNF*. Web. 19 March 2012.
- . *Les Baliverneries d'Eutrapel, autrement dit Leon Ladulphi*. Paris: Pierre Trepperel, Nicolas Buffet, et Estienne Groulleau Libraire, 1548. Ed. Gaël Milin. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1969. Print.
- . *Les Baliverneries: et les contes d'Eutrapel*. Ed. Ernest Courbet. Vol. 1. Paris: Alphonse Lemerre, 1894. Nabu Public Domain Reprints. Print.
- Dureau, Jeanne-Marie. "Les premiers ateliers français." *Histoire de l'Édition Française: le livre conquérant*. Eds. Roger Chartier and Henri-Jean Martin. Vol. 1. Paris: Promodis, 1983. 163-175. Print.
- Duval, Edwin M. "Intertextuality: The Bible." *Approaches to Teaching the Works of François Rabelais*. Eds. Todd W. Reeser and Floyd Gray. New York: MLA, 2011. 54-61. Print.
- . "Et Puis, quelles nouvelles?" *Critical Tales*. Eds. John D. Lyons and Mary B. McKinley. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1993. 241-262. Print.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. *The Praise of Folly*. Ed. and Trans. Clarence H. Miller. 2nd ed. New Haven: Yale UP, 2003. Print.
- Estienne, Henri. *Traité Préparatif à l'Apologie pour Herodote*. Ed. Bénédicte Boudou. 2 vols. Geneva: Droz, 2007. Print.
- . *Apologie pour Hérodote: Satire de la Société au XVI^e siècle*. Ed. P. Ristelhuber. 2 vols. Geneva: Slatkine, 1969 (1879). Print.
- Ferguson, Gary and David LaGuardia, Introduction and Eds. *Narrative Worlds: Essays on the Nouvelle in Fifteenth and Sixteenth-Century France*. Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2005. 59-76. Print. *Medieval and Renaissance Texts & Studies* v. 285.

-
- Gaudin, Laurence. "La Fonction structurale des adresses au lecteur dans *Les Nouvelles récréations et joyeux devis de B. Des Périers*." *Nouvelle Revue du XVIe Siècle* 13.2 (1995): 179-198. Web. 31 March 2014.
<<http://www.jstor.org/stable/25598803>>
- Goyet, Francis, Ed. *Traité de poétique et de rhétorique de la Renaissance*. Paris: Librairie Générale Française, 1990. Print.
- Greimas, Algirdas Julien and Teresa Mary Keane. *Dictionnaire du moyen français*. Paris: Larousse, 2001. Print.
- Grierson, Herbert J. C. and Sandys Wason. *The Personal Note or First and Last Words from Prefaces, Introductions, Dedications, Epilogues*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1946. Print.
- Hampton, Timothy. "Criticism in the city: Lyons [sic] and Paris." *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism: Volume 3 The Renaissance*. Ed. Glyn P. Norton. Boston: Cambridge UP, 1999. 348-354. Print.
- Harris, John. "The Arrangement of Stories in Des Périers' *Nouvelles Récréations et Joyeux Devis*." *French Studies* 38.2 (April 1984): 129-143. Print.
- Hassell, James. "The Proverb in B[onaventure] Des Périers Short Stories." *Journal of American Folklore* 75 (January-March 1962): 33-47. Web. 23 March 2014.
- . *Sources and Analogues of the Nouvelles Récréations*. 2 vols. Chapel Hill: U North Carolina P, 1957. Print.
- Hirsch, Rudolf. "Printing in France and Humanism, 1470-80." *Library Quarterly* 30: 2 (1960) 111-123. Print.
- Hoffmann, George. "Renaissance printing and the book trade." *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism: Volume 3 The Renaissance*. Ed. Glyn P. Norton. Boston: Cambridge UP, 1999. 384-391. Print.
- . *Montaigne's Career*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1998. Print.
- . "About being about the Renaissance: Bestsellers and Booksellers." *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 22.1 (1992): 75-88. Print.

-
- Horace. *Satires, Epistles, Ars Poetica*. Trans. H. Rushton Fairclough. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1991 (1926). Print.
- Huchon, Mireille. "Le Propos linguistique de Noël du Fail." *Noël du Fail: écrivain*. Ed. C. Magnien-Simonin. Paris: Vrin, 1991. 111-125. Print.
- . *Rabelais Grammairien: de l'histoire du texte aux problèmes d'authenticité*. Etudes rabelaisiennes. Vol. 16. Geneva: Droz, 1981. Print.
- Irwin, Bonnie D. "Framed (for) Murder: The Corpse Killed Five Times in the *Thousand Nights and a Night*." *Telling Tales: Medieval Narratives and the Folk Tradition*. Eds. Francesca Canadé Sautman, Diana Conchado and Guiseppe Carlo Di Scipio. NY: St. Martin's P, 1998. 155-172. Print.
- Jacob, P. L. Introduction. *Le Cymbalum Mundi, précédé des Nouvelles récréations et joyeux devis de Bonaventure des Périers*. (1558-) Paris: Adolphe Delahays, 1858. Print.
- Jeanne Flore. *Les Contes amoureux*. Ed. Régine Reynolds-Cornell. Lyon: Sainte-Etienne, 2005. Print.
- Jeanneret, Michel. "Modular Narrative and the Crisis of Interpretation." *Critical Tales: New Studies of the Heptameron and Early Modern Culture*. Ed. John D. Lyons and Mary B. McKinley. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1993. 85-103. Print.
- Jourda, Pierre. *Une princesse de la Renaissance: Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre, 1492-1549*. (1932) Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1973. Print.
- Jodelle, Étienne. Preface. *L'Histoire Palladienne*. By Claude Colet. 2 vols. In *Œuvres complètes*. Ed. Enea Balmas. Paris: Gallimard, 1964. Print.
- Kasprzyk, Krystyna. "Un exemple de comique subversive: l'emploi du proverbe dans les *Nouvelles Récréations* de B[onaventure] Des Périers." *Le Comique Verbal en France au XVI^e Siècle*. Warsaw: Editions of the U of Warsaw, 1981. 219-226. Print.
- . "Henri Estienne conteur." *La Nouvelle Française à la Renaissance*. Ed. Lionello Sozzi. Geneva: Slatkine, 1981. 471-480. Print.

-
- . "Des Périers et la communication." *Etudes seiziémistes offertes à V. L. Saulnier*. Geneva: Droz, 1980. 169-178. Print.
- . Introduction. *Nouvelles Récréations et joyeux devis: I-XC*. By Bonaventure des Périers. Paris: Honoré Champion, 1980. vii-iii. Print.
- Krailsheimer, A.J. "The *Heptaméron* reconsidered." *The French Renaissance and its heritage: essays presented to Alan M. Boase*. London: Methuen, 1968. 82-85. Print.
- La Borderie, Arthur de. Introduction. *Les Propos Rustiques*. Noël du Fail. Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1970. I-LIV. Print.
- La Caille, Jean de. *Histoire de l'Imprimerie et de la librairie où l'on voit son origine et son progrès jusqu'en 1689. Divisée en deux livres*. Geneva: Slatkine, 1971. Print.
- Lacour, Louis, ed. Introduction and Preface. *Œuvres Françaises de Bonaventure Des Périers*. By Bonaventure Des Périers. 2 vols. Paris: Jannet, 1856. Vol. 1, vii-xcvii. Vol. 2, v-xviii. Print.
- La Croix du Maine, François Budé, sieur de and Antoine Du Verdier. *Les Bibliothèques françaises de La Croix du Maine et de Du Verdier*. vol.1-12. Paris, 1772. Print.
- Lajarte Philippe de. "The Voice of the Narrators in Marguerite de Navarre's Tales." *Critical Tales: New Studies of the Heptameron and Early Modern Culture*. Ed. John D. Lyons and Mary B. McKinley. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1993. 172-187. Print.
- La Monnoye, Bernard de, Rigoley de Juvigny, Jean Bouhier, Camille Falconet, Eds. and comps. *Les bibliothèques françaises de La Croix du Maine et de Du Verdier*. By La Croix du Maine and Antoine du Verdier. Paris: Saillant and Nyon, 1772-1773. Print.
- Leclercq-Magnien, Aline. "Propos rustiques: Caractérisation des devisants et statut du texte." *Noël du Fail, Ecrivain*. Ed. C. Magnien-Simon. Paris: J. Vrin, 1991. 49-61. Print.
- Lefèvre, Sylvie. "Notes sur les manuscrits et les éditions anciennes de l'*Heptaméron*." *L'Heptaméron*. By Marguerite de Navarre. Ed. with Nicole Cazauran. Paris: Gallimard Folio, 2000. 606-610. Print.

-
- . "L'Heptaméron entre éditions et manuscrits." *Marguerite de Navarre (1492-1992)*. Mont-de-Marsan: Éditions Inter-Universitaires, 1995. 445-482. Print.
- Marguerite de Navarre. *L'Heptaméron*. Ed. Nicole Cazauran and Sylvie Lefèvre. *Œuvres complètes*. Ed. Nicole Cazauran. Vol. 10. Books 1-3. Paris: Honoré Champion, 2013. Print.
- . *L'Heptaméron*. Ed. Nicole Cazauran and Sylvie Lefèvre. Paris: Gallimard Folio, 2000. Print.
- . *Heptaméron*. Ed. Renja Salminen. Paris: Droz, 1999. Print.
- . *L'Heptaméron*. Ed. Simone de Reyff. Paris: Flammarion, 1982. Print.
- . *L'Heptaméron des nouvelles par la princesse Marguerite de Valois, royne de Navarre, remis en ordre par Claude Gruget*. Ed. Claude Gruget. 1558. BNF, Paris: Vincent Sertenas. *Gallica, Bibliothèque numérique, BNF*. Web. 19 March 2012.
- . *Histoires des Amans fortunez dédiées à très illustre princesse Madame Marguerite de Bourbon, duchesse de Nivernois*. Ed. Pierre Boaistuau. 1557. BNF, Paris: Gilles Gilles. *Gallica, Bibliothèque numérique, BNF*. Web. 12 August 2011.
- Martin, Henri-Jean. "Classements et conjonctures." *Histoire de l'Édition Française: le livre conquérant*. Eds. Roger Chartier and Henri-Jean Martin. Vol. 1. Paris: Promodis, 1983. 428-457. Print.
- . "Le Temps de Robert Estienne." *Histoire de l'Édition Française: le livre conquérant*. Eds. Roger Chartier and Henri-Jean Martin. Vol. 1. Paris: Promodis, 1983. 230-235. Print.
- . "Galliot Du Pré." *Histoire de l'Édition Française: le livre conquérant*. Eds. Roger Chartier and Henri-Jean Martin. Vol. 1. Paris: Promodis, 1983. 244-245. Print.
- . "Culture écrite et culture orale, culture savante et culture populaire dans la France d'Ancien Régime." *Journal des Savants*, July-December (1975): 225-282. Print.
- . "Ce qu'on lisait à Paris au seizième siècle." *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance: Travaux et documents* 21.1 (1959): 222-230. Print.

-
- and Lucien Febvre. *The Coming of the Book: The Impact of Printing, 1450-1800*. Trans. David Gerard. Ed. Geoffrey Nowell-Smith and David Wootton. London: Verso, 2010 (1976). Print.
- and Lucien Febvre. *L'Apparition du livre. L'Évolution de l'humanité synthèse collective XLIX*. Paris: Editions Albin Michel, 1958. Print.
- McFarlane, Ian. "Le personnage du narrateur dans les 'Nouvelles Récréations'." *La Nouvelle Française à la Renaissance*. Ed. Lionello Sozzi. Geneva: Slatkine, 1981. 307-318. Print.
- McNamara, John. "Problems in Contextualizing Oral Circulation of Medieval Saints' Legends." *Telling Tales: Medieval Narratives and the Folk Tradition*. Eds. Francesca Canadé Sautman, Diana Conchado and Guiseppe Carlo Di Scipio. NY: St. Martin's P, 1998. 21-36. Print.
- Metzger-Rambach, Anne-Laure. "Figure du fol et réflexion sur le monde tel qu'il va dans les *Nouvelles Récréations et joyeux devis* de Bonaventure Des Périers." *Lire les Nouvelles Récréations et joyeux devis de feu Bonaventure Des Périers*. Ed. Dominique Bertrand. Clermont-Ferrand: PU Blaise Pascal, 2009. 119-133. Print.
- Montagne, Véronique. "Proverbes, blasons et expressions imagées dans les *Nouvelles Récréations*." *Bonaventure Des Périers, conteur facétieux*. Ed. Véronique Montagne, Marie-Claire Thomine-Bichard. Paris: PUF, 2008. 73-88. Print.
- Montaignon, Anatole de. Avertissement. *L'Heptaméron des Nouvelles de la Reine de Navarre*. Ed. Le Roux de Lincy and Anatole de Montaignon. 1880. Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1969. Vol. 1. 1-20. Print.
- Mounier, Pascale. *Le roman humaniste, un genre novateur français: 1532-1564*. Paris: Champion, 2007. Print.
- Norton, Glyn P. *The Ideology and Language of Translation in Renaissance France and Their Humanist Antecedents*. Geneva: Droz, 1984. Print.
- Nykrog, Per. "The Rise of Literary Fiction." *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*. Ed. Robert L. Benson, Giles Constable, Carol D. Lanham. Cambridge: Harvard UP; 1982. 593-612. Print.

-
- Ordine, Nuccio. *Teoria della novella e teoria del riso nel cinquecento*. Napoli: Liguori, 1996. Print.
- Parent, Annie (see also Annie Charon-Parent). *Les Métiers du Livre à Paris au XVI^e siècle (1535-1560)*. Geneva: Droz, 1974. Print.
- Pédeflous, Olivier. "La traduction de *L'Âne d'or* par Guillaume Michel (1517): une contribution à la poétique du roman au XVI^e siècle." *Revue d'Histoire Littéraire de la France* 107.3 (2007): 515-535. Print.
- Peletier, Jacques. "Art poétique." *Traité de poétique et de rhétorique de la Renaissance*. Ed. Francis Goyet. Paris: Librairie Générale Française, 1990 (1555). 221-314. Print.
- Pérouse, Gabriel. "A propos de Lupolde: un mot sur les personnages de Noël du Fail." *Noël du Fail Écrivain*. Ed. C. Magnien-Simonin. Paris: Vrin, 1991. 87-96. Print.
- . "Le Dessein des *Propos Rustiques*." *Études Seiziémistes offertes à Monsieur V.-L. Saulnier par plusieurs de ses anciens doctorants*. Geneva: Droz, 1980. 137-150. Print.
- . *Nouvelles françaises du XVI^e siècle: Images de la vie du temps*. Geneva: Droz, 1977. Print.
- Perrault, Charles. *Contes*. Ed. Marc Soriano. Paris: Flammarion, 1989. Print.
- Philipot, Emmanuel. *La Vie et l'œuvre littéraire de Noël du Fail, gentilhomme breton*. Paris: Droz, 1914. Print.
- Propp, Vladimir. *Morphology of the Folk Tale*. Trans. Laurence Scott. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1958. Print.
- Rabelais, *Tiers livre des faictz et dictz héroïques du noble Pantagruel, composez par M. Franç. Rabelais, docteur en médecine et calloïer des isles Hières*. Paris: C. Wechel, 1546. *Gallica, Bibliothèque numérique, BNF*. Web. 18 May 2012.
- Renouard, Philippe. *Imprimeurs & Libraires parisiens du XVI^e siècle*. 6 vol. Histoire Générale de Paris. Paris: Bocard-Bonamy, 1964-1995. Print.
- Ristelhuber, P. Introduction. *Apologie pour Hérodote: Satire de la société au XVI^e siècle*. By Henri Estienne. Geneva: Slatkine, 1969 (1879). Vol. 1. v-xlviii. Print.

-
- Ronsard, Pierre de. "Abrégé de l'art poétique français." *Traité de poétique et de rhétorique de la Renaissance*. Ed. Francis Goyet. Paris: Librairie Générale Française, 1990 (1565). 431-453. Print.
- . *Les amours de P. de Ronsard, ... nouvellement augmentées par lui, et commentées par Marc-Antoine de Muret. Plus quelques odes de l'auteur, non encor imprimées*. Paris: Veuve M. de la Porte, 1553 in *Gallica, Bibliothèque numérique, BNF*. Web. 18 May 2012
- Rossi, Luciano. "Entre fabliau et facétie: La Nouvelle en France au XVe siècle." *La Nouvelle de langue française aux frontières des autres genres, du Moyen Age à nos jours*. Eds. Vincent Engel and Michel Guissard. Ottignies, Belgium: Editions Quorum, 1997. Print.
- Roudie, P. and L. Desgraves. "Relations entre les imprimeurs et les libraires de Bourdeaux et de Lyon aux XVIe et XVIIe siècles." *Nouvelles Etudes Lyonnaises: Histoire et civilisation du livre*. Geneva: Droz, 1969. 65-78. Print.
- Rousse, Michel. "Noël Du Fail et le théâtre: de l'art de voir à l'art d'écrire." *Noël du Fail Écrivain*. Ed. C. Magnien-Simonin. Paris: Vrin, 1991. 127-143. Print.
- Salminen, Renja. Introduction. *Heptaméron*. By Marguerite de Navarre. Paris: Droz, 1999. xi-xcii. Print.
- Saugrain, Claude-Marin. *Code de la librairie et imprimerie de Paris*. Paris: 1744. Print.
- Schenck, Mary Jane Stearns. "Narrative Structure in the Exemplum, Fabliau, and the Nouvelle." *Romanic Review* 72 (1981): 367-382. Print.
- Sébillet, Thomas. "Art Poétique Français." *Traité de poétique et de rhétorique de la Renaissance*. Ed. Francis Goyet. Paris: Librairie Générale Française, 1990. 37-174. Print.
- Siméon, Jean-Pierre. "Classes sociales et antagonismes sociaux dans *Les Nouvelles Récréations et joyeux devis* de Bonaventure Des Périers." *La Nouvelle Française à la Renaissance*. Ed. Lionello Sozzi. Geneva: Slatkine, 1981. 319-351. Print.
- Simonin, Michel. "Notes sur Boaistuau." *L'Encre & la Lumière: Quarante-sept articles (1976-2000)*. Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance 391. Geneva: Droz, 2004. 3-14. Print.

-
- . "La disgrâce d'Amadis." *L'Encre & la Lumière: Quarante-sept articles (1976-2000)*. Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance 391. Geneva: Droz, 2004. 189-234. Print.
- . "De la Prime Fortune Éditoriale des Nouvelles de Marguerite de Navarre (XVI^e siècle et début du XVII^e siècle)." *L'Encre & la Lumière: Quarante-sept articles (1976-2000)*. Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance 391. Geneva: Droz, 2004. 705-718. Print.
- . "Peut-on parler de politique éditoriale au XVI^e siècle? Le cas de Vincent Sertenas, libraire du Palais." *L'Encre & la Lumière: Quarante-sept articles (1976-2000)*. Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance 391. Geneva: Droz, 2004. 761-782. Print.
- . *Vivre de sa plume au XVI^e siècle ou la carrière de François de Belleforest*. Geneva: Droz, 1992. Print.
- . "Ronsard et la poétique des *Œuvres*." *Ronsard en son IV^e centenaire*. Ed. Yvonne Bellenger. Vol. 1. Geneva: Droz, 1988-1989. 47-59. Print.
- Souillier, Didier. *La nouvelle en Europe: De Boccace à Sade*. Paris: PUF, 2004. Print.
- Sozzi, Lionello. *Les Contes de Bonaventure des Périers: contribution à l'étude de la nouvelle française à la Renaissance*. Torino: G. Giappicheli, 1964. Print.
- Stone, Donald Jr. "Observations on the text of the *Histoires des amans fortunez*." *Renaissance Quarterly* 33.2 (Summer 1980): 201-213. Web. 15 March 2014. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2861117>>
- Sturel, René. *Bandello en France au XVI^e siècle*. (1918) Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1970. Print.
- Tchemerzine, Avenir. *Bibliographie d'éditions originales et rares d'auteurs français des XV^e, XVI^e, XVII^e, et XVIII^e siècles* Avenir Tchemerzine. *Reproduction de l'édition originale publiée par Marcel Plée, 1927-1933 / avec annotations de Lucien Scheler*. 10 vols. Paris: Hermann, 1977. Print.
- Thomine, Marie-Claire (see Marie-Claire Bichard and Marie-Claire Bichard-Thomine). "Autour d'un titre: la nouvelle, le devis, la recreation et le rire." *Bonaventure Des Périers, conteur facétieux*. Ed. Véronique Montagne, Marie-Claire Thomine-Bichard. Paris: PUF, 2008. 15-40. Print.

-
- Thompson, Emily. "“Une merveilleuse espece d’animal’: Fable and Verisimilitude in Bonaventure des Périers’s *Nouvelles Recreations et Joyeux Devis*.” *Narrative Worlds: Essays on the Nouvelle in Fifteenth and Sixteenth-Century France*. Ed. and Intro. Gary Ferguson and David LaGuardia. Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2005. 17-33. Print. *Medieval and Renaissance Texts & Studies* v. 285.
- . "The Querelle in the Marketplace: Bonaventure Des Périers and the Fishwife’s Rhetoric.” *French Forum* 29.3 (Fall 2004): 1-12. Web. 24 March 2014. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/40552573>>
- Thompson, Stith. *Motif-index of folk-literature; a classification of narrative elements in folktales, ballads, myths, fables, mediaeval romances, exempla, fabliaux, jest-books, and local legends*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1955-58. 6 vols. Print.
- Thorel, Mathilde. "L’art de la parole-vive: le dialogue dans les *Nouvelles Récréations*.” *Bonaventure Des Périers, conteur facétieux*. Ed. Véronique Montagne, Marie-Claire Thomine-Bichard. Paris: PUF, 2008. 41-72. Print.
- Toulet, Jean. "Les Reliures.” *Histoire de l’Édition Française: le livre conquérant*. Eds. Roger Chartier and Henri-Jean Martin. Vol. 1. Paris: Promodis, 1983. 531-539. Print.
- Tudor, H. "L’Institution des Princes Chrestiens: a note on Boaistuau and Clichtove.” *Bibliothèque d’Humanisme et Renaissance* 45.1 (1983): 103-106.
- Veyrin-Forrer, Jeanne. "Fabriquer un livre au XVI^e siècle.” *Histoire de l’Édition Française: le livre conquérant*. Eds. Roger Chartier and Henri-Jean Martin. Vol. 1. Paris: Promodis, 1983. 279-301. Print.
- Veizin, Jean. "La fabrication du manuscrit.” *Histoire de l’Édition Française: le livre conquérant*. Eds. Roger Chartier and Henri-Jean Martin. Vol. 1. Paris: Promodis, 1983. 25-47. Print.
- Vigneulles, Philippe de. *Les Cent nouvelles nouvelles*. 1515. Ed. Charles H. Livingston. Geneva: Droz, 1972. Print.
- Virtue, Nancy E. "Translation as Violation: A Reading of Pierre Boaistuau's *Histoires tragiques*.” *Renaissance and Reformation/Renaissance et Réforme* 22.3 (1998): 35-58. Print.

Walter, Philippe. "Myth and Text in the Middle Ages: Folklore as Literary 'Source'." *Telling tales: medieval narratives and the folk tradition*. Ed. Francesca Canad Sautman, Diana Conchado, and Giuseppe Carlo Di Scipio. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998. 59-78. Print.

Worth, Valérie. "'C'est étranger naturalisé': Du Bellay traducteur de Virgile." *Du Bellay: Actes du Colloque International d'Angers du 26 au 29 mai 1989*. Ed. Georges Cresbron. Angers: PU Angers, 1990. Vol. 2. 485-495.