

UC Berkeley

UC Berkeley Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

Repatriating Romance: Politics of Textual Transmission in Early Modern France

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5d77p9f4>

Author

Louie, Linda

Publication Date

2018

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

Repatriating Romance:
Politics of Textual Transmission in Early Modern France

By

Linda Danielle Louie

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the

requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Romance Languages and Literatures

and the Designated Emphasis

in

Renaissance and Early Modern Studies

in the

Graduate Division

of the

University of California, Berkeley

Committee in charge:
Professor Timothy Hampton, Chair
Professor Mairi McLaughlin
Professor Victoria Kahn

Fall 2017

Repatriating Romance: Politics of Textual Transmission in Early Modern France
© 2018
by Linda Danielle Louie

Abstract

Repatriating Romance: Politics of Textual Transmission in Early Modern France

by

Linda Danielle Louie

Doctor of Philosophy in Romance Languages and Literatures

Designated Emphasis in Renaissance and Early Modern Studies

University of California, Berkeley

Professor Timothy Hampton, Chair

This dissertation reveals the central role that transcultural literary exchange plays in the imagining of a continuous French literary history. The traditional narrative of French literary history describes the vernacular canon as built on the imitation of the ancients. However, this dissertation demonstrates that Early Modern French canon formation also depends, to a startling extent, on claims of inter-vernacular literary theft. Throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, a central preoccupation of French authors, translators, and literary theorists was the repatriation of the romance genre. Romance was portrayed as a cornerstone of French literary patrimony that Italian and Spanish authors had stolen. The repatriation of individual romance texts entailed a skillful co-opting of the language of humanist philology, alongside practices of translation and continuation usually associated with the medieval period. By looking at romance translation as part of a project of national canon formation, this dissertation sheds new light on the role that chivalric romance plays in national and international politics. We see that during this period, chivalric romance emerges as a French nationalist alternative to humanist history.

The four chapters of the dissertation trace the phenomenon of romance repatriation from its origins in French humanist theories of genre, through its expression in translations of Spanish and Italian romance. In Chapter One, the Renaissance reception of the medieval *Pseudo-Turpin* is read alongside theories of genre by humanists like Pierre de Ronsard and Joachim Du Bellay, in order to illustrate the tension between two humanist projects: the philological reexamination of historical source texts, and the construction of national canons. In Chapters Two and Three, I trace the use of translation to transform foreign romances into French nationalist histories, looking at French translations of Garcí Rodríguez de Montalvo's chivalric romance *Amadis de Gaula*, Ludovico Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso*, and Matteo Boiardo's *Orlando Innamorato*. And finally, in Chapter Four I look at how the use of translation as a tool of nationalist annexation broadens beyond romance source texts. This dynamic comes to characterize French-Spanish literary exchange in general, as we see in French translations of Miguel de Cervantes' *Don Quixote* and a Spanish translation of Alain-René Lesage's picaresque *Gil Blas*. By showing that translation played a central role in the construction of the national canon during the Early

Modern period, the dissertation challenges myths about the linguistic and literary origins of the French nation that remain potent today.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	II
INTRODUCTION	III
CHAPTER ONE	
<i>FORGING THE FRENCH CANON: FICTIONS OF PHILOLOGY FROM THE PSEUDO-TURPIN TO THE PLÉIÀDE</i>	1
I. The Art of Lying: Forgery and Humanist Historiography	4
II. National History and Selective Philology: The Pseudo-Turpin in France, Spain, and Italy.....	8
III. Epic Without History: Du Bellay's <i>Défense et illustration de la langue française</i>	13
IV. Epic as Pseudo-History: Ronsard's <i>Françiad</i> e.....	17
V. Conclusion	26
CHAPTER TWO	
<i>THE KING'S SPEECH: ROMANCE, RHETORIC, AND ROYAL POWER IN THE AMADIS DE GAULE</i>	28
I. "Poésie en façon d'histoire": Translation and the Historicizing of Romance	32
II. Inventing Vernacular Pedagogy: The <i>Trésor des Amadis</i> as Commonplace Book	39
III. How to Talk Like A King: Nicolas Herberay des Essarts' Translations of Speeches	44
IV. After Herberay: Gabriel Chappuys and the End of the <i>Amadis</i>	51
CHAPTER THREE	
<i>VINDICATING TURPIN: FROM ROMANCE TO HISTORY IN FRENCH PROSE TRANSLATIONS</i>	
<i>OF ORLANDO FURIOSO</i>	56
I. Peripheral Charlemagnes: Turpin in Europe Before the <i>Furioso</i>	60
II. Impossible Genealogies: France and Turpin in Ariosto and Boiardo	64
III. Toward an Orlando Cycle: Early French Translations of Ariosto and Boiardo	70
IV. Return to Roncesvalles: François de Rosset's <i>Roland Furieux</i>	82
V. Conclusion	91
CHAPTER FOUR	
<i>"REVESTUE À LA FRANÇOISE": ROMANCE TEXTUALITY AND LITERARY MODERNITY,</i>	
<i>FROM DON QUIXOTE TO GIL BLAS</i>	94
I. "Extravagante, & Barbare": Hispanomania and Hispanophobia in French Classicism.....	97
II. Tilting at Turpin: Romance Textual Transmission in Cervantes' <i>Don Quixote</i>	106
III. Cide Hamete in France: Romancing <i>Don Quixote</i>	114
IV. "Robadas a España y adoptadas en Francia": Repatriating the Picaresque in the Works of Alain-René Lesage	124
CONCLUSION	
<i>THE COBWEBS IN THE WINE: TOWARD A REVOLUTIONARY ROMANCE</i>	130
BIBLIOGRAPHY	134

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thank you first of all to Tim Hampton, whose gift for bringing literature to life converted me from a modernist to an Early Modernist in my first year of graduate school, and whose Virgilian insights have led me through the *selva oscura* of the dissertation. To Mairi McLaughlin, whose generous mentorship and intellectual rigor have inspired me and shaped my aspirations as a scholar. To Vicky Kahn, who has made me a better writer and thinker, and whose class on Renaissance humanism was a formative academic experience. My deepest thanks also to Albert Ascoli, Déborah Blocker, and Ignacio Navarrete, whose teaching and guidance throughout my time at Berkeley made this project possible.

I am very grateful for the financial support and intellectual fellowship I received from groups and departments at Berkeley. Many thanks to the Romance Languages and Literatures program, the Departments of French and Italian, the Renaissance and Early Modern Studies Designated Emphasis, the Berkeley Language Center, the Townsend Center Translation Studies Working Group, Digital Humanities at Berkeley, and the Institute of European Studies. A special thank you to Linda von Hoene and my colleagues at the Graduate Division for helping me cross the finish line, and for everything else you do for graduate students at Berkeley. Finally, thanks to Kelly Anne Brown and the UC Humanities Research Institute's Humanists@Work program, as well as the tremendous student organization Beyond Academia, for helping me understand the many ways that humanists contribute to the world at large.

There are many teachers, friends, and colleagues who have made graduate school a deeply meaningful experience. In the French Department, I can't thank Mary Ajideh enough for her friendship, timely reminders, and wise counsel. One of the greatest pleasures of working at Berkeley has been the opportunity to learn from gifted teachers like Seda Chavdarian, Vesna Rodic, and Rick Kern, whose skill and dedication inspire me daily. My writing partners—Diana Thow, Elyse Ritchey, and Marion Phillips—provided laughter and companionship at many crucial moments. To Mike Arrigo: thank you for being a dear comrade and fellow traveler on this journey. To José Villagrana and Aileen Liu: I am so grateful for your support and solidarity amidst *tantas moles. Per aspera ad astra*. Thank you to Sokrat Postoli for your steadfast and generous friendship over the years, which has taken every form from fresh bread to earthquake assistance. Thanks to Livi Yoshioka-Maxwell, who very kindly invited me to present a version of my first chapter to her colleagues and students at Pomona College, and has helped me puzzle my way through both grad school and life. Thank you also to Jane Raisch, Keith Budner, Jenelle Thomas, Maya Smith, Brock Imel, Billy Heidenfeldt, Emily Hellmich, Jordan Greenwald, Nell Cloutier, Zane Burris, and Julia Nelsen for your academic and moral support. Thank you to Amy Saltzman and Kate Brittain, who cast out much-needed lifelines from the outside world.

To my mother, Judith LeFevre, and my brother, Cameron Louie: I am so grateful for your support over the past six years, and long before that, too. I love and admire you both more than words can express, and I wouldn't be here without you. My thanks to the Heckels: becoming part of your family has meant the world to me. To Peter, who has supported me all the way from qualifying exams to the last page of the dissertation: thank you for always reminding me of what really matters. I look forward to working side by side on many projects in the years to come.

INTRODUCTION

I. “*Ces beaux larcins connus*”: *The Foreign Origins of the French Canon*

Jean Vauquelin de la Fresnaye was a lawyer and poet from Normandy and admirer of the Pléiade,¹ who also fought in the French Wars of Religion. For Vauquelin, as for many authors of his generation, this experience shapes his vision of the past and future of French literature. The horrors of the civil wars inform Vauquelin’s depiction of the monarchy as a lone bulwark against political chaos in his 1563 poem, *La monarchie de ce royaume contre la division*, dedicated to Catherine de’ Medici. And in Vauquelin’s *L’Art poétique françois* (1605), his mission is to establish a continuous narrative of French literary history, from its origins to the present. It is easy to see how the desire for an uninterrupted literary historiography might grow out of the political and religious fragmentation that Vauquelin had recently experienced. But considering the traditional narrative of Renaissance vernacular literature as built on the imitation of the ancients, Vauquelin’s version of French literary history depends, to a startling extent, on claims of inter-vernacular literary theft. For instance, in speaking of lyric, Vauquelin describes the Provençal origins of the sonnet, complaining that the form is attributed to Petrarch, “Tant que l’Italien est estimé l’auteur, / De ce dont le François est premier inventeur.”² The Italian and Spanish languages themselves, according to Vauquelin, are beholden to French, as are these languages’ greatest literary works:

De nostre Cathelane ou langue Provençalle
La langue d’Italie & d’Espagne est vassalle:
Et ce qui fist priser Petrarque le mignon,
Fut la grace des vers qu’il prist en Avignon...³

These claims appear once again, with even greater force and specificity, when it comes to romance:

Nostre Amadis de Gaule en vieil Picard rimé,
N’estoit moins que nos Pairs entre nous estimé.
D’Amadis, l’Espagnol a sa langue embellie,
Et sa langue embellit de nos Pairs l’Italie:
Et quand nous reprendrons ces beaux larcins connus,
De rien nous ne pouvons leur en estre tenus.⁴

Here, Vauquelin outlines a specific project of literary repatriation: to reclaim the “*beaux larcins connus*,” those alleged (implicitly translational) thefts through which the Spanish and Italian languages enriched themselves using French romances now lost to France. The means of accomplishing this repatriation, for Vauquelin, seems to be translation as well— but a kind of

¹ Vauquelin wrote a poem in praise of Ronsard, Jean-Antoine de Baïf, and Jacques Tahureau, *De trois lyres*.

² Jean Vauquelin de la Fresnaye, *Les diverses poésies du sieur de La Fresnaie, Vauquelin...* (Caen: C. Macé, 1605), 20.

³ Jean Vauquelin de la Fresnaye, *Les diverses poésies*, 22.

⁴ Jean Vauquelin de la Fresnaye, *L’Art poétique*, ed. Georges Pellissier (Paris: Garnier Frères, 1885), 118. 1005-1010

translation in which no infidelity is forbidden, because the real fidelity is to France, and French glory, rather than to any source text. Vauquelin's *Art poétique* points to the ways in which the "beaux larcins connus" of Italy and Spain were a necessary imaginative step in the re-unification of a discontinuous French literary history.

The French project of repatriating romance does not begin with Vauquelin; nor does it end with him. The first of this study's two main goals is to trace the history of Early Modern French canon formation through translations of romance from Italian and Spanish, beginning with the first French translation of the *Amadis de Gaule* in 1540, and ending with the explosion of French translations of the Spanish picaresque from the seventeenth to the early eighteenth century. My first chapter describes how this history overlaps and engages with the now well-known process of *translatio studii* through which the literary and intellectual legacy of the ancients moves into the vernacular during this same period. We will see that French translations of the *Amadis de Gaula* (Chapter Two), *Orlando Furioso* (Chapter Three), and *Don Quixote* (Chapter Four), among others, illuminate surprising relationships between the new literary models ushered in by humanism, and the still-essential older models rooted in vernacular literary culture. Spanish and Italian romances were translated and re-translated into French in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries with remarkable frequency; and once transplanted, these romances took root and grew. The French receptions of the *Amadis*, the *Orlando*, and the *Quixote* all became projects of repatriation, in which translation and continuation were used to claim the works for France. Humanist theories and pedagogies of rhetoric, historiography, and philology all play important roles in this process.

The second goal of my study is to map the formal and ideological transformation of individual romance texts—and, through them, romance writ large—through translation. As such, my concept of romance is rooted in a pragmatic, descriptive understanding of genre, which draws on Renaissance theoretical texts, as well as reception and paratext. Scholars like Patricia Parker (1979) and Northrop Frye (1957) have provided influential definitions of romance as a set of formal and rhetorical strategies—in Frye's words, a mode rather than a genre.⁵ These strategies—such as *entrelacement* and the delayed pursuit of love—are present in all of the romances that I examine here, as are the traditional plot elements of romance (such as marvels, prophecies, and hidden identities). However, my interest here is not in these plots and narrative strategies themselves. Rather, my aim is to historicize the way in which romance translators, well aware of the protean qualities of romance, manipulate what Hans Robert Jauss calls the reader's "horizon of expectations."⁶ In paying attention to the processes through which romance is transformed, I present a new argument for granting practices of textual transmission an important place in the definition of Early Modern romance as a genre. Translation and continuation, just as much as prophecy and interlacing, prime the reader's expectations of a romance text.

For as we saw in Vauquelin's *Art Poétique*, sixteenth-century French culture ultimately produced not the rewriting of medieval romance that du Bellay envisions, but rather, a narrative of international textual thefts (the "beaux larcins connus") that claim Italian and Spanish works as part of the French literary canon. This is a project that is both innovative (in that it looks

⁵ Patricia A. Parker, *Inescapable Romance: Studies in the Poetics of a Mode* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1979); Herman Northrop Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism* (New Jersey: Princeton U. Press, 1957).

⁶ Hans Robert Jauss, "Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory," transl. Elizabeth Benzinger, *New Literary History* 2, no. 1 (1970): 7. This historicization also relates to Fredric Jameson's argument that moments where a text deviates from generic norms "allow us to read its structure as ideology, as a socially symbolic act, as a protopolitical response to a historical dilemma." Fredric Jameson, "Magical Narratives: Romance as Genre," *New Literary History* 7, no. 1 (1975): 157.

toward the formation of national literary historiography), and archaizing, in that it employs techniques of textual transmission associated with medieval literature. Mikhail Bakhtin's discussion of the ways in which chivalric romance is not novelistic is a useful encapsulation of this seeming paradox:

Strictly speaking, [Lancelot, Parzival, and Tristan] are not heroes of individual novels (in general there are no *individual*, self-contained chivalric romances)—what we get is heroes of *cycles*. They cannot, therefore, belong to individual novelists as their private property... like epic heroes, they belong to a common storehouse of images, although this is an international storehouse and not, as in the epic, one that is merely national.⁷

Bakhtin's definition of the romance as communal property is precisely the historiographical difficulty that the project of literary repatriation helps to solve.⁸ Staking a national claim on the romance genre, as Du Bellay suggests, requires planting a French flag on the "international storehouse" of romance. A strategy for staking this national claim emerges in the sixteenth century and is used again and again thereafter. This technique is to adopt heroes who had been partially or fully "individuated" from the romance cycle by Italian and Spanish authors—heroes like Amadis, Orlando, and Don Quixote—and to re-incorporate them into romance cycles through translation and continuation. From this perspective, the role Early Modern French romance plays in the history of literary forms is as a technique for absorbing new narratives into the emerging national canon.

To suggest that romance plays a crucial role in canon formation might seem counter-intuitive, since prominent intellectuals of the sixteenth century often derided romance as entertainment for women and children, good only for light amusement or the early stages of a literary education. Jacques Amyot, in the preface to his French translation of Heliodorus' *Aethiopica* (1547), writes of romance:

...la plus grande partie des livres de ceste sorte, qui ont anciennement esté escritz en nostre langue, oultre ce qu'il n'y a nulle erudition, nulle cognoissance de l'antiquité, ne chose aucune (à brief parler) dont on peust tirer quelque utilité, encore sont ilz le plus souvent si mal cousuz & si esloignez de toute vraysemblable aparence, qu'il semble que ce soient plus tost songes de quelque malade resvant en fievre chaude qu'inventions d'aucun homme d'esprit, & de jugement.⁹

⁷ Mikhail Bakhtin, "Forms of Time and the Chronotope in the Novel," in *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin*, ed. Michael Holquist, transl. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1981), 153.

⁸ The historical potency of romance—the reason that it becomes the vehicle of literary historiography—can be seen as a manifestation of what Bakhtin calls "the historicity of castle time"—that is, the settings and plots associated with romance generate narratives that look toward the past. ("Forms of Time and the Chronotope in the Novel," 246.) Castles, says Bakhtin, are full of legends, inheritances, family archives, ancestral portraits—small wonder, then, that the stories in this setting are often historically oriented. Bakhtin does not, however, apply the concept of "castle time" to the chivalric romance (since he defines romance as non-novelistic); rather, he defines it in relation to the English Gothic novel.

⁹ Jacques Amyot, "Le Proësme du translateur." *L'Histoire aethiopique de Heliodorus* (Paris: J. Longis, 1547), A.ii^v-A.iii^f.

Michel de Montaigne, in his essay “De l’institution des enfants” (1580), writes that as a child he found the whimsy of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* to be an adequate concession to “la faiblesse de [son] âge,” but as for romances: “...des *Lancelot du Lac*, des *Amadis*, des *Huon de Bordeaux*, et tel fatras de livres à quoi l’enfance s’amuse, je n’en connaissais pas seulement le nom, ni ne fais encore le corps: tant exacte était ma discipline.”¹⁰ Scholars have noted with some perplexity the fact that many literary figures associated with French humanism did, nevertheless, participate in romance translation projects.¹¹

My study unpacks this apparent contradiction by showing that though chivalric romance was not theoretically a genre held in high esteem by most humanists,¹² many recognized it as an indispensable link between the past and future of French vernacular literature. Joachim Du Bellay, in the *Défense et illustration de la langue française* (1549), generally takes a dim view of the native French literary tradition, recommending imitation of the ancients instead. However, there is one important exception. He famously instructs writers with ambitions to write a French epic, “...choisis-moi quelqu’un de ces beaux vieux romans français, comme un *Lancelot*, un *Tristan*, ou autres: et en fais renaître au monde une admirable *Iliade* et laborieuse *Énéide*.”¹³ Du Bellay’s suggestion that a *Lancelot* or *Tristan* could be re-fashioned into Virgilian epic underscores the generic and formal flexibility of romance, one of the reasons it proved so important as a vehicle for canon formation. Medieval romance is sometimes written in prose and sometimes in verse; it sometimes emphasizes love plots, and other times chivalric exploits; it influences, and is influenced by, other genres from epic and historiography to hagiography and didactic texts.¹⁴ Romance’s ambiguous relationship to other genres is, for Du Bellay, a strength rather than a weakness, in that it provides an opportunity to forge a modern French epic out of

¹⁰ Michel de Montaigne, *Essais de Michel de Montaigne*, ed. André Tournon (Paris: Impr. nationale éditions, 1998), 299.

¹¹ As one example, Virginia Krause, in writing on Barthélemy Aneau’s *Alector*, comments, “Given the climate around 1560, it is rather surprising that a serious humanist... should attempt to rehabilitate romance.” Virginia Krause, “The End of Chivalric Romance: Barthélemy Aneau’s ‘Alector’ (1560),” *Renaissance and Reformation / Renaissance et Réforme* 23, no. 2 (Spring 1999): 46. See also Michel Simonin, “La disgrâce d’Amadis,” *Studi Francesi* 28 (1984): 1-35; as well as Marc Fumaroli, “Jacques Amyot and the Clerical Polemic Against the Chivalric Novel,” *Renaissance Quarterly* 38, no. 1 (April 1, 1985): 22–40.

¹² While recent scholarship has pointed to Heliodoran romances (for which Amyot’s translation of the *Aethiopica* is a starting point) as a sixteenth-century humanist take on the romance genre, my discussion of “romance” here refers specifically to chivalric romance with its roots in medieval vernacular literature. Amyot’s discussion of chivalric romance in the preface to his translation makes it clear that he views chivalric romance as entirely distinct from Heliodoran romance. For a discussion of the impact of Heliodoran romance on Renaissance literature, see Steve Mentz, *Romance for Sale in Early Modern England: The Rise of Prose Fiction* (Aldershot, England ; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2006).

¹³ Joachim Du Bellay, *Les Regrets, precede de Les Antiquités de Rome et suivi de La Défense et Illustration de la Langue française*. Ed. S. de Sacy (Paris: Gallimard, 1967), 266. Du Bellay’s description of “ces beaux vieux romans” as “français” is more argumentative than it might seem; indeed, in the same passage he complains that Ariosto, with the *Orlando Furioso*, “a bien voulu emprunter de notre langue les noms et l’histoire de son poème.” I discuss this further in Chapter One.

¹⁴ Cf. Simon Gaunt, “Romance and Other Genres,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval Romance*, ed. Roberta L. Krueger (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 45. In Italy, this generic ambiguity raises important theoretical problems. Debates over epic and romance centering on the contrasting merits of Ariosto’s *Orlando Furioso* and Torquato Tasso’s *Gerusalemme Liberata* raged throughout the sixteenth century. Italian humanists spilled much ink seeking to codify romance in relation to other genres, a project that arose with particular urgency around the rediscovery of Aristotle’s *Poetics*. While this debate certainly appears in France, French humanists like Du Bellay—lacking the luxury of prestigious national vernacular models like Boccaccio and Petrarch—were much less concerned with differentiating romance from its neighboring genres.

native literary history. Du Bellay portrays romance as raw material, a natural resource that can be hammered into useful shapes to fill gaps in the national canon.

Looking at romance as part of a humanist approach to national canon formation, rather than as a genre inherently at odds with humanism, opens up a new perspective on romance's relationship to historical and political thought in Early Modern France. It also allows me to tell a very different story about humanists' relationships to the textual past. My work here builds on previous work on humanism and the emergence of vernacular literature beginning with Thomas Greene's *The Light in Troy* (1982), which masterfully identified the anxieties of discontinuity underlying the humanist's relationship to the classical past, and how this anxiety shapes humanist imitative practices.¹⁵ More recent scholarship, such as JoAnn DellaNeva's *Unlikely Exemplars* (2009), has begun to show that these same dynamics inform humanists' approaches to less prestigious, non-classical models.¹⁶ My focus on romance translation contributes to this reconsideration of humanist models, in showing how anxieties of historical alterity often inform humanists' relationship to vernacular texts from the more recent past, just as much as to classical texts. Re-framing our understanding of humanism to include inter-vernacular textual transmission allows us to see more clearly how humanist practices contribute to vernacular canon formation.

This approach reflects my belief that humanism should be defined broadly, including in its scope those texts, practices, and genres that represent compromised, rather than ideal, forms of humanist behavior. In this, I follow in the footsteps of work such as Anthony Grafton and Lisa Jardine's *From Humanism to the Humanities* (1986), which provides a nuanced understanding of the internal complexities and contradictions of the humanist educational program.¹⁷ In a sense, my study picks up where Grafton and Jardine leave off, in that it offers literary parallels to the pragmatic pedagogy of social advancement exemplified by humanists like Petrus Ramus. My study applies a similar lens to romances, which are often labeled non-humanist or even anti-humanist, finding in them innovative syntheses of new and old practices of textual transmission, deployed to reconcile the internal politics of a particular text with external circumstances of politics and patronage.¹⁸ I trace the trajectory of these practices through the seventeenth century, showing how writers with humanistic training negotiated a literary landscape characterized by an increasingly centralized and regulated relationship to the monarchy.

II. Translation and the Modernization of Pseudo-History

With this perspective on humanism in mind, we can now turn to the central question animating this study, namely: why is it that romances that were published and read with such great zeal in Early Modern France, the romances that underpin this new French canon formation,

¹⁵ Thomas M. Greene, *The Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982).

¹⁶ JoAnn DellaNeva, *Unlikely Exemplars: Reading and Imitating beyond the Italian Canon in French Renaissance Poetry* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2009). DellaNeva points out the omnipresence of "minor model imitation" (that is, imitation of relatively unknown Italian authors) among members of the Pléiade.

¹⁷ Anthony Grafton and Lisa Jardine, *From Humanism to the Humanities: Education and the Liberal Arts in Fifteenth- and Sixteenth-Century Europe* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1986).

¹⁸ In the case of this study, romance translation is informed by the humanist imitation and pedagogy drawn from Horace, Quintilian, and Cicero, but also by humanist historiography and philology, as well as forgery and pseudo-historiography.

were not, in fact, French? Why were translations (rather than the rewriting of medieval French works, as Du Bellay suggests) the mechanism for romance's role in canon formation? Popular sixteenth-century romances like the *Amadis de Gaule* and *Roland Furieux* were not, as Amyot puts it, works "qui ont anciennement esté escritz en nostre langue." Rather, they were more recent Spanish and Italian compositions, themselves informed in various ways by humanist literary culture. The techniques used in the Renaissance recuperation of romance bore little resemblance to the philological excavation of classical texts during this same period. There was no Poggio Bracciolini figure tracking down fragments of the *Chanson de Roland*, no painstaking editorial project to restore the authorial version of the *Roman de la Rose*¹⁹—there was, instead, the collective imagining of lost French source texts upon which the *Amadis de Gaula*, the *Orlando Furioso*, and even *Don Quixote* were supposedly based.

Romance translation practices also differed from those applied to classical texts since, as Vauquelin de la Fresnaye's *Art Poétique* illustrates, Horatian and Ciceronian exhortations to fidelity were not necessarily thought to be applicable to texts being "repatriated" to their original language.²⁰ Translational infidelity was not just allowed; it was an important affirmation of the original Frenchness of the translated texts. A narrative of continuous French literary history, one that could vie with the ancients' or the Italians', was an indispensable part of the vernacular French literary project. But this national edifice was not constructed using the same philological tools that humanists used to revive classical literature. Rather, the French canon was built using practices of transformative translation and continuation, which, though familiar from medieval textual transmission, are usually described as outmoded by the Early Modern period. The product of these translations and continuations was a vision of "repatriated" French literary history that was, at its core, pseudo-historical.

And yet, I show in Chapter One that to say that this literary history was pseudo-historical is emphatically not to say that it was divorced from the concerns of humanism. On the contrary, as Anthony Grafton and Walter Stevens have shown, forgery and pseudo-historiography were very much intertwined with humanist philology throughout the Early Modern period.²¹ In my first chapter, I set the stage for my analysis of translated romance by showing how Joachim Du Bellay and Pierre de Ronsard confront the problem of creating an epic out of national history that is according to the humanist historiography of their time, increasingly considered pseudo-historical. I show how this problem is evident throughout the text and paratext of Ronsard's *Franciade*, and how it informs Du Bellay's proposal in the *Défense et illustration de la langue*

¹⁹ For more on how sixteenth-century readers and authors did interact with medieval French texts, see Jane H.M. Taylor's *Rewriting Arthurian Romance in Renaissance France: From Manuscript to Printed Book* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2014), particularly Chapter 1 ("Pierre Sala, Poacher"). Taylor and I share an interest in sixteenth-century textual transmission and writers "assimilate the sometimes perplexing otherness, the 'alterity' of their sources into nicely comprehensible texts accessible to and reassuring for the readers of the Renaissance" (13). While Taylor is interested in the "translation" of medieval French texts into sixteenth-century French, she understands this term more metaphorically than I do here, and is concerned primarily with intra-French literary adaptation; nevertheless, there are important points of contact between our work, and a future area of study would be to consider potential overlaps between the kinds of translation-adaptation practices she identifies, and those that I discuss.

²⁰ This is not to say that the translators of romance do not make reference to theories and tropes that emerge out of humanist translations of classical texts. The seminal work on these theories is Glyn P. Norton, *The Ideology and Language of Translation in Renaissance France and Their Humanist Antecedents* (Paris: Librairie Droz, 1984).

²¹ Walter Stephens, "Complex Pseudonymity: Annius of Viterbo's Multiple Persona Disorder," *MLN* 126, no. 4 (2011): 689–708; and *Giants in Those Days: Folklore, Ancient History, and Nationalism* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1989). Anthony Grafton, *Forgers and Critics: Creativity and Duplicity in Western Scholarship* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990).

française for a romance-based epic. This leads me to compare Ronsard's dubiously scholarly use of humanist philology in the *Franciade*, to the medieval romance's techniques of fictionalizing (and, thereby, often obfuscating) the origins of a text. The trope of the "found and translated manuscript" is the most obvious of these. I argue that the paratext to the *Franciade* is, like a found manuscript narrative, a complex product of three overlapping matrices: the pseudo-historiography born of humanist philology; the fictionalized tropes of romance textual transmission; and the real labor (translational, philological, or otherwise) that produced the textual artifact in the reader's hands.

This ambiguity warrants serious consideration, since it can produce real scholarly problems that endure well into the twentieth century. For instance, as I discuss in Chapter Two, in the preface to his French translation of the *Amadis de Gaula*, Nicolas Herberay des Essarts claims that the Spanish text he is translating was itself based on a French original:

... il est tout certain qu'il fut premier mis en nostre langue Françoise, estant Amadis Gaulois, & non Espagnol. Et qu'ainsi soit j'en ay trouvé encores quelque reste d'ung vieil livre escript à la main en langaige Picard, sur lequel j'estime que les Espagnolz ont fait leur traduction, non pas du tout suyvant le vray original, comme l'on pourra veoir par cestuy, car ilz en ont obmis en d'aulcuns endroitz, et augmenté aux aultres....²²

It was only with the twentieth-century discovery of fragments of a fourteenth-century Spanish *Amadis de Gaula*²³ that scholars excluded the possibility that Nicolas Herberay des Essarts' claim to have seen an original manuscript of the work in Picard could actually be true.²⁴ Thus, just as humanist philology (willingly or unwillingly) lent its new technologies to the production of ever more persuasive forgeries, so it also spurred romance narration to newly plausible, if still fanciful, autobiographies of textual transmission. That this approach was embraced by many humanists can be seen in the fact that humanists like Henri Estienne, Étienne Pasquier, and Thomas Sébillet praised the *Amadis* throughout the sixteenth century; three members of the Pléiade (including Du Bellay) wrote prefatory poems for books in the series; and other Pléiade members, like Jacques Gohory, translated volumes themselves.

Chapter Two explains the unlikely humanist approbation for the *Amadis* by looking at how Nicolas Herberay des Essarts' translation of the *Amadis* skillfully weaves humanist rhetorical pedagogy and historiographical theory into the fabric of Garcí Rodríguez de Montalvo's original Spanish text. Comparing examples from Herberay's translations of the first four books to Montalvo's original, I show that one of Herberay's primary translational tendencies is to rewrite letters and speeches. I argue that one of the main functions of Herberay's translation is to provide instructive instances of effective vernacular oratory. I contrast the *Trésor des Amadis*—a collection of speeches and letters from the 21 volumes of the French *Amadis*, organized by rhetorical function—with a subsequent *Trésor des vies de Plutarque* drawn from Jacques Amyot's translation of Plutarch's *Lives*. In comparing the two, I show that despite Amyot and Herberay's equally lauded French prose styles, Herberay—in translating from a

²² Nicolas Herberay des Essarts, *Amadis de Gaule*. Livre I, Ed. Michel Bideaux (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2006).

²³ See Antonio Rodríguez-Moñino, "El primer manuscrito del 'Amadís de Gaula' (Noticia bibliográfica)," *Boletín de la Real Academia Española*, 199-216. Tomo XXVI, Cuaderno CXLVII (May-August, 1956).

²⁴ For example, see, as late as 1933, A. K. Jameson's "Was There a French Original of the 'Amadis de Gaula'?" *The Modern Language Review* 28, no. 2 (April 1933): 176-193.

vernacular romance, rather than classical history—is able to succeed where Amyot does not in creating the material for a vernacular commonplace book. The *Amadis* thus exposes internal conflicts between the project of transmitting classical literature in the vernacular, and that of developing a modern French prose style for use in contemporary court life.

But what happens when the pseudo-historicity of romance translation is applied to source material that is more directly historical? I address this question in Chapter Three, where I begin by looking at the reasons that romance had important new political stakes in France at this period, from its use as a model for courtly behavior, to its ties to the national myths underlying the Gallican monarchy and its diplomatic relations to Spain and Italy. These political stakes are all brought to bear on the French translations of the *Orlando Furioso*, which move Ludovico Ariosto's thoroughly non-historical adventures of the love-struck Orlando gradually closer to French pseudo-history. In looking at multiple translations of the *Furioso* across a hundred years, I show how the influence of the *Amadis*—which initially leads the *Furioso* to be translated as a prose romance—ultimately leads to the transformation of the *Furioso* into a multi-volume cycle. This cycle includes both translations of Matteo Boiardo's *Orlando Innamorato*, and pseudo-historical continuations that explicitly connect Ariosto and Boiardo's romance tales of Orlando to those of Roland, the French hero of Roncesvalles.

Throughout this analysis, I explore the heretofore-unremarked fact that royal historiographers (or aspiring royal historiographers) were principal agents in the textual transmission of romance in France. No historian seeking a position at court, or hoping to maintain such a position, could afford to overlook the political importance of chivalric romance. I argue that this is largely because romance became the *de facto* generic home for the episodes and characters from medieval epic that underpinned the Gallican monarchy's claim to religious independence and international primacy. Roncesvalles, Roland, Turpin, Charlemagne—all were, in the Middle Ages, more the domain of the *chanson de geste* or the chronicle than of romance, but the genres often overlapped. By the Renaissance, when humanists began to reform historical methodology, they no longer properly belonged anywhere; but at this moment they also became of crucial diplomatic importance. Roncevaux is the crux of nationalistic disagreement over medieval historiography with important implications for contemporary political relations between Italy, France, and Spain. Italian diplomats invoked Charlemagne's mythical founding of the city of Florence to curry favor with France, while Spanish historiographers complained that French political and religious authority was based on clearly pseudo-historiographical accounts attributed to the Archbishop Turpin. Thus, despite the widely proclaimed appreciation for Ariosto in France, the French translations work to re-historicize material that Ariosto, in his treatment of the narrator Turpin, explicitly proclaimed to be ahistorical. At the same time, in enacting this transformation, translators show themselves to be acute readers of the paradoxical relationship between Ariosto's text and that of his more conventionally romance-oriented predecessor, Matteo Boiardo.

Finally, Chapter Four looks at the long-term legacy of the transformation of romance into a tool of mediation between the literary and the pseudo-historiographical. In the seventeenth century, shifting cultural and political trends brought about a more intentionally regulated relationship between royalism and intellectualism. In this chapter, I consider how literary practices associated with chivalric romance—such as the “found manuscript” narrative; translation and continuation as vehicles for vernacular authorship; and the staking of nationalist claims on foreign source texts—are embraced in France well into the eighteenth century, moving beyond romance into a growing number of literary genres, despite being more commonly

associated with the pre-modern. First taking a broad view of the paradoxical Hispanomania and Hispanophobia that characterize French translations of Spanish literature in the seventeenth century, I then move to an analysis of French translations of *Don Quixote* in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. These translations, despite their proclaimed reverence for Cervantes' dismantling of the primitive genre of romance, nevertheless use the tools of romance textual transmission to transform *Don Quixote* into a multi-volume, multi-author romance cycle, in a process mirroring that of the *Orlando Furioso* and the *Amadis*. Ultimately, I argue that the translation of Spanish literature plays a central role in the articulation of modernity in seventeenth-century French literature and culture, particularly via the Quarrel of Ancients and Moderns.

III. Beyond "Belles Infidèles": On Reading Translations

My approach to reading translations in chapters Two, Three, and Four is the product of a considered, if somewhat idiosyncratic, methodology. To compare multiple translations—and translations of multi-volume romances, at that—is to chart a single course across a vast sea, rather than to map the ocean. My study is more historically broad, and more generically focused, than most translation histories in that it takes a *longue durée* approach to the translation of romance. By comparing multiple translations of each source text across approximately a hundred years, I hope to make visible long-term processes that cannot always be seen from the perspective of a single translation or a single source text. In assembling and comparing these translations, I have been able to bring to light a significant corpus that has not previously been considered as such. And reading a corpus of translations, rather than just one or two, has enabled me to reconsider and move beyond my own *a priori* understanding of what made particular source texts important and worthy of translation. The French reception of the *Orlando Furioso* is generally considered in the context of Italian epic; the *Amadis* in the context of Iberian prose romance; and *Don Quixote* in the context of the picaresque or the rise of the novel; but, as I show here, all three belong to a larger pattern of French translation and continuation in the service of canon formation. Viewing these familiar source texts from this perspective illuminates new ways of thinking about genre and the rise of national literatures.

Scholarship on translation history, to which this study contributes, is growing at a rapid pace. The past few decades have seen an explosion of new scholarship on this subject. To fully trace the reasons for this growth is beyond the scope of this discussion, but one contributing factor that has proved particularly relevant to my research is the rise of digitization, which has made previously obscure translations more widely available. This new scholarship has made great strides in our understanding of the readership and circulation of Early Modern texts, uncovering important intersections between translation and print, and identifying previously overlooked translation practices.²⁵ French scholars have played a particularly active role in

²⁵ This transformation is commemorated by recent edited volumes like José María Pérez Fernández and Edward Wilson-Lee's *Translation and the Book Trade in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge University Press, 2014). Other works on this subject include Marian Rothstein, ed., *Charting Change in France around 1540* (Selinsgrove: Susquehanna University Press, 2006); Anne E.B. Coldiron, *Printers without Borders: Translation and Textuality in the Renaissance* (Cambridge University Press, 2015); Belén Bistué, *Collaborative Translation and Multi-Version Texts in Early Modern Europe* (Surrey, England; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2013); and the section "Généalogies d'un genre" in Cécile Alduy's *Politique des 'Amours': Poétique et genèse d'un genre français nouveau (1544-1560)* (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2007).

translation history; and reception histories in general, often comprised of histories of individual translations, are not uncommon in French literary scholarship today.²⁶ The *Amadis de Gaule*, in particular, has emerged as an important text in the history of translation, reception, and textual transmission.²⁷ Several major works on French translation history have made important contributions to our understanding of Early Modern translation.²⁸ And recent works like Barbara Fuchs' *The Poetics of Piracy* (2013) and Warren Boutcher's *The School of Montaigne in Early Modern Europe* (2017) analyze Early Modern inter-vernacular translation in other cultural contexts.²⁹ This recent work has helped to supplement or revise earlier historical studies of translation—like Roger Zuber's *Les "Belles infidèles" et la formation du goût classique* (1969)—which, while influential, focus on just one or two exemplary translators, thus portraying practices as groundbreaking or idiosyncratic that are, in fact, part of a larger cultural pattern or translational tendency.³⁰ This new scholarship has also established the importance of placing translations within their own cultural context, rather than weighing them against anachronistic standards of translational accuracy. Still, I find that much work in translation history today is prone to over-rely on prefaces in characterizing what a translation is or does, without looking carefully at the translated text itself.³¹ For this reason, I view the history of translation practice as still very much in its infancy.

²⁶ Marian Rothstein, "Le genre du roman à la Renaissance," *Études françaises* 32, no. 1 (1996): 35; Centre V.L. Saulnier, ed. *L'Arioste et le Tasse en France au XVIe siècle*. (Paris: Rue d'Ulm, 2003), Jane H. M. Taylor, *Rewriting Arthurian Romance in Renaissance France*; and Louise Wilson's "The Publication of Iberian Romance in Early Modern Europe," in *Translation and the Book Trade in Early Modern Europe*, 201-215.

²⁷ The foundational text for scholarship on the *Amadis* is Luce Guillerme's *Sujet de l'écriture et traduction autour de 1540* (Lille; Paris: Atelier national Reproduction des thèses, Université Lille III, 1988). Also Marian Rothstein, *Reading in the Renaissance: Amadis de Gaule and the Lessons of Memory* (University of Delaware Press, 1999); Virginia Krause, "Serializing the French Amadis in the 1540s," in *Charting Change in France around 1540*; Christine de Buzon, "Amadis de Gaule en français: continuation romanesque, collection, compilation," *French Studies* 65, no. 3 (July 1, 2011): 337-46.

²⁸ Yves Chevrel, Annie Cointre, Yen-Mai Tran-Gervat, eds, *Histoire des traductions en langue française: XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles (1610-1815)* (Lagrasse: Verdier, 2014). Forthcoming volumes will cover the fifteenth, sixteenth, and twentieth centuries, and a previous volume has covered the nineteenth. Giovanni Dotoli, *Traduire en français du Moyen Âge au XXIe siècle: Théorie, pratique et philosophie de la traduction* (Paris: Hermann, 2010). M. Ballard and L. d'Hulst (eds.), *La traduction en France à l'âge classique* (Presses Univ. Septentrion, 1996).

²⁹ Warren Boutcher, *The School of Montaigne in Early Modern Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017). Barbara Fuchs, *The Poetics of Piracy: Emulating Spain in English Literature* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013). Fuchs' *The Poetics of Piracy* is perhaps the most direct scholarly precursor for my study. Situated within the literary tradition of reception studies, Fuchs' study, in her words, "traces the emergence of a national canon for England in the context of its rivalry with Spain—a model constantly emulated even as it was disavowed." Ranging across multiple genres, from the Renaissance to the present, Fuchs' interest is in how Spanish texts constitute an unacknowledged literary debt, consciously occluded by English authors due to an ongoing international rivalry. My study includes French examples that support Fuchs' argument that the Spanish literary influence on England during the Early Modern period has been unduly overlooked by scholarship. I also share Fuchs' desire to historicize strategies of literary appropriation in order to "reconstruct the ideological vectors of transnational exchanges" (16). However, our approaches and conclusions differ considerably since I focus more on the mechanisms of textual transmission within a defined genre and time period.

³⁰ Roger Zuber, *Les "belles infidèles" et la formation du goût classique* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1995). I would also include in this category Antoine Berman's *Jacques Amyot, traducteur français: Essai sur les origines de la traduction en France* (Paris: Belin, 2012).

³¹ This is not to say that paratext itself is not an important area of study; indeed, works such as Bernard Weinberg's *Critical Prefaces of the French Renaissance* (Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1950), Gérard Genette's *Seuils* (Paris: Seuil, 1987), and Kevin Dunn's *Pretexts of Authority: The Rhetoric of Authorship in the Renaissance Preface*. (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1994) are important predecessors to today's scholarship at the

Scholars in the broader field of translation studies have lamented the lack of attention to methodology in translation history.³² The fact that translation history is now studied across a number of disciplines—by self-identified translation scholars, but also by historians, sociologists, and literary scholars, each responding to questions within their own fields—makes methodology particularly thorny. Generally speaking, literary scholars working on translation are much more likely to situate themselves within the fields of book history or intellectual history than within translation history as a sub-field of translation studies.³³ In part, this is because translation studies scholars like Anthony Pym (1992) advocate approaches to translation history based in the “sociology of literature” rather than the traditional methodologies of literary studies.³⁴ Translation historians like Pym, in taking a sociological perspective, tend to emphasize the commercial rather than textual dimensions of translation, focusing on agents, trends, and institutions rather than texts themselves. But what I find useful in Pym’s methodology is his challenge to the assumption that, as he puts it, “translators worked in a certain way because certain conditions existed in the target cultures”; Pym suggests, instead, that “target cultures were as they were because of the way certain translators worked.”³⁵ My translation analysis is situated between these two poles: I take note of the ways in which translation practices are shaped by cultural conditions, while also seeking to uncover the transformative effects of these translations on French culture.

Therefore, this study, while primarily situated within the methods and conversations of literary scholars of translation history, is also guided in important ways by scholarship from translation studies. The literary approach entails reading prefaces and other paratexts, and considering the materiality of the books in which translations are printed; my work entailed archival research at the Bibliothèque nationale de France, the British Library, and the Bibliothèque municipale de Lyon, among other places. I also base my conclusions about the translations on comparative textual analysis that is, effectively, close reading. But unlike the typical literary study of translation history, my approach to the analysis of translations is informed by work from the field of translation studies on concepts such as domestication,³⁶

intersection of book history and translation history. My contention is simply that prefaces cannot be taken at face value in what they say about the translation practice of the works they precede; for a more detailed example of this problem, see my discussion of Alain-René Lesage’s *Gil Blas* in Chapter Four.

³² Anthony Pym, “Complaint Concerning the Lack of History in Translation Histories,” *Livius: Revista de Estudios de Traducción*, no. 1 (1992): 1–12. Anthony Pym, *Method in Translation History* (London – New York: Routledge, 1998). Theo Hermans, “Introduction: How is Translation Possible?” In *Between Cultures and Texts: Itineraries in Translation History*, ed. Antoine Chalvin, Anne Lange and Daniele Monticelli (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2011), 13. One example of an edited volume working toward a more explicit methodology is Georges L. Bastin and Paul F. Bandia (eds), *Charting the Future of Translation History* (Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 2006).

³³ This is the case with the work of scholars like Rita Copeland, Anne Coldiron, Belén Bistué, and Guyda Armstrong, all of whom have shaped my approach to this study. Rita Copeland, *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages: Academic Traditions and Vernacular Texts*. (Cambridge [England]; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991); A. E. B. Coldiron, *Canon, Period, and the Poetry of Charles of Orleans Found in Translation* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000); Guyda Armstrong, *The English Boccaccio: A History in Books* (University of Toronto Press, 2013), Belén Bistué, *Collaborative Translation and Multi-Version Texts in Early Modern Europe*.

³⁴ Anthony Pym, “Complaint Concerning the Lack of History in Translation Histories.”

³⁵ Anthony Pym, “Complaint Concerning the Lack of History in Translation Histories,” 8.

³⁶ Lawrence Venuti defines these terms as measures of translations’ interventions in or concessions to the prevailing norms of the target culture, the extent to which they either disrupt or shore up dominant genres, modes, and aesthetic preferences. Lawrence Venuti, *The Translator’s Invisibility: A History of Translation* (New York: Routledge, 1994). For Venuti, foreignizing translation is a contemporary ethical imperative (“it is highly desirable today, a strategic

retranslation,³⁷ and equivalence.³⁸ I find that these concepts supply useful ways of thinking about the kinds of similarities and differences that can exist between translations of the same source text, or between a translation and a source text. Scholarship on these concepts illustrates the fact that there are many different ways to measure, and to theorize, terms like “closeness” or “fidelity.” These studies also usefully illustrate the intuitive but under-recognized fact that translations can be (indeed, always are) partially “faithful,” by whatever measure. This is worth keeping in mind, since it places limits on how much we can use these terms to characterize historical periods’ translation practice. It also cautions us against taking paratextual descriptions of translation at face value, or assuming that a translational approach that appears in one part of a translation is used consistently throughout. Many of the translations that I examine define their approach in various ways (as a “traduction libre,” for instance, or a “traduction fidèle”), but we should be careful about placing too much importance on such definitions as descriptions of actual translation practice. As the retranslation scholar Outi Paloposki puts it, “Domestication and foreignization are abstractions, and as such, need to be treated with care in applying them to empirical studies.”³⁹ Not pretending to any absolute definition of these terms myself, I make every effort to use them as consciously relative designations, which I use to talk about how translations compare to one another, rather than to any objective standard of fidelity.

The study of these translations seems, to me, particularly important at a moment when pseudo-history has reasserted a powerful hold on the political imagination of all three countries

cultural intervention in the current state of world affairs” [Venuti, 20]). At the same time, Venuti identifies several periods in the history of translation, and describes the Early Modern period as producing a period of “fluency” and domestication (C17th-19th), developed according to Horace’s famous prescription in the *Ars Poetica* not to be a “fidus interpres” and including such practitioners as the *belles infidèles*. However, there is a contradiction in that for Venuti the degree of foreignization is both a characteristic of a historically bound, periodized translational regime *and* an approach that can (and should) be adopted at will by the modern translator; it is an ideological and *not* (as he clarifies in the second edition of *The Translator’s Invisibility*) a methodological approach. Nevertheless, the terms are useful and commonly used.

³⁷ The majority of empirical studies on retranslation have, so far, been structured as responses to (or tests of) the “retranslation hypothesis” famously posited by Antoine Berman in a special issue of *Palimpsestes*. (cf. Paloposki and Koskinen (2004), Isabelle Desmidt (2009), Deane-Cox (2014)). According to Berman’s hypothesis, first translations have a tendency to assimilate the original text to the target language and culture, whereas subsequent translations are always more foreignizing. (Antoine Berman (1990), “La retraduction comme espace de la traduction,” *Palimpsestes* 8:4, 1-7.) Much recent theoretical work on retranslation since Berman’s retranslation hypothesis (RH) has identified the motivation behind a retranslation as its key distinguishing feature. (cf. Enrico Monti (2012), Jörn Albrecht (2011), Yves Gambier (2012)). However, a second methodological question not addressed in any of these theoretical works is how, having established the motivation of a retranslation based on these contextual and paratextual factors, a researcher might then relate those findings to, or test them against, the retranslated text itself.

³⁸ Equivalence is, simply, the concept of equal value between translation and source text, “at the level of form, function, or anything in between” (Pym, *Exploring Translation Theories*, London ; New York: Routledge, 2010, 6). In the empirical studies I examined above, researchers propose various methodologies to account for equivalence shifts in retranslation (for example Paloposki and Koskinen’s example of the morpho-syntactic changes to The Vicar of Wakesfield, Desmidt’s “shortenings, substitutions, and extensions,” or Deane-Cox’s investigation of deictic markers or tense, aspect, and mood). The most important work on this topic for me is Vinay and Darbelnet’s *Stylistique compare du français et de l’anglais* (1958); I use their terms for translation procedures such as “calque” and “transposition,” as well as “prosodic effects” like “amplification” and “explicitation.” I believe that several of these terms (such as amplification) are non-technical and self-explanatory, but I provide definitions of other terms where necessary as I use them.

³⁹ Outi Paloposki, “Domestication and Foreignization,” in *Handbook of Translation Studies*, ed. Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer (Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2011), 40-42.

where I conducted my research (France, the United Kingdom, and the United States). The myths at the heart of national identity remain a controversial, yet still central, part of political discourse nearly five hundred years after the texts I study here. As recently as September 2016, as part of his bid for the French presidency, Nicolas Sarkozy gave a speech on immigration in the Paris suburb of Franconville in which he controversially said, by way of courting voters on the far right, “... nous ne nous contenterons plus d’une intégration qui ne marche plus, nous exigerons l’assimilation. Dès que vous devenez français, vous ancêtres sont gaulois.”⁴⁰ Historians like Benjamin Stora quickly pointed out that the idea that modern-day France is directly descended from Gaul is more a national myth than a defensible historical position.⁴¹ Just as quickly, others came to Sarkozy’s defense by arguing that history was irrelevant; his campaign manager, Gérald Damarnin, tweeted: “Petit, mes parents bercèrent mes jeunes années avec Astérix et Obélix. Mes ancêtres étaient culturellement Gaulois. Et j’en suis fier.”⁴² To become French, according to Sarkozy’s speech and Damarnin’s subsequent defense, is to embrace the mythology of the Gallic origins of France; and this mythology is embodied just as effectively by *Astérix* as by historical scholarship, if the latter will not cooperate.⁴³

When I began this dissertation, I had no idea that my study of the mechanisms through which fake history can become something history-adjacent would come to feel all too contemporary. My initial feelings of curiosity and bemusement regarding the use of translation as a tool of nationalist pseudo-history thus became considerably more conflicted over the course of my writing. It was no coincidence that these debates over Gaul occurred in the context of a speech on immigration; nor was it coincidental that Sarkozy made, in the same speech, numerous references to assimilation as the “roman national”: “... c’est tout notre roman national qui s’écrit: celui des femmes et des hommes du monde entier qui ont adopté la France, ses valeurs, sa nation...” Later, he repeated, “A la minute où on devient français, ce sont nos ancêtres collectifs, au sens du roman national.”⁴⁴ There is no indication that Sarkozy intended, in his comments, to make any literal claims about literary historiography. However, his remarks underscore how closely the fantasy of transforming the foreign into the French is still intertwined with the concept of the “roman national.” Long before *Astérix*, Early Modern French writers and translators called upon romance to preserve and transmit the national myths that history could no longer support. I have come to understand that it behooves us, as scholars of literature, not to overlook the political power of *Astérix*, *Amadís*, and “tel fatras de livres à quoi l’enfance s’amuse.” Nor should we forget to ask whether those who loudly proclaim something has been stolen from them—a romance, or a “roman national”—are actually stealing something themselves, and calling it repatriation.

⁴⁰ “Pour Nicolas Sarkozy, nos ancêtres étaient les Gaulois mais aussi « les tirailleurs musulmans ».” *Le Monde.fr*, September 24, 2016.

⁴¹ “Les Gaulois sont-ils nos ancêtres ? La réponse d’un historien.” *RTL.fr*, September 21, 2016.

⁴² Arthur Berdah, “‘Nos ancêtres sont Gaulois’: Sarkozy sous le feu des critiques.” *Le Figaro*, September 20, 2016.

⁴³ For more on the role of *Astérix* and the Gauls in the French colonial imaginary, cf. Janice Gross, “Revisiting ‘nos Ancêtres Les Gaulois’: Scripting and Postscripting Francophone Identity,” *The French Review* 78, no. 5 (2005): 948-59. There is also, of course, important work on the enduring cultural significance of the Gauls in Pierre Nora’s *Les lieux de mémoire*; cf. particularly Krzysztof Pomian, “Francs et Gaulois,” in *Les Lieux de mémoire*, ed. Pierre Nora, Vol. 1 (Paris: Gallimard, 1992), 40-105.

⁴⁴ “Pour Nicolas Sarkozy, nos ancêtres étaient les Gaulois...” *Le Monde.fr*.

CHAPTER ONE

Forging the French Canon: Fictions of Philology from the Pseudo-Turpin to the Pléiade

Pierre de Ronsard's epic poem *La Franciade* was first announced in 1549, just after Joachim Du Bellay's call for a "long poëme français" in the *Défense et illustration de la langue française*. A national epic would be the crown jewel in the French humanist project to build a vernacular literature that could rival the literary canons of the ancients and the Italians; and Ronsard, hailed as the greatest poet of his generation, would seem to be the logical writer for the job. But after being announced with fanfare, the *Franciade* project stalled. The first four books were not published until 1572, and they were then posthumously re-issued, heavily revised, in 1587. Until recently, modern scholars considered the *Franciade* a failure, both aesthetically and because Ronsard never wrote the remaining twenty books he had planned for the complete epic. Charles-Augustin Sainte-Beuve wrote in 1828, "Ronsard le premier rendit tacitement justice à son œuvre en ne l'achevant pas."⁴⁵ In 1962, the Homeric scholar Noémi Hepp upheld this assessment, saying, "La Franciade [...] est, de l'aveu général, l'œuvre la moins heureuse de quelqu'un qui n'en est pas moins un très grand poète."⁴⁶

However, this negative assessment of the *Franciade* has recently been reconsidered, beginning in the 1980's. In 1984 Albert Py called the *Franciade* "peut-être mal aimée pour avoir été mal lue."⁴⁷ In 1985, the Bibliothèque Nationale held an exposition with six *Franciade* documents including the original handwritten manuscript, and several copies of the first edition.⁴⁸ Perhaps the most compelling recent argument in favor of the *Franciade* is that of John Phillip Usher (2014),⁴⁹ who has shown that there is adequate evidence of the poem's success in its own time. Most notably, this success takes the form of a series of 78 paintings by Toussaint Dubreuil based on the *Franciade* decorated the walls of the royal chateau at Saint-Germain-en-Laye.⁵⁰ The paintings, commissioned by King Henri IV, clearly indicate a deep appreciation of Ronsard's poem by the French monarchs that the poem was meant to glorify. The paintings attest to the king's sustained and expensive interest in the story, and Dubreuil depicts the protagonist of the paintings—Francus, a refugee from the fall of Troy who goes on to found the nation of France—as an epic hero, memorializing him with a completeness that the poem itself never achieved.

What these paintings conceal, however, is Ronsard's deeply ambivalent relationship with the subject of his poem. The paintings represent a legend about the Trojan origins of France that was, in the second half of the sixteenth century, being contested by humanist historians. The

⁴⁵ Charles-Augustin Sainte-Beuve, *Tableau historique et critique de la poésie française et du théâtre française au seizième siècle* (Paris : A. Sautet et Alexandre Mesnier, 1828), 336. On the *Franciade*'s reception history see Denis Bjaï, *La Franciade sur le métier: Ronsard et la pratique du poème héroïque* (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2001), 12-13.

⁴⁶ Noémi Hepp, *Atti della Accademia delle Scienze di Torino*, t. XCVI (1961-1962), 493, n. 1.

⁴⁷ Albert Py, *Imitation et Renaissance dans la poésie de Ronsard* (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1984), 29-30.

⁴⁸ Denis Bjaï, *La Franciade sur le métier*, 13. The exhibition produced a catalogue, *Ronsard: La trompette et la lyre* (Paris: Bibliothèque nationale de France, 1985).

⁴⁹ Phillip John Usher, *Epic Arts in Renaissance France* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014).

⁵⁰ "At least according to Henri IV and his painter, France now *did* possess a *long poëme*—unlike earlier French monarchs, he did not have to look back to antiquity for a source of an epic gallery; Ronsard had, despite his later critics, actually delivered." Phillip John Usher, *Epic Arts in Renaissance France*, 159.

popular nationalist narrative tracing the founding of France back to refugees from Troy was politically indispensable. It established a historical France that was both independent from that of the Italianate states (and not beholden to the Holy Roman Empire), and internally coherent, with French kings and citizens sharing a single unbroken bloodline. This historical genealogy, derived from medieval chronicles, depicted Charlemagne as the progenitor of the Gallican kingship, with French kings inheriting his responsibility as defender of the faith. Sixteenth-century historical works such as Jean Lemaire de Belges' *Illustrations de Gaule et singularitez de Troye* (1511-1512) and Guillaume Du Bellay's *Epitomé de l'antiquité des Gaules et de France* (1556) endowed Charlemagne (and the French kingship) with even greater significance. Walter Stephens has shown that Lemaire presents Charlemagne as both the genealogical and allegorical inheritor of the Biblical and classical worlds. According to Lemaire, Charlemagne is literally descended from the illustrious bloodlines of Noah and of Francus (a Trojan); and he also gives meaning to these earlier events, fulfilling a Christian typology that leads to modern France.⁵¹ The story of Francus is thus a crucial link between the mythological and historiographical narratives underpinning the French monarchy. The text of Ronsard's *Franciade*—at least, the four books that he completed—is full of passages and episodes that celebrate the direct genealogical connection between Francus and the sixteenth-century French monarchy.

But the paratexts to the *Franciade* also attest to Ronsard's awareness that this genealogy was the subject of fierce debate in sixteenth-century humanist historiography. The mid-sixteenth century was a period of rapid change in France—cultural, aesthetic, and political.⁵² One specific area of change was the emergence of new ideas about the theory and practice of history. History was traditionally considered a branch of rhetoric concerned with moral and political education; from the twelfth century through the Renaissance, many scholars claimed, as Cicero and Quintilian had, that the use of rhetorical techniques in historical writing did not jeopardize history's relationship to truth.⁵³ As early as the fourteenth century, though, writers of history were beginning to discuss the importance of finding credible sources. During the Renaissance, many humanists began to advocate for the importance of evaluating the sources upon which history was based, using the tools of textual criticism provided by humanist philology. As this methodology gained importance, some mid-sixteenth-century humanists began to advocate for a total separation between rhetoric and history.⁵⁴ The concept of the Trojan origins of France was situated squarely in the center of these debates.

Composing a national epic about the Trojan founder of France in this intellectual climate thus posed considerable challenges. Looking at Ronsard's *Franciade* through this lens illuminates the tension between the work of the poet and the truth of the historian that characterized the entire project of constructing the French literary canon during this period. The creation of a French cultural history required the establishment of a national canon of poets and scholars who could rival those of classical antiquity, but also those of Italy. Ever since Petrarch dismissed France as a nation of barbarians in the fourteenth century,⁵⁵ French scholars had

⁵¹ Walter Stephens, *Giants in Those Days* (Lincoln; London: University of Nebraska Press, 1989), 168-170.

⁵² For some of the different causes of this change cf. Marian Rothstein, ed., *Charting Change in France around 1540* (Selinsgrove: Susquehanna University Press, 2006).

⁵³ Anthony Grafton, *What Was History? The Art of History in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 51.

⁵⁴ Ctd. Grafton, *What Was History?*, 39.

⁵⁵ Among many such statements made in Petrarch's "Against a Detractor of Italy," cf. "Clearly, every Gaul is a barbarian, but not every barbarian is a Gaul." Francesco Petrarca, *Invectives*, ed. and transl. David Marsh (Cambridge, MA; London: Harvard University Press, 2003), 439. This invective is part of a quarrel over returning

sought to build their own lineage of intellectual luminaries, but this lineage was unfortunately patchy. The list usually began with Gallo-Roman authors such as Statius and Claudian, proceeded through late antiquity, and then took a long hiatus before picking up again with twelfth-century scholars such as Alexander of Hales and Hildebert of Lavardin. Colette Beaune observes that when scholars attempted to construct such canons, “[t]he result was a fragmentary notion of French culture itself, one whose history was punctuated by many long pauses.”⁵⁶ Symphorien Champier, who in his *Defense against a calumniator of Gaul* and *On the Writers of Gaul* was able to offer the most complete picture yet of French intellectual history, wrote that stories about French heroes should be written “in our French tongue, for they always sought the public welfare of the French nation [and therefore] have always been loved by all French people”⁵⁷; however, as Beaune points out, Champier wrote in Latin, as did all the authors he cites.

By the sixteenth century, then, it was clear that there were significant obstacles in establishing a historiography of French scholarship, and even greater obstacles in building a canon of literature written in the French vernacular, rather than in Latin. Thus, while scholars like Thomas Greene and Terence Cave have pointed to the important influence of classical imitative theory on the poetic practice of the Pléiade,⁵⁸ there is another humanist textual practice that is just as relevant in their conception of epic: forgery. It is well known today that as the philological scrutiny of sources became increasingly central to humanist scholarship, forgers developed increasingly sophisticated methods for inventing sources that could pass muster.⁵⁹ But the distinction between “forger” and “critic,” I argue in this chapter, is much less clear-cut than it might seem when it comes to the invention of the literary canon.

In the epic theory of members of the Pléiade—most notably the prefaces to Ronsard’s *Franciade*, and Du Bellay’s *Défense et illustration de la langue française*—we see these authors using their understanding of historiographical critical method in selective, strategic ways. At the same time, comparing Ronsard’s and Du Bellay’s use of philological fictions to imagine a continuous French literary and cultural history exposes certain contrasts and inconsistencies within the Pléiade literary project. In considering their work from this perspective, we can see that Ronsard and Du Bellay hold very different views about what obligations a literary humanist has to humanist historiography. Du Bellay views the literary humanist as an arbiter of style first and foremost; as such, he distinguishes between genres like history, romance, epic on the basis of their different formal qualities, rather than their relationship to truth. His depiction of French literary history is forged around this perspective. Ronsard, on the other hand, presents a neo-Aristotelian view of history as the province of truth, and poetry as the realm of verisimilitude. But his definitions of these terms are informed by the inherently pseudo-historical nature of the *Franciade* as a work of national mythology, in ways that reflect similar compromises made by humanist historiographers.

the seat of the papacy from Avignon to Rome. This quarrel directly concerns the respective cultural statuses of France and Italy, prefiguring the Renaissance quarrels over Charlemagne that I discuss in this chapter and Chapter 3.

⁵⁶ Colette Beaune, *The Birth of an Ideology: Myths and Symbols of Nation in Late-Medieval France*, transl. Fredric L. Cheyette (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991), 279

⁵⁷ Ctd. Beaune, *The Birth of an Ideology*, 282.

⁵⁸ Thomas M. Greene, *The Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982). Terence Cave, *The Cornucopian Text: Problems of Writing in the French Renaissance* (Clarendon Press, 1979).

⁵⁹ Anthony Grafton, *Forgers and Critics: Creativity and Duplicity in Western Scholarship* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990).

This chapter begins by discussing the developments in humanist historiography that placed new pressure on the relationship between epic and history in the Renaissance. Using the example of the medieval history the *Pseudo-Turpin* as a case study, I show that across Europe, the deployment of humanist critical methods to debunk particular texts and histories was frequently politically motivated. The Early Modern reception of this text in France, Spain, and Italy shows that humanists deployed philological criticism in its purist form to dismantle the cherished national myths of their political rivals. At the same time, humanists referred to the rhetorical nature of historiography in justifying falsehoods they deemed politically necessary. In the latter half of the chapter, I look at how these dynamics inform questions of national canon formation, imitative practice, and genre in the epic theory of Ronsard and Du Bellay.

I. The Art of Lying: Forgery and Humanist Historiography

It has long been a commonplace of modern historiographical scholarship that fifteenth-century Italian humanists, like Leonardo Bruni and Lorenzo Valla, laid the foundations for the methodologies that constitute history today. According to this view, these humanists broke from the methods of medieval historiography, which were based on the authority of particular texts, rather than their verifiability, to found a historical method based on the scrutiny and weighing of primary sources (I refer to the latter practice here as “critical methods”).⁶⁰ However, more recent scholarship has begun to re-evaluate this view of humanist historiography, taking note of the ways in which these humanists’ practices show that the new critical methods were not an end in themselves, but rather used in the service of other social, political, and intellectual goals. Gary Ianziti (2011) has made an important recent contribution to our understanding of how the critical methods of humanists like Bruni and Valla did not exclude practices that seem surprisingly unscholarly:

These might include the deliberate suppression of information, the rearrangement of key facts, and even the outright falsification of data. An important reason—often overlooked—behind such revisionism was the need to cater to new audiences. Bruni and his fellow humanists were for the most part closely associated with the inner circle of the Italian ruling elites. Their job descriptions as humanists required them, among other duties, to elaborate accounts of the past that would be compatible with the needs and tastes of their readership.⁶¹

This perspective is an important addition (and to some extent, a corrective) to Anthony Grafton’s conclusions about the relationship between humanist philology and forgery. Grafton calls the notorious forger Annius of Viterbo, whose forged works are the basis for Jean Lemaire de Belges’ French history, “the first really modern theorist of critical reading of historians.”⁶² He considers Annius’ deep knowledge of classical philology and history, as well as the complex architecture of imaginary authors and translators to whom the eleven chronicles in his forged

⁶⁰ Cf. Berthold L. Ullman, “Leonardo Bruni and Humanistic Historiography,” *Medievalia et Humanistica* 4 (1946): 45-61; Edmund B. Fryde, *Humanism and Renaissance Historiography* (London: The Hambledon Press 1983).

⁶¹ Gary Ianziti, *Writing History in Renaissance Italy: Leonardo Bruni and the Uses of the Past* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012), 4.

⁶² Grafton, *Forgers and Critics*, 104.

collection are attributed, an unusual and remarkable manifestation of humanist erudition. He argues that sixteenth-century French humanists like Guillaume Postel and Jean Bodin (among others), in considering and debunking the forgeries of Anniius of Viterbo, adopted certain aspects of his methods and conclusions.⁶³

But leaving celebrity forgers like Anniius aside for a moment, studies like Ianziti's show us that certain practices we might place under the category of "forgery"—the suppression of information, the rearrangement of facts, and the falsification of data—can also be usefully understood as routine among some of the most widely respected humanist historians. As Ianziti shows, in practice, the use of critical methods had to be reconciled with the political needs of a historian's patrons. There may be a clear and salient distinction to be made between the wholly deceptive texts produced by Anniius and the falsified information promulgated by historians like Bruni and Valla. But at the same time, it is too simplistic to say that forgers and critics represented two different ethical positions in relation to the use of critical methods. "Critics" themselves often shared with forgers a selective, flexible deployment of those methods to achieve particular political ends.⁶⁴ To fully understand humanist textual practices requires us to recognize the highly pragmatic forms that these practices sometimes took, often shaping themselves around the requirements of national politics.

We might, then, reframe the ethical dimensions of Renaissance forgery by looking at it as a politicized form of historiographical critique.⁶⁵ As I have mentioned, humanist historians were by no means consistent, rigorous devotees of critical method under all circumstances. On the other hand, critical method was a useful weapon that could be wielded against other nations' historical texts, since many humanist rhetorical practices verged on forgery in method, if not in intent. Prior to the advent of critical methods, the writing of history was viewed as a literary task governed by rhetorical theory. The teaching of rhetoric entailed an attention to style and dialect, as well as the rhetorical and grammatical concepts of decorum. Techniques like *sermocinatio*—the invention of fictional speeches attributed to historical figures—were long-standing parts of historical writing, firmly supported by classical rhetorical theory from the likes of Cicero, Quintilian, and the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. Such techniques fell under the umbrella of *enargeia*—techniques to make the truth more visible and emotionally compelling to the listener, or as Matthew Kempshall puts it, "when something true needs, not just to be stated (*dicere*) but also, in some sense, to be shown (*ostendere*)."⁶⁶ For Quintilian, the moral use of such techniques relies on the orator's superior judgment, for he himself is not misled by his own falsehoods, but rather uses them to guide the suggestible masses toward the truth.⁶⁷ Therefore, learning how to

⁶³ Anthony Grafton, *Defenders of the Text: The traditions of scholarship in an age of science, 1450-1800* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994), 80.

⁶⁴ Some part of Anniius' reception, particularly in France and Italy, included those who saw through the forger's philological schemes, but rather than unmasking him, chose to tweak his philological fictions for their own purposes. After all, one can hardly be accused of failing to properly interpret a forger. And those sixteenth-century humanists who most clearly dismantled the stylistic and textual inconsistencies that made Anniius' forgery clear—Antonio Agustín of Tarragona, and Gsapar Barreiros of Portugal—belonged to nations that had nothing to lose (and, indeed, much to gain) from Anniius' exposure. Walter Stephens, "When Pope Noah Ruled the Etruscans: Anniius of Viterbo and His Forged Antiquities," *MLN* 119, no. 1a (2004): S218.

⁶⁵ Grafton himself has suggested, in a work more recent than *Forgers and Critics*, that humanist historians like François Baudouin and Jean Bodin "treated the *ars historica* as a hermeneutical discipline, a set of rules for critical readers of history, rather than a set of canons for effective writers." Grafton, *What Was History?*, 68.

⁶⁶ Matthew Kempshall, *Rhetoric and the Writing of History, 400-1500* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2011), 331.

⁶⁷ Kempshall, *Rhetoric and the Writing of History*, 343.

effectively invent speeches and impersonate historical figures was an important part of the orator's rhetorical training, and a normal part of humanist historical writing throughout much of the Renaissance.⁶⁸

This can be seen, for instance, in Lorenzo Valla's treatise on the Donation of Constantine, *De falso credita et ementita Constantini donatione*,⁶⁹ a paradigmatic work of humanist scholarship. Drawing on humanist philological techniques, Valla scrutinized and, ultimately, debunked a number of fraudulent but politically important texts from the Middle Ages. The best-known part of Valla's treatise is his painstaking analysis of the Latin of the *Donation of Constantine*, which shows that the document could not have been written in the fourth century, and was thus a forgery. But the treatise also contains a lesser-known series of speeches written by Valla and attributed to historical figures such as the Pope and Constantine's sons, arguing against the donation. These two dimensions of Valla's work illustrate the complexity of humanist historiography prior to the sixteenth century. Matthew Kempshall points out that the long-term historiographical legacy of Valla's humanist philology was a decreased emphasis on the use of rhetorical techniques in historical writing, in favor of illuminating the "philological relativism" of past historical texts used as sources.⁷⁰ This movement toward philological approaches entailed a hermeneutical definition of historiography as the weighing of evidence rather than as a rhetorical practice. However, despite the fact that Valla is in some sense the founding father of this school of historiography, he himself was very much still engaged in rhetorical practices such as *sermocinatio*. Valla explicitly addressed and dismissed the notion that such speeches might be mistaken as real in his *Gesta Ferdinandi Regis Aragonum*, asking: "Does anyone actually believe that those admirable speeches that we find in histories are genuine, and not rather fitted, by a wise and eloquent writer, to the person, the time, and the situation, as their way of teaching us both eloquence and wisdom?"⁷¹ As Anthony Grafton points out, Valla's question echoes humanists' beliefs that the historical speech served pedagogical functions relating to prudence and judgment for both the writer and the reader.⁷² Techniques like *sermocinatio* were thus considered justifiable instances of falsehood in the service of truth, so long as they were composed credibly.

Valla's contemporary, Leonardo Bruni, introduced a new element of rigor to the use of such speeches by including transcriptions or paraphrases of written records, rather than simply inventing them all himself. Of those that Bruni did invent, Eric Cochrane argues that their primary function is to elucidate the historical events' *ratio*, or causes, rather than for rhetorical purposes of *enargeia*; for Bruni, the primary function of historiography is to train the prudential judgment of the reader through truthful exempla.⁷³ Bruni also distinguished between histories pertaining to the lives of men of letters, which could be written in the vernacular (as he did in his

⁶⁸ Kempshall, *Rhetoric and the Writing of History*, 340.

⁶⁹ *De falso credita et ementita Constantini donatione libri duo*, written ca. 1440 and first printed in 1517. For more on this, see Riccardo Fubini, "Humanism and Truth: Valla Writes Against the Donation of Constantine," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 57, no. 1 (1996): 79-86 and Salvatore I. Camporeale, "Lorenzo Valla's Oratio on the Pseudo-Donation of Constantine: Dissent and Innovation in Early Renaissance Humanism," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 57, no. 1 (1996): 9-26.

⁷⁰ Kempshall, *Rhetoric and the Writing of History*, 504.

⁷¹ Ctd. Grafton, *What Was History?*, 36.

⁷² "Writing [the speech] forced the historian to think his way formally into the situation in which his actors had to make and explain their choices. And reading it enhanced the reader's prudence by enabling him to do the same." Grafton, *What Was History?*, 38.

⁷³ Eric W. Cochrane, *Historians and Historiography in the Italian Renaissance* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981), 4.

lives of the *tre corone*), and historical accounts of matters of state, which should be written in Latin due to their more monumentalizing function.⁷⁴ Bruni has a reputation as the father of modern history; but his focus was much more on reforming the stylistic norms associated with the writing of history, than on the hermeneutics of critical method, with its emphasis on the interrogation of sources.⁷⁵ Ultimately, the historical writings of both Bruni and Valla illustrate that fifteenth-century humanist historiography was characterized by a fluid relationship between critical method and rhetorical approaches. Each was seen as useful for different purposes, and the two were viewed as compatible.

By the mid-sixteenth century, though, this began to change. Some humanists went further than Bruni, beginning to advocate for a total separation between rhetoric and history, based on the belief that refining rhetorical approaches to the writing of history was less important than history's relationship to truth. Francesco Patrizi, in his *Della historia dieci dialoghi*, says, "...the work of the orator goes against the truth of the historian."⁷⁶ Humanist philology, to which Valla was a founding contributor, did gradually emerge as fully-fledged critical method.⁷⁷ This approach was then used to criticize previous histories as being full of lies—a fact which, before, would have been largely par for the course. A full study of how critical method informs the works of French humanist historians like Claude Fauchet, La Popelinière, Vignier, and Estienne Pasquier is beyond the scope of this chapter. However, it is instructive to consider the difference between how Pasquier's *Recherches de la France* was received in the 1560s, and in the 1590s. When the first book of the *Recherches* was published in 1560, critics viewed it as something of a curiosity, questioning whether it was really necessary for Pasquier to continually cite his sources.⁷⁸ By the 1590s, Pasquier's approach was recognized as a critical method whose aims were different from, and sometimes in opposition to, those of rhetorical historians. As George Huppert puts it, "He was not indifferent to style, but he thought of his activity as, first and foremost, a reconstruction of the past for the needs of the present, and a reconstruction which would be worthless if it did not aim at achieving a degree of certainty beyond dispute."⁷⁹ For all Pasquier's humanist zeal, however, it is worth noting that he never held a post as a titled royal historiographer.⁸⁰ Though the emergence of critical method was an exciting landmark in scholarly history, its value to a royal patron was rather limited.

This is, no doubt, a large part of the reason that the re-definition of historiography as the weighing of evidence rather than as a rhetorical practice was never fully accomplished during the

⁷⁴ Cochrane, *Historians and Historiography*, 6.

⁷⁵ George Huppert, *The Idea of Perfect History* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1970), 15-17. On this perspective, see also Nancy Struever, *The Language of History in the Renaissance* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1970) and Hanna Gray, "Renaissance Humanism: The Pursuit of Eloquence," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 24 (1963): 497-514.

⁷⁶ Ctd. Grafton, *What Was History?*, 39. Such concerns had been raised as early as the twelfth century; despite the traditional Aristotelian dictum that the difference between the historical and the poetic was not one of form (prose and poetry) but of verisimilitude (what did happen and what could have happened), medieval vernacular literary culture saw these two poles move increasingly toward one another. Not only did twelfth-century history and poetry move equally between poetry and prose, but they often addressed the same subjects (the deeds of kings) and, moreover, serious history was no longer distinguished by the use of Latin over the vernacular. Cf. Kempshall, *Rhetoric and the Writing of History*, 434-435.

⁷⁷ Kempshall, *Rhetoric and the Writing of History*, 504.

⁷⁸ Huppert, *The Idea of Perfect History*, 34.

⁷⁹ Huppert, *The Idea of Perfect History*, 34.

⁸⁰ Chantal Grell, "Les historiographes en France: XVIe-XVIIe Siècles," in *Les historiographes en Europe de la fin du Moyen Âge à la Révolution*, Ed. Chantal Grell (Paris: Presses de l'Université Paris-Sorbonne, 2006), 139.

Renaissance. Indeed, the pendulum swung back toward rhetorical approaches under Louis XIII and Louis XIV, to the extent that Jean Le Clerc's *Ars Critica*, published in 1697, once again found it necessary to argue that historical writing needed to be definitively purged of practices such as *sermocinatio*.⁸¹ Unfortunately for Ronsard, the one historical moment when critical method gained a temporary foothold as a prevailing cultural norm coincided with the moment when he published the first four books of the *Franziade*. This means that Ronsard's critical reckoning with his own status as a kind of forger emerges as a particularly salient dimension of his epic theory and practice. Du Bellay's epic theory, by contrast, is clearly informed by a rhetorical approach to the definition of genre. But before considering Ronsard and Du Bellay, I will first turn to a case study that illustrates how in the early Renaissance, critical method is typically deployed along politicized, nationalist lines: the *Pseudo-Turpin*.

II. National History and Selective Philology: The *Pseudo-Turpin* in France, Spain, and Italy

In chapters to come, I will discuss how Early Modern literary works by Matteo Boiardo, Ludovico Ariosto, and Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra cast the medieval historian Turpin as the quintessential "lying historiographer." But in the Middle Ages, he was merely a historiographer. The *Pseudo-Turpin* purports to be a firsthand account written by the Archbishop Turpin, that tells the story of Charlemagne's infamous Spanish campaign, which ends in the rout at Roncesvalles famously narrated in the epic *Chanson de Roland*. But the text of the *Pseudo-Turpin*, though it is written in Latin prose, thus having the basic formal markers of medieval historiography, has a number of features that could and did make sixteenth-century humanists question the text's authenticity as an eyewitness testimony. Foremost among these are, of course, the story and characters. Though the particulars of the Battle of Roncesvalles in the *Pseudo-Turpin* differ from those of the *chanson de geste* tradition, the overall concept of Roncesvalles as a key moment in the battle between Christian and Saracen Europe is an invention of the *chansons de geste*. The characters of Roland and Turpin also come from the epic tradition; both play a negligible role in the earliest medieval attestations of Charlemagne's Spanish campaign if they are mentioned at all.

The earliest Latin chronicles on the life of Charlemagne, which Renaissance humanists and contemporary scholars alike would come to view as the most reliable in establishing the historical facts, are Einhard's *Vita Caroli* and Notker's *De Carolo Magno*. Neither of these mentions the Battle of Roncesvalles, or Roland, or Turpin. The legend of Roland only began to appear in the *Nota Emilianense* (ca. 1050-1075), written about 250 years after the events.⁸² Current scholarly opinion on Charlemagne's Spanish campaign, based on the earliest testimonies, holds that Charlemagne launched his campaign as part of a political bargain with the caliphates of Abbassides in Northern Spain, rather than as a religious crusade. Charlemagne ultimately abandoned this campaign, however, to return home and quell a Saxon rebellion that had arisen in his absence. In the process of this retreat, his rear guard was attacked by Basques at a place that may or may not have been called Roncevaux. The version of the story that includes Turpin and Roland, which is narrated in both the *chanson de geste* tradition and in the *Pseudo-*

⁸¹ See Grafton, *What Was History?*, 6-11.

⁸² Aline Laradji, *La légende de Roland: de la genèse française à l'épuisement de la figure du héros en Italie* (Paris: Harmattan, 2008), 33-35.

Turpin, describes Charlemagne's campaign as a holy crusade to drive the Saracens (not the Basques) out of Spain. According to this tradition, Roncesvalles is either the scene of a climactic showdown between the two forces, where Turpin witnesses Roland being killed in battle (in the *Pseudo-Turpin*), or the moment when Roland alerts Charlemagne to the treachery of his knight Ganelon, dying in order to warn him (as in the *Chanson de Roland*).

Beyond these basic facts, there are other moments in the *Pseudo-Turpin*, that push the boundaries of credibility; one of the most prominent is Chapter 17, which describes the battle between Roland and the giant Ferragus (who is later to appear in the works of both Ariosto and Boiardo, though not as a giant). In this battle, Roland appears both as a Davidian warrior for the Christian faith (arguing theological points such as the nature of the Trinity with Ferragus between bouts), and as an avatar of the incipient French nation: when Ferragus inquires about Roland's heritage, he responds, "I am a native of the line of the Franks."⁸³ Verisimilitude is always secondary to the importance of reinforcing Roland's symbolic significance. Long speeches abound throughout the work; Chapter 21, which recounts the Battle of Roncesvalles, includes a number of long speeches by Roland, such as one addressed to his sword, Durandal, and another on his deathbed to Christ. We have seen that speeches were acceptable to some humanist historiographers and not to others; but even some medieval chroniclers found the speeches in the *Pseudo-Turpin* a bridge too far. They were suppressed in some medieval chronicles that drew on the *Pseudo-Turpin* as a source, such as Vincent de Beauvais' *Speculum Historiale*.⁸⁴

Today, the *Pseudo-Turpin* looks like an obvious forgery. The work's intent to deceive readers about its true origins is made clear by the invented paratext: the *Pseudo-Turpin* itself is preceded by a letter signed by Turpin (the putative first-person author), addressed to Luitprand, fictional Dean of Aachen, and it concludes with three letters attributed to Pope Calixtus II, who vouches for the authenticity of the narrative.⁸⁵ Despite these testimonies to the veracity of Turpin's eyewitness account, there is much internal evidence that would lead readers to question the narrator's claim to be an eyewitness. Firstly, the Latin of the text is so ostentatiously erroneous that one modern scholar has proposed it must have been written poorly on purpose, as a kind of instructional grammar text.⁸⁶ Furthermore, Turpin sometimes references himself in the third person, in a manner that suggests slips on the forger's part rather than an intentional

⁸³ Kevin R. Poole, ed. and transl., *The Chronicle of Pseudo-Turpin: Book IV of The Liber Sancti Jacobi (Codex Calixtinus)* (New York: Italica Press, 2014), 44.

⁸⁴ For other changes made by Beauvais (and later restored in Jean Baignon's *Fierabras*), see Ian Short, "The Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle: Some Unnoticed Versions and Their Sources," *Medium Aevum* 38 (January 1, 1969): 13-15. Another important moment where the *Pseudo-Turpin* departs from Renaissance historiographical conventions is the ekphrastic description of the Liberal Arts painted on the walls of Charlemagne's palace. This section, though very brief in its treatments of dialectic and rhetoric, has longer treatments of music and mathematics, as well as a lengthy encomium to grammar. (Poole, ed., *The Chronicle of Pseudo-Turpin*, 76.)

⁸⁵ The manuscript of *Pseudo-Turpin* is one one of five books in a larger work called the *Liber Sancti Jacobi* (also called the *Codex Calixtinus*). Each of the five books relates to the life of St. James. In the case of the *Pseudo-Turpin*, St. James—who is the patron saint of Spain—logically plays an important role in the narrative about Charlemagne's Spanish campaign against the Saracens.

⁸⁶ "...no other explanation will hold. No one in the twelfth century could have learned as much Latin as the 'archbishop' and still at the end of his studies make, through ignorance, the particular types of mistake that he does." Christopher Hohler, "A Note on Jacobus," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 35 (1972): 36.

stylistic choice on the purported author's.⁸⁷ The narrator also lists warriors at various battles whose presence would have been obviously anachronistic to a twelfth-century reader.⁸⁸

This kind of evidence would seem to make the *Pseudo-Turpin* an obvious target for the kind of humanist textual criticism that Lorenzo Valla deployed to debunk the *Donation of Constantine*. However, in France, this was not always the case. Robert Gaguin, in his 1495 *Compendium de Origine et Gestis Francorum*, described the *Pseudo-Turpin* as fraudulent, but in the fifteenth century, he was the exception rather than the rule; most French chroniclers of the period were happy to use the *Pseudo-Turpin* as a historiographical source.⁸⁹ Scholars like Gabrielle Spiegel have shown that in the Middle Ages, it was less important that the *Pseudo-Turpin* was not what it claimed to be, than that it could be used for ideological purposes. Spiegel's discussion centers on the six French translations of the *Pseudo-Turpin* that were published between 1200 and 1230.⁹⁰ These translations were commissioned by members of the Francophone Flemish aristocracy, and Spiegel shows that they were used to assert Flemish independence against the growing power of the French monarchy, by reinforcing the translators' patrons' claims to Carolingian ancestry.⁹¹ Spiegel does not address how, or whether, the translators and their patrons viewed the many indications that the *Pseudo-Turpin* was a forgery. But her analysis suggests that the reliability of the source text itself is less important to them than its symbolic value. In their bid for control over Charlemagne as a symbol of political power, it mattered only that the text be written in the form and language of plausible authority, not that it be philologically verifiable. Fifteenth-century French works on Charlemagne, like David Aubert's *Croniques et Conquestes de Charlemagne* (1458) and Jean Bagnyon's *Fierabras* (1478), continued to draw freely from the *Pseudo-Turpin* alongside epic sources—seemingly untroubled by any need to distinguish one from the other—in constructing their narratives of Carolingian history.

But if early French humanists proved willing to overlook signs that the *Pseudo-Turpin* was a forgery propping up the pet myths of the Gallican kingship, the same was not true of medieval Spanish historiographers. This is, of course, partly due to the fact that the story as a whole is about Charlemagne's conquest of Spain. There is also the fact that many details in the *Pseudo-Turpin* reinforce the independence of the Gallican monarchy from the pope, and the right of the French king to exercise authority over religious matters in his own kingdom, claims which

⁸⁷ See, for example, Chapter 21, "About the Battle of Roncevalles": "While Charlemagne, Ganelon, Turpin and twenty thousand Christians were crossing the pass and others were forming the rearguard, Marsilius, Beligrand and fifty thousand Saracens sprang up from the hills and forests... All of the knights who were there died except for Roland, Baldwin, Turpin, Theodoric and Ganelon..." (Poole, ed., *The Chronicle of Pseudo-Turpin*, 60.)

⁸⁸ For example, Poole says of Aigolande's list of allies, "The author has taken these names, some of whom would have been recognized by readers of the twelfth century, either from historical documentation or from popular lore. Not only is their placement in the time of Charlemagne (indeed, even in one another's time) anachronistic, but their having been gathered together by Aigolande would have been considered laughable by knowledgeable readers or listeners of the *Pseudo-Turpin*" (Poole, ed., *The Chronicle of Pseudo-Turpin*, 22, n. 27).

⁸⁹ Short, "The Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle," 19.

⁹⁰ Gabrielle M. Spiegel, "Forging the Past: The Language of Historical Truth in Middle Ages," *The History Teacher* 17, no. 2 (1984): 267–83. In addition to the article cited here, see also similar points by Spiegel made in the following: *Romancing the Past* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993); "History, Historicism, and the Social Logic of the Text in the Middle Ages," *Speculum* 65, no. 1 (1990): 59–86; "Pseudo-Turpin, the Crisis of the Aristocracy and the Beginnings of Vernacular Historiography in France," *Journal of Medieval History* 12, no. 3 (1986): 207–23; and "Medieval Canon Formation and the Rise of Royal Historiography in Old French Prose," *MLN* 108, no. 4 (September 1993): 638–658.

⁹¹ Gabrielle Spiegel, "Forging the Past," 276. The Capetian kings, by contrast, were not able to claim such a genealogical connection to Charlemagne.

were often contested by nations more closely allied to the papacy. For instance, the *Pseudo-Turpin* served as important evidence of Charlemagne's death as a martyr, leading to his canonization in 1165, a crucial moment for the concept of the Gallican kingship.⁹² And the Church of Saint-Denis relied for many of its privileges on Chapter 22 of the *Pseudo-Turpin*, which describes Charlemagne bestowing these privileges on the church; this led the church to begin to accumulate copies of the *Pseudo-Turpin*.⁹³ Furthermore, the manuscript of the *Pseudo-Turpin* is embedded within a larger document attempting to establish the French role in the rediscovery of St. James's tomb, thus suggesting French patronage of the Camino de Santiago, which could have important implications for the lucrative trade connected to pilgrimage along that route. For all these reasons, the diffusion of the *Pseudo-Turpin* in Spain was quite limited.

Due to the political unpopularity of the *Pseudo-Turpin* in Spain, then, Spanish humanists paid much greater attention than French humanists to the indications that the text was an obvious forgery.⁹⁴ The Spanish historiographer Rodrigo Ximénez de Rada expressed great skepticism about Turpin's account in the *De rebus Hispaniae* as early as the thirteenth century.⁹⁵ A Spanish archivist who disapproved of the *Pseudo-Turpin*'s political implications removed it from the copy of the *Liber Sancti Jacobi* at Compostela in 1619.⁹⁶ This philological prosecution of the *Pseudo-Turpin* could not, however, be said to reflect a universally rigorous, nonpartisan attitude toward forgery on the part of Spanish humanists. Sixteenth-century Spanish literary culture was rife with examples of works that blurred the line between fiction and history just as much as as the *Pseudo-Turpin*. Some such Spanish forgeries, like, Jerónimo Román de la Higuera's "false chronicles" (first published in 1594)—which Higuera fabricated while claiming to have received them from a Benedictine abbey in Germany—were widely accepted as historical. Katrina Olds argues that sixteenth-century readers were not naïve to the dubious origins of Higuera's texts, but rather, supported the legitimacy of forgery as a mode of historical writing in certain cases:

Forgeries were not, at least from the perspective of their perpetrators, outright lies; they were, rather, a recovery of a deeper, more essential truth that had been waylaid somehow. By introducing an invented passage in an otherwise authentic text, for example, the forger would be recovering "accidentally misplaced facts" that confirmed his particular vision of a contested past.⁹⁷

Olds' depiction of forgeries as "misplaced facts" bears a strong resemblance to Gabrielle Spiegel's description of how the *Pseudo-Turpin* was understood in medieval France. Thus, at the

⁹² Chapter 24 of the *Pseudo-Turpin* purports to be an account by Pope Calixtus on the discovery of Turpin's body, about which Calixtus says: "Although Charlemagne and Turpin did not die in Roncesvalles alongside Roland, Oliver and the other martyrs, they are not undeserving of the eternal crown that the others received, for, while alive, they endured the agony of wounds, blows, and the struggle for combat alongside the others." (Poole 85)

⁹³ Cf. Elizabeth A.R. Brown, "Saint-Denis and the Turpin Legend," in *The Codex Calixtinus and the Shrine of St. James*, ed. John Williams and Alison Stones (Tübingen: G. Narr, 1992), 51-88.

⁹⁴ Santiago López Martínez-Morás, "Le Pseudo-Turpin en Espagne," *Cahiers de recherches médiévales et humanistes. Journal of medieval and humanistic studies*, no. 25 (June 30, 2013): 471-494.

⁹⁵ "Cum igitur hec omnia infra ducentorum annorum spacium potestati accreuerint christiane, non uideo quid in Hispaniis Carolus acquisiuit, cum ab eius morte anni pene efluxerunt CCCC. Facti igitur euidentie est potius annuendum quam fabulosis narrationibus attendendum." Ctd. López Martínez-Morás, "Le Pseudo-Turpin en Espagne," 483.

⁹⁶ Poole, *The Chronicle of Pseudo-Turpin*, xxi.

⁹⁷ Katrina B. Olds, *Forging the Past: Invented Histories in Counter-Reformation Spain* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2015), 12.

same time that some Spanish humanists were using textual criticism to unveil the *Pseudo-Turpin* as the forgery that it was, equally implausible Spanish documents went unchallenged.

A more controversial example is Fray Antonio de Guevara's *Marco Aurelio*, which was first published as the *Libro aureo de Marco Aurelio* in 1524 and later as the *Reloj de principes*. The *Marco Aurelio* claims to be a translation from Greek of a document found in Italy, and is supported with false citations and references to invented sources. Some Spanish humanists such as Bachiller Pedro de Rhúa criticized Guevara for his use of humanist apparatus to create a plausible historical document intended merely as diversion, thereby clouding the necessary distinction between orator and historian.⁹⁸ Other humanists, like Alfonso García Matamoros, defended Guevara as a "Spanish Herodotus," while acknowledging that his work did not meet the standards of verifiability practiced by contemporary humanist historiography.⁹⁹ Matamoros' defense of Guevara is particularly interesting, since it represents an attempt to re-frame Guevara's pseudo-historical writing as merely rhetorical in the classical sense. A similar re-framing can be found, as we will see, in the prefaces to Ronsard's *Franciade*.

In Renaissance Italy, the historiographical dimensions of the *Pseudo-Turpin* and Charlemagne's Spanish campaign were much less contested than in Spain. This is not to say that the political dimensions of the Matter of France were without importance in Italy; indeed, the medieval historiographies of Charlemagne played a very significant role in diplomatic relations between France and Florence. According to Florentine historiographers (including Leonardo Bruni), Charlemagne re-founded the city of Florence on his way back to Rome after his coronation in 800, restoring the walls that had been destroyed. Florentine diplomats seeking aid or a closer relationship with France repeatedly referenced this anecdote; as early as 1396, Maso degli Albizzi was instructed to mention it in his request for intervention by Charles VI in Italy.¹⁰⁰ Filippo de' Medici likewise mentions the story in the letter of presentation he offered to Louis XI (written in French) upon Louis' coronation, in which Filippo says of Charlemagne: "...sa race, cette très noble race, qui s'est perpétuée heureusement et pieusement en ce royaume jusqu'à nos jours, a tant mérité de la foi du Christ qu'on a eu raison de l'appeler très chrétienne."¹⁰¹ Florentine diplomats were well aware that Charlemagne's role in the founding of the Gallican kingship was intertwined with the story about his founding of Florence.

But like Roland and Roncevaux, Charlemagne's founding of Florence was more diplomatically useful than it was philologically verifiable. Thus, the trope of Charlemagne as founder of France presented conflicts for humanist diplomats between diplomatic tact and philological methodology. For example, the Florentine ambassador Donato Acciaiuoli wrote a life of Charlemagne for Louis XI, which was later incorporated into a Latin translation of Plutarch. Acciaiuoli relied on principles of humanist philology in basing his account on the earliest possible Latin sources, principally Eginhard's *Vita Karoli*, rather than on the popular oral tradition or more recent prose versions of the *chanson de geste*. The problem, as we have seen, was that the Latin sources make almost no mention of Roland and Roncevaux, these being innovations of the *chanson de geste* tradition. Acciaiuoli, therefore, struck a compromise

⁹⁸ Horacio Chiong Rivero, *The Rise of Pseudo-Historical Fiction: Fray Antonio de Guevara's Novelizations* (New York: Peter Lang, 2004), 3.

⁹⁹ Chiong Rivero, *The Rise of Pseudo-Historical Fiction*, 135.

¹⁰⁰ M. Jacques Monfrin, "La figure de Charlemagne dans l'historiographie du XVe siècle," in *Annuaire-Bulletin de la Société de l'histoire de France* (1964), 71.

¹⁰¹ M. Jacques Monfrin, "La figure de Charlemagne," 71.

position between the historical and epic Carolingian narratives by mainly following Eginhard, but also adding a greatly expanded account of Roncevaux in accordance with the ubiquity of the story and his desire to flatter the French king.¹⁰² Florentine accounts of Carolingian history, therefore, were characterized by an effort to include only facts that could be verified by humanist historiographical methods, tempered by the necessity of including crowd-pleasing and diplomatically useful but not philologically verifiable events such as Roncevaux and Charlemagne's founding of Florence.

Of course, Italy's most famous sixteenth-century literary humanist, Ludovico Ariosto, took quite another position in relation to the *Pseudo-Turpin*. In the *Orlando Furioso*, Ariosto frequently references Turpin's authority as a historian in satirical terms that indicate his full awareness of the *Pseudo-Turpin* as an obvious forgery still passing for history. Turpin's invocation signals Ariosto's total rejection of the poet's obligation—or even capacity—to represent historical truth. For Ariosto, in Sergio Zatti's words, "Poetry neither reflects history, nor betrays it; it simply confirms or denies other poetry."¹⁰³ I discuss at length Ariosto's relationship to Turpin, and the important ways that this relationship changes in the French translations of Ariosto, in Chapter Three. Here, I turn now to consider the treatment of pseudo-histories like the *Pseudo-Turpin* in the work of one of Ariosto's French admirers: Joachim Du Bellay.

III. Epic Without History: Du Bellay's Défense et illustration de la langue française

Not enough attention has been paid to the historiographical dimensions of Du Bellay's *Défense et illustration de la langue française*. While this treatise is most famous as a roadmap for the future development of French literature, it is also a work that aspires to create a vernacular literary canon, which would repair once and for all the gaps in vernacular literary history that earlier humanists had found to be so problematic. At the same time, Du Bellay does not present this task as an easy one; the *Défense* is permeated throughout with an elegiac sense of regret over the inaccessibility of French history. Du Bellay repeatedly laments what he describes as a uniquely French historiographical gap:

Au contraire les faits des autres nations, singulièrement des Gaulois, avant qu'ils tombassent en la puissance des Français, et les faits des Français mêmes depuis qu'ils ont donné leur nom aux Gaules, ont été si mal recueillis, que nous en avons quasi perdu non seulement la gloire, mais la mémoire.¹⁰⁴

For Du Bellay, this complaint takes on a different significance than it had for humanist historiographers. For literary humanists, the lack of established national historiography also means a lack of subjects for the composition of vernacular literature, particularly epic. It is, perhaps, for this reason that Du Bellay positions himself firmly on the side of those French humanist historiographers who continued to unabashedly promulgate nationalist pseudo-history.

¹⁰² M. Jacques Monfrin, "La figure de Charlemagne," 75.

¹⁰³ Sergio Zatti, "Turpin's Role: Poetry and Truth in the *Furioso*," in *The Quest for Epic: From Ariosto to Tasso*, ed. Dennis Looney (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006), 93.

¹⁰⁴ Joachim Du Bellay, *Les Regrets, Les Antiquités de Rome, Défense et Illustration de la Langue française*, ed. S. de Sacy ([Paris]: Gallimard, 1967), 226.

Du Bellay's cousin Guillaume, we recall, was one such historiographer.¹⁰⁵ Jean Lemaire de Belges was another, and as we will see, Du Bellay frequently cites Lemaire as an authority on both history and literature. Unlike the *Franciade*, the *Défense* comes down clearly on the side of historiography (and pseudo-historiography) as tools of national advancement.

One example of Du Bellay's tendency to refer directly to pseudo-historiographical accounts of French history can be found toward the end of the *Défense*, when Du Bellay cites Lemaire as a source for his account of the Gallic origins of rhyme. Du Bellay also alludes to the fact that despite his earlier lamentations about the paucity of reliable histories of the Gauls' many accomplishments, he could fill a book with such feats if he wished to:

Or quant à l'antiquité de ces vers que nous appelons rimés, et que les autres vulgaires ont empruntés de nous, si on ajoute foi à Jean le Maire de Belges, diligent chercheur de l'antiquité, Bardus V, roi des Gaules, en fut inventeur : et introduisit une secte de poètes nommés bardes, lesquels chantaient mélodieusement leurs rimes avec instruments, louant les uns et blâmant les autres... Je pourrais alléguer assez d'autres antiquités, dont notre langue aujourd'hui est ennoblie, et qui montrent les histoires n'être fausses qui ont dit les Gaules anciennement avoir été florissantes, non seulement en armes, mais en toutes sortes de sciences et bonnes lettres. Mais cela requiert bien un œuvre entier...¹⁰⁶

Of course, Du Bellay earlier stated that no reliable textual evidence attesting to the Gauls' accomplishments exists, but he also suggests that the lack of such evidence should not stop anyone from making these claims. Other Early Modern accounts of the origins of oral lyric identify rhyme as originating with the Occitan troubadours; but the Provençal poets are notably absent throughout the *Défense*. Du Bellay does not grant them any role whatsoever in his poetic history, whether as models (as with Greek, Latin, and Italian authors), as counter-examples (as with several of the older French poets), or even simply as predecessors. This is just one example of the many ways in which humanist practices of forgery and pseudo-historiography that I have discussed above are integrated into Du Bellay's construction of the French literary canon.

Pseudo-historiography is all the more important to Du Bellay's project because despite his evident interest in constructing a French literary canon, his assessment of his literary predecessors is famously negative. The second book of the *Défense* includes a chapter titled, "De quelques observations outré l'artifice, avec une invective contre les mauvais poètes français."¹⁰⁷ In this chapter, Du Bellay laments, "Ô combien je désire voir sécher ces *Printemps*, châtier ces petites *Jeunesses*, rabattre ces *Coups d'essai*, tarir ces *Fontaines*, bref, abolir tous ces beaux titres assez suffisants pour dégoûter tout lecteur savant d'en lire davantage!"¹⁰⁸ In the chapter "Des poètes français," Du Bellay singles out the *Roman de la Rose* as one of the few works worthy of being considered part of the French canon. However, it is not the poem itself (neither its content nor its style) that Du Bellay values, so much as the proof that it offers that French literature does, indeed, have a history:

De tous les anciens poètes français, quasi un seul, Guillaume du Lorris et Jean de Meung, sont dignes d'être lus, non tant pource qu'il y ait en eux beaucoup de choses qui se

¹⁰⁵ Guillaume's *Epitomé de l'antiquité des Gaules et de France* was published six years after the *Défense*.

¹⁰⁶ Du Bellay, *Défense et Illustration de la la Langue française*, 275.

¹⁰⁷ Du Bellay, *Défense et Illustration de la la Langue française*, 281 (Chapitre XI).

¹⁰⁸ Du Bellay, *Défense et Illustration de la la Langue française*, 284.

doivent imiter les modernes, comme pour y voir quasi comme une première image de la langue française, vénérable pour son antiquité.¹⁰⁹

Another French author whom Du Bellay singles out for praise in this chapter is Jean Lemaire de Belges, who, says Du Bellay, “me semble avoir premier illustré et les Gaules et la langue française, lui donnant beaucoup de mots et manières de parler poétiques, qui ont bien servi même aux plus excellents de notre temps.”¹¹⁰ In the case of both the *Roman de la Rose* and the *Illustrations de Gaule*, the works are important less as literary models, than as bricks in the edifice of French literary history.

There is, then, a distinction in the *Défense* between canonical works that simply serve as evidence of the antiquity of French literature, and works that are valuable for their aesthetic qualities. The latter works are rarely, if ever, French. Du Bellay says that if he were asked to name the greatest French poets, he would answer:

...qu'ils ont bien écrit, qu'ils ont illustré notre langue, que la France leur est obligée ; mais aussi dirais-je bien qu'on pourrait trouver en notre langue (si quelque savant homme y voulait mettre la main) une forme de poésie beaucoup plus exquise, laquelle il faudrait chercher en ces vieux Grecs et Latins, non point ès auteurs français : pour ce qu'en ceux-ci on ne saurait prendre que bien peu, comme la peau et la couleur ; en ceux-là on peut prendre la chair, les os, les nerfs et le sang.¹¹¹

This moment illustrates the rather Frankensteinian quality of vernacular canon formation as Du Bellay conceives it. The project of building French literary history cannot do without the raw material of prior French authors, however aesthetically inadequate their work from a humanist literary perspective. But these French works are essentially vacant placeholders—nothing but “la peau et la couleur”—while it is the works of the ancients that animate these empty texts with flesh, blood, and nerves, bringing the literary tradition to life.

This concept is taken up again in the fifth chapter (“Du long poème français”), in which Du Bellay speaks of epic as the crowning ornament of a prospective, fully illustrated French. Ariosto is put forth as a particularly sterling example of a vernacular author who has equaled Homer and Virgil. Once again, we see the idea that lesser works from French national literary history provide a useful starting point for contemporary literary work, as Du Bellay encourages his fellow countrymen to follow Ariosto’s example:

Comme lui donc, qui a bien voulu emprunter de notre langue les noms et l’histoire de son poème, chosis-moi quelqu’un de ces beaux vieux romans français, comme un *Lancelot*, un *Tristan*, ou autres: et en fais renaître au monde une admirable *Iliade* et laborieuse *Énéide*.¹¹²

One part of the work Du Bellay does in this passage is to reclaim “les noms et l’histoire” of the *Orlando Furioso* as French national property. As will be further discussed in Chapter 3, this is not strictly true, as the plot of the *Furioso* derives from an Italian literary tradition (though, to

¹⁰⁹ Du Bellay, *Défense et Illustration de la la Langue française*, 256-257.

¹¹⁰ Du Bellay, *Défense et Illustration de la la Langue française*, 257.

¹¹¹ Du Bellay, *Défense et Illustration de la la Langue française*, 259.

¹¹² Du Bellay, *Défense et Illustration de la la Langue française*, 266.

further confuse matters, these stories were often written by Italians in French). However, it speaks to a general belief that Roland, Turpin, and especially Charlemagne are French characters, and that the *Furioso* is thus in some sense a French national epic written by an Italian.

This moment is particularly telling because, in reclaiming these subjects and characters as French epic material, Du Bellay reveals the extent to which the project of developing the national canon is in conflict with the humanist historiographical project. Firstly, Du Bellay makes no mention of the fact that—as we have seen elsewhere in this chapter—Roland and Turpin come from French historical texts that could not be verified by humanist critical methods. These characters are the legacy of medieval historiography contained in questionable texts like the *Pseudo-Turpin*; and mocking the dubious historicity of the *Pseudo-Turpin* is a central feature of the *Orlando Furioso*. But Du Bellay not only fails to distinguish between the confirmed and unconfirmed aspects of the Matter of France (of which Roland and Roncevaux fall firmly on the “unconfirmed” side); he also further confuses the matter by offering up subjects and characters that belong unquestionably to the ahistorical Matter of Britain (“un *Lancelot*, un *Tristan*”) as potential subjects of the French *Iliad* or *Aeneid*. It is evident, here, that Du Bellay is entirely uninterested in distinguishing between these different genres (epic, romance, and history) on the basis of their relationship to historical truth. Rather, Du Bellay’s aim is to use any and all natural resources within French literary culture to fill gaps in the canon, wherever they might be, in whatever genre. For Du Bellay, it is less important that romance be clearly distinguished from epic than that French literary material of the past be used to forge the French literary canon of the future. But one side effect of Du Bellay’s proposal to use French medieval romance as the basis of national epic would be the evacuation of any particular relationship between epic and history, with the genre defined in purely formal terms.

This approach becomes even clearer when Du Bellay suggests, later on, that the French authors currently wasting their talents on chivalric romance would do better to employ their skills in writing French history. Crucially, his focus is on emphasizing the stylistic and formal similarities between romance and history, rather than on drawing distinctions between the two genres in terms of truth or verisimilitude:

Je veux bien en passant dire un mot à ceux qui ne s’emploient qu’à orner et amplifier nos romans, et en font des livres, certainement en beau et fluide langage, mais beaucoup plus propre à bien entretenir damoiselles qu’à doctement écrire : je voudrais bien (dis-je) les avertir d’employer cette grande éloquence à recueillir ces fragments de vieilles chroniques françaises, et comme a fait Tite-Live des annales et autres anciennes chroniques romaines, en bâtir le corps entier d’une belle histoire, y entremêlant à propos ces belles concions et harangues à l’imitation de celui que je viens de nommer, de Thucydide, Salluste, ou quelque autre bien approuvé, selon le genre d’écrire où ils se sentiraient propres.¹¹³

In Chapter Two, I discuss further the fact that the “concions et harangues” which are (as we have seen in this chapter) so crucial to the rhetorical arts of history-writing are also central to Renaissance chivalric romance. These two genres could not be more different in terms of their relationship to truth; indeed, much ink was spilled by prominent sixteenth-century humanists in France who felt that popular chivalric romances like the *Amadis de Gaule* were morally

¹¹³ Du Bellay, *Défense et Illustration de la la Langue française*, 266-267.

pernicious and full of lies.¹¹⁴ However, for Du Bellay, the important thing is that the two genres entail similar forms of eloquence, and as such, French writers of romance could be recruited to turn their talents toward the writing of history instead.

Because Du Bellay sees no essential distinction between genres on the basis of their content, he instead distinguishes between them on the basis of practices of imitation and textual transmission. For instance, in the passage above, he argues that while classical history and contemporary romances entail similar kinds of eloquence, the romances are “orné” and “amplifié” rather than simply composed, thus participating in medieval rather than humanist modes of literary imitation. He is, therefore, redefining the proper role of the literary humanist as that of arbiter of style first and foremost, rather than protector of historical fact as verified by philological methodologies. To ensure that future French literary works will possess sufficient “gloire” to ensure their posterity entails a turn away from traditional French modes of imitation, and toward the imitative practices of classical authors. Translation, in particular, is frequently mentioned as an outmoded form of textual imitation. (“Toutefois ce tant louable labour de traduire ne me semble moyen unique et suffisant pour élever notre vulgaire à l’égale et parangon des autres plus fameuses langues”¹¹⁵). Du Bellay’s insistence that translation is not sufficient as a means of illustrating the French language distinguishes him from other writers of poetic treatises during the sixteenth century (most notably Thomas Sébillot).

Throughout the *Défense et illustration*, then, Du Bellay depicts French literary history—up to and including the present—as a kind of raw ore that must be turned toward new genres and practices more conducive to glory. Medieval works like *Lancelot*, *Tristan*, and the *Roman de la Rose* are important evidence that France possesses a vernacular literary history, just as Italy does. But it matters little to Du Bellay how that raw material was originally categorized—truth or fiction, history or romance or epic—as long as it is French. Whatever the original genre, all that matters is how the work can be re-shaped to suit the requirements of the modern canon. This approach grows directly out of the kind of nationalist pseudo-historiography practiced by Jean Lemaire de Belges. We may recall that Katrina Olds described the work of Early Modern forgers as the recovery of “accidentally misplaced facts” that buttress a contested vision of the past. Similarly, Du Bellay hopes to inspire the creation of what might be called “accidentally misplaced texts”—works that fit within the generic and stylistic parameters of the sixteenth century, but also connect Early Modern France to an illustrious medieval past. Pierre de Ronsard’s *Franciade* is just such a text; but in his case, the process of forging a national epic is undertaken with many qualifications and misgivings.

IV. Epic as Pseudo-History: Ronsard’s Franciade

We have seen, with the example of the *Pseudo-Turpin*, that French Renaissance historiography was characterized by a tolerant attitude toward pseudo-history that had particular nationalist and royalist significance. However, there was a distinct period at the end of the sixteenth century when it seemed that the scholarly pendulum had swung definitively away from supporting the Trojan origins of France. The late sixteenth century saw the publication of a number of works by respected humanist historiographers—such as François Hotman’s *Franco-*

¹¹⁴ I discuss these critiques at length in Chapter Two.

¹¹⁵ Joachim Du Bellay, *Les Regrets, Les Antiquités de Rome, Défense et Illustration de la Langue française*, ed. S. de Sacy ([Paris]: Gallimard, 1967), 231.

Gallica (1573) and François de Belleforest's *Grandes annales et histoire générale de France* (1579)—which followed humanist critical method and concluded that the story was a myth. This turned out to be a temporary state of affairs; by 1600, the medieval legend would be largely reinstated as acceptable historical material, since historical research was sidelined, and rhetorical approaches to history reinstated, under Louis XIII and Louis XIV.¹¹⁶ (I discuss this further in Chapter Four.) This shift would come too late for the *Franciade*, though; during the extended period that Ronsard spent writing his epic, French humanist historiographers went from regarding the Trojan origins of France as a keystone of French history, to considering it a debunked national myth.

The fourth book of the *Franciade*—the final book that Ronsard completed—exemplifies Ronsard's dilemma, in that it ends with a *tour de force* display of the French historiography that had gone from widely accepted to completely outdated in just a few decades. In a famous and lengthy scene, the prophetess Hyante grants Francus a vision of his descendants; all the kings of France to come, from Pharamond to Charles Martel, parade before him one by one. Hyante describes each king and his significance to French history, and each description is a concise summary of late-fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century humanist historiography on the subject, taken from sources such as Robert Gaguin's *Chroniques de France*, as well as histories by Nicole Gilles and Jean Bouchet, and earlier sources like Grégoire de Tours.¹¹⁷ For instance, Hyante's description of Clovis contains details taken from Gaguin:

Vois-tu CLOVIS grand honneur des Troyens?
 Qui le premier abhorrant les Payens
 Et des Gentils les menteuses escolles,
 Pour suivre Christ laissera les idolles,
 Donnant batesme aux Francois desvoyez ?
 Et lors du ciel luy seront envoyez
 Un Oriflame, estandart pour la crainte
 Des ses hayneux, et l'Ampouille tressainte,
 Huille sacrée, oincture de voz rois.
 Son escusson, deshonoré de trois
 Crapaux boufis, pour sa vieille peinture
 Prendra des Lis à la blanche teinture,
 Present du ciel : Dieu qui le choisira
 D'honneur, de force et de biens l'emplira !¹¹⁸ (IV.1143-1156)

Though Clovis' divine gift of the *fleur-de-lys* symbol and the *Sainte Ampoule* are politically indispensable parts of the autobiography of the Gallican monarchy, it is hard to see how these episodes could be made consistent with sixteenth-century humanist critical method.

The obvious historical dilemma posed by the *Franciade* thus becomes particularly clear at this point in the epic, which is also where it ends. Though it is clear that this parade of kings was intended to continue up to Charles IX, the *Franciade* ends after Charles Martel, with a verse

¹¹⁶ Huppert, *The Idea of Perfect History*, 75-85.

¹¹⁷ Paul Laumonier, ed. of Pierre de Ronsard's *Œuvres complètes*, 5.961, n. 1.

¹¹⁸ Pierre de Ronsard, *Œuvres complètes*, 5.968.

stating that the work will remain unfinished due to the king's death.¹¹⁹ But despite never being completed, Ronsard's descriptions of the early French kings achieved a considerable amount of renown entirely separate from the *Franciade* as a whole. The artistic merit of the "parade of kings" scene was recognized by seventeenth-century humanist historiographers, even though the *Franciade* as a whole was based on pseudo-history; for instance, these sections were cited frequently in the royal historiographer François de Belleforest's *Annales* (1579), despite the fact that Belleforest's work explicitly denies the Trojan origins of France that are the *Franciade*'s *raison d'être*.¹²⁰

The evident scholarly care that Ronsard shows in the composition of this scene is interesting in the context of the preface to the 1572 edition of the *Franciade*. A considerable part of this preface is devoted to theorizing the difference between poetry and history, demonstrating that it is an issue of great importance to Ronsard in introducing his epic. The difference between the two that Ronsard articulates, is that despite the many rhetorical similarities between the two, the historian says what really happened, while the poet is limited to the *vraisemblable*:

Encore que l'Histoire en beaucoup de sortes se conforme à la Poësie, comme en vehemence de parler, harangues, descriptions de batailles, villes, fleuves, mers, montaignes, & autres semblables choses, où le Poëte ne doibt non plus que l'Orateur falsifier le vray, si est-ce quand à leur sujet ils sont aussi eslongnez l'un de l'autre que le vraysemblable est eslongné de la verité. L'Histoire reçoit seulement la chose comme el est, ou fut, sans desguisure ny fard, & le Poëte s'arreste au vraysemblable, à ce qui peut estre, & à ce qui est desja receu en la commune opinion.¹²¹

Of course, the way Ronsard defines these two genres in terms of "vérité" and the "vraisemblable" comes from new theories of genre that were emerging around the gradual rediscovery and diffusion of Aristotle's *Poetics* in the second half of the sixteenth century.¹²² Aristotle famously distinguishes between history and poetry on the basis of their respective relationships to historical fact, rather than on the basis of form:

...the difference between the historian and the poet is not in their utterances being in verse or prose (it would be quite possible for Herodotus' work to be translated into verse, and it would not be any the less a history with verse than it is without it); the difference lies in the fact that the historian speaks of what has happened, the poet of the kind of thing that *can* happen.¹²³

¹¹⁹ Pierre de Ronsard, *Œuvres complètes*, 5.1000. « Si le Roy Charles eust vescu, / J'eusse achevé ce long ouvrage : / Si tost que la mort l'eut veincu, / Sa mort me veinquist le courage. » Despite these claims, scholars believe that Ronsard had long intended to abandon the work.

¹²⁰ For a further comparison of these two works, see Donald Stone, "The Boundaries of History and Literature: Belleforest's 'Les Grandes Annales' and Ronsard's 'Franciade,'" *Renaissance and Reformation / Renaissance et Réforme* 12, no. 3 (Summer 1988): 207-213.

¹²¹ Pierre de Ronsard, *Œuvres complètes*, 5.673-674.

¹²² Cf. Baxter Hathaway, *The Age of Criticism: The Late Renaissance in Italy* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1962) and Déborah Blocker, "The Hermeneutics of Transmission: Deciphering Discourses on Poetry and the Arts in Early Modern Europe (1500-1800)," *Intermédialités: Histoire et théorie des arts, des lettres et des techniques/Intermediality: History and Theory of the Arts, Literature and Technologies* 5 (2005): 37-60.

¹²³ Aristotle, *Aristotle: Poetics*, transl. Gerald F. Else (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1967), 32-33.

Ronsard goes on to say that the poet who writes “les choses comme elles sont” is erring, since this is properly the domain of the historian.¹²⁴ Thus, like Aristotle, Ronsard seems to mark a clear distinction between the two genres on the basis of their relationship to truth.

However, the picture becomes slightly blurrier when we consider Ronsard’s gloss of the *vraisemblable* as “ce qui est desja receu en la commune opinion.” By positing the poet as neither one who “falsifies the truth” nor one who writes “things as they are,” Ronsard’s definition of the proper domain of poetry is actually rather narrow—much narrower than that described by a poet like Ariosto. Indeed, Ronsard directly criticizes Ariosto, saying that he goes too far in his inventions, of which he says, “le corps est tellement contrefaict & monstrueux qu’il ressemble mieux aux resveries d’un malade de fievre continue qu’aux inventions d’un homme bien sain.”¹²⁵ However, while this criticism of Ariosto might lead us to believe that in Ronsard’s prefatory theory of epic, verisimilitude refers to an imitation of life, this is not quite true. Rather, his definition of verisimilitude above describes a poetic representation of popular, but unscholarly, beliefs about history—“la commune opinion.” This theory of epic becomes clearer when we see that it allows for the coexistence of the two contradictory versions of French history that I have explored in this chapter. The internal conflicts of sixteenth-century humanist historiography, torn between national patriotism and critical method, can be resolved if the philologically verified version of history is defined as “Histoire,” and nationalist history (such as the royalist Trojan genealogy put forward by historiographers like Jean Lemaire de Belges) is re-categorized as “Poésie.” Of course, these two versions of history were both circulating with roughly equal legitimacy during the sixteenth century, so by implying that the Trojan origins of France are merely *vraisemblable*, Ronsard is making a considerable intervention in Renaissance historiographical debates.

These theoretical moves indicate a strong degree of self-awareness on Ronsard’s part about the way his epic project potentially undermines the work of humanists seeking to found national historiography upon critical method. Ronsard uses his prefaces to provide explanatory glosses on the apparently pseudo-historical material that he puts forth in the epic itself, attempting to harmonize this pseudo-history with humanist historiography and neo-Aristotelian literary theory. Scholars like François Rigolot have suggested that the obvious tension between the epic and humanist scholarship did not bother Ronsard; according to Rigolot, “It matters little to Ronsard that subsequent readers might have doubts about his having chosen Trojan legends to give the French a sense of their national history... The prefatory imagination simply cannot accommodate any tension between the poetic and the political projects.”¹²⁶ But looking more closely at the contrast between scholarly statements made in the preface and pseudo-scholarship found in the epic itself, we can see that Ronsard does very much see this as a problem casting a

¹²⁴ “...le Poëte qui escrit les choses comme elles sont ne merite tant que celui qui les feint & se recule le plus qu’il luy est possible de l’historien.” Pierre de Ronsard, *Œuvres complètes*, 5.674.

¹²⁵ Pierre de Ronsard, *Œuvres complètes*, 5.674. As Rigolot (1988) has observed, these somewhat contradictory statements also illustrate Ronsard’s desire to reconcile two currents in the theory of imagination in the sixteenth century: “One has a moral and didactic origin and would condemn ‘phantasie’ as ‘mistress of false-hood’; the other proceeds from the rhetorical tradition and would welcome the ability of the mind to recreate ideas in different forms” (29-30). I discuss Ronsard and Du Bellay’s opinions on the *Orlando Furioso*

¹²⁶ François Rigolot, “Ronsard’s Pretext for Paratexts: The Case of the ‘Franciade,’” *SubStance* 17, no. 2 (January 1, 1988): 34. Rigolot’s overall argument is that the prefaces show Ronsard’s contradictory desire to honor the Carolingian origins of his prince and dedicatee Charles IX, but also to imitate Homer and Virgil. I would frame this somewhat differently, in terms of a conflict between the “common belief” in Charles IX’s Carolingian royal genealogy (which serves a necessary function in national epic), and Ronsard’s clear awareness that this myth is not, according to humanist critical method, admissible as history.

shadow over the *Franciade* project as a whole. We can see this in the fact that he is making a clear and extraordinary distinction between the reader of the preface, and the reader of the poem, and addressing himself differently to each audience on the question of history. He envisions the reader of the preface as an educated humanist, who will both understand Ronsard's dilemma as a humanist writer of national epic, and appreciate that he has done his best to find appropriate stylistic and scholarly solutions to it.

The most obvious example of this interplay between the preface and the text can be found in the four etymologies that Ronsard provides in the *Franciade*. The first three take place within a speech given by Jupiter, the king of the Roman gods, to his wife Juno, in which Jupiter delivers a number of prophecies about the great deeds Francus is destined to perform. In the first instance, Jupiter predicts that Francus will marry one of the daughters of a German king, and then give his name to one of the duchies of Germany, Franconia, after achieving a military victory there:

...Ainsi la Parque & moy
Donnons arrest que les grands roys de France
D'un sang meslé prendront un jour naissance
Conjoint ensemble au Troyen & Germain.

De là Francus magnanime à la main
Pasteur guerrier d'une troupe infinie
Doit surmonter les champs de Françonie
Qu'il nommera de son nom redouté...¹²⁷ (I.180-187)

In the second example, Ronsard describes the way "Gaul" was renamed "France" in similar terms. He describes how the city of Paris will be destroyed, and then rebuilt by King Merovech (a supposed descendent of Francus and the founder of the Merovingian dynasty), in whose honor Gaul will be renamed "France":

La Gaule, apres, de Francus nommera
Chef des François, qui pour la souvenance
D'un si grand prince aura le nom de France.

De Merové des Peuples conqureur,
Viendra meint prince, & meint grand empereur
Haut esleuvez en dignité supresme :
Entre lesquels un Roy CHARLES neuvfiesme,
Neufiesme en nom & premier en vertu
Naistra...¹²⁸ (I.244-252)

Today's etymologists would say that both the words "France" and "Franconia" come from the Germanic *franca* (a kind of distinctive Frankish javelin)¹²⁹; here, however, Ronsard establishes

¹²⁷ Parentheticals refer to book and line number. Citations are from Pierre de Ronsard, *Œuvres complètes* V, ed. Paul Laumonier ([Paris]: Société des textes français modernes, 2015), 5.708. This edition is a reprint of Pierre de Ronsard, *Oeuvres complètes XVI: La Franciade (1572)*, ed. Paul Laumonier (Paris: Librairie Nizet, 1983).

¹²⁸ Pierre de Ronsard, *Œuvres complètes*, 5.711.

¹²⁹ Cf. H.D. Austin, "Germanic Words in Uguiccone's Lexicon," *Speculum* 23, no. 2 (April 1948): 276.

that Francus' name is the origin of these words, rather than invented from them. In both of these cases, this etymology is closely linked to the belief in the twin Germanic and Trojan origins of the French people; the second example takes pains to show that this genealogy descends directly to the current king, Charles IX. Thus, they reinforce the interdependence of monarchy and philology by exposing just how much the monarchy's genealogical claims to illustrious Trojan ancestry depend on etymologies like this, which relate present-day France to the mythic figure of Francus.

The third etymology describes how Francus crosses the Rhine from Germany and comes to found Paris on the banks of the Seine. This example is somewhat different from the previous two, and the only one of the four I discuss here is not related to the name "Francus." This time, Ronsard provides an etymology of the toponym "Paris":

Comme un torrent qui s'enfle & renouvelle
 Viendra couvrir les champs de la Mozelle,
 Puis en l'honneur de son oncle Pâris
 Aux bords de Seine ira fonder Pâris,
 Siege royal d'un sceptre si superbe.¹³⁰ (I.201-205)

Here, rather than attempting to link Francus to geographical place-names in a way that reinforces French royal genealogy, Ronsard makes a simple and elegant connection between Paris, the character who kicks off the Iliad by abducting the beautiful Greek Helen, and the name of the city Paris. In this case, therefore, the genealogy at stake is literary rather than royal; Ronsard's concern is to ensure the filiation between the Franciade and its epic forebears. (In fact, the similarity between the name of the character and the name of the city is purely happy coincidence; Paris, the city, is derived from the Latin Parisii, which is how Roman settlers referred to the original inhabitants.)

The final etymology concerns the derivation of the name "Francus." This appears later in the first book, when Francus and his troops are assembling to leave the city of Buthrotum, where they have been sheltering since the fall of Troy, and set off on the great journey that will ultimately lead them to Paris. This is the moment when Ronsard decides to reveal the etymology behind Francus's name itself. Of course, this is somewhat difficult, since in reality the name Francus was formed out of the name "Frank" rather than the other way around. Furthermore, the character from the Iliad whom Ronsard has used as Francus was, inconveniently, named Astyanax. Ronsard comes up with an ingenious explanation:

Adonq Francus qui seul prince commande,
 Pront & gaillard au milieu de la bande,
 Voulant sa main d'une lance charger,
 D'Astynax en Francus fit changer
 Son premier nom, en signe de vaillance
 Et des soldats fut nommé Porte-lance,
 Pheré-enchos, nom, des peuples vaincus
 Mal prononcé, & dit depuis Francus.¹³¹ (I.945-952)

¹³⁰ Pierre de Ronsard, *Œuvres complètes*, 5.709.

¹³¹ Pierre de Ronsard, *Œuvres complètes*, 5.746.

This etymology, which seems to be original to Ronsard, makes the name “Francus” a Germanic mis-pronunciation of the Greek nickname, “Lance-Bearer.” The placement of this explanation represents a seeming departure from the other etymologies. Ronsard drops this important etymology into a part of the poem that is totally divorced from genealogical concerns; it is preceded and followed by descriptions of the glorious arms and raiment of Francus’s fellow Trojans. However, the timing of the example becomes clearer if we consider that this etymology is very concerned with literary genealogy, in the form of the relationship between the *Franciade* and its epic forebears. At the moment when Francus is preparing to depart his homeland, Ronsard gives us an example of how language can mutate in ways that are neither glorious nor prophetic: through simple time, chance, and the mispronunciation of “peuples vaincus,” the glorious Greek name Astynax can be transformed into the garbled “Francus.” This etymology is thus something of a cautionary tale.¹³²

We might, at first, be tempted to assume that Ronsard is simply providing the etymology of these four words to the best of his own knowledge. However, if we return to the prefaces of the *Franciade* and consider how Ronsard discusses these etymologies there, we see Ronsard is aware of how the etymologies are characteristic of a clear tension between nationalist ideology and critical method. In the 1572 preface, Ronsard prefaces his remarks on the etymologies with a preemptive assurance that he has always told the truth—at least, as much as Homer and Virgil did: “...quand à moy je pense avoir dit la verité, me soumetant toujours à la correction de la meilleure opinion. Autant en faut estimer de Virgile...”¹³³ He goes on to say that Virgil had no choice but to follow the “vieilles Annales de son temps,” just as Ronsard himself has done:

... voyant que le peuple François tient pour chose tres-assurée selon les Annales, que Francion, fils d’Hector, suivy d’une compagnie de Troyens, après le sac de Troye, aborda aux palus Maeotides, & de là plus avant en Hongrie, j’ay allongé la toile, & l’ay fait venir en Franconie, à laquelle il donna le nom, puis en Gaule, fonder Paris, en l’honneur de son oncle Pâris.¹³⁴

Within the poem itself, there is no room for Ronsard to qualify or justify his own degree of belief in these etymologies; nor would it make sense to do so, as they are part of the poem’s nationalist project. Here in the preface, however, Ronsard takes the opportunity to make it clear that he is presenting them as examples of “la correction de la meilleure opinion”—that is, they are considered historical by “les vieilles Annales” and by “le peuple français” rather than by Ronsard himself. Moreover, he justifies his choice to use such etymologies with the fact that Virgil and Homer did the same, thus basing his authority on the ancient examples of these humanist paragons, rather than on his humanist contemporaries and colleagues.

These justifications puncture the idea that Ronsard might genuinely believe that the etymological explanations in the poem are supported by contemporary humanist philology. Indeed, Ronsard claims them as literary rather than scholarly inventions when he says, “J’ai allongé le toile, et l’ai fait venir en Franconie.” He portrays this invention as a reluctant but necessary capitulation to common belief, in which we see strong echoes of the etymology in the poem that links the name “Astyanax” to “Francus” through mispronunciation. The French people will believe what they will believe, and pronounce as they want to pronounce, and the task of the

¹³² Rigolot discusses this etymology as well in “Ronsard’s Pretext for Paratexts,” 36.

¹³³ Pierre de Ronsard, *Œuvres complètes*, 5.677.

¹³⁴ Pierre de Ronsard, *Œuvres complètes*, 5.677.

writer of epic (or the epic hero, as the case may be) is simply to make the best of it. This is further emphasized by the end of the preface, in which Ronsard outlines the danger that the reader's mispronunciation poses to his own poem: "Je te suppliray seulement d'une chose, lecteur, de vouloir bien prononcer mes vers & accomoder ta voix à leur passion, & non comme quelques uns les lisent, plustost à la façon d'une missive, ou de quelques lettres royaux que d'un Poëme bien prononcé!"¹³⁵ By suggesting that some of his own readers will be foolish enough to read poetry as if it were prose, and implying that others will recognize how ridiculous this would be, he uses the preface to hint at a hierarchy of two very different kinds of readership.

Ronsard's long prefatory justifications for his choice not to use alexandrines also hint at this dual audience. Ronsard chooses to write in decasyllables, rather than the alexandrine, which Ronsard himself had called *vers héroïques* in his *Meslanges* (1555).¹³⁶ Ronsard initially claims in the 1572 preface that his royal patron imposed the choice of decasyllables upon him, contrary to his desires. Such a statement clearly indicates that Ronsard is envisioning two different audiences: one, his patron, who is the reader of the poem itself; and another, an informed literary reader aware that decasyllables are the "wrong" choice of meter, to whom he addresses and justifies himself in the preface. Interestingly, Ronsard eliminates this justification for the decasyllables in the 1587 preface, in which he replaces it with a stylistic rationale, and says of his 1572 statement that "je m'estois abuse":

[Les vers Alexandrins] sentent trop la prose tres-facile, & sont trop enervez & flaques, si ce n'est pour les traductions, ausquelles à cause de leur longueur ils servent de beaucoup pour interpreter le sens de l'Auteur qu'on entreprend de traduire. Au reste, ils ont trop de caquet, s'ils ne sont bastis de la main d'un bon artisan, qui les face autant qu'il luy sera possible hausser... de la prose triviale & vulgaire (car le style prosaïque est enemy capital de l'eloquence poëtique[...])¹³⁷

Though the fact that Ronsard is speaking directly to the educated humanist reader is less obvious here, it is still true; only such a reader would understand that (as Du Bellay established in his *Défense*) associating prose with translation is also a way of associating it with inferior forms of textual imitation. At the end of the preface, by contrast, prose becomes not just a mode of imitation practiced by inferior writers, but an effect that can be created by the reader's mispronunciation: "Je te suppliray seulement d'une chose, lecteur, de vouloir bien prononcer mes vers & accomoder ta voix à leur passion, & non comme quelques uns les lisent, plustost à la façon d'une missive, ou de quelques lettres royaux que d'un Poëme bien prononcé!"¹³⁸ By suggesting that some of his own readers will be foolish enough to read poetry as if it were prose, he once again uses the preface to hint at two distinct groups of readers, while of course, the epic poem as a work of nationalist mythmaking must not distinguish between them.

The importance of the *Franciade's* preface, then, is that it offers a place where Ronsard can mitigate his commitment to a royal epic project that is ruthlessly enforced within the poem itself. For example, at the beginning of the poem Ronsard invokes the king explicitly, as is standard in the classical epic tradition exemplified by Homer and Virgil:

¹³⁵ Pierre de Ronsard, *Œuvres complètes*, 5.682.

¹³⁶ Cf. Philip John Usher, Introduction to *The Franciade (1572)* (New York: AMS Press, 2010), liv.

¹³⁷ Pierre de Ronsard, *Œuvres complètes*, 5.1001.

¹³⁸ Pierre de Ronsard, *Œuvres complètes*, 5.682.

“CHARLES MON PRINCE, enflez moy le courage,
En vostre honneur j’entrepren cet ouvrage,
Soyez mon guide, & gardez d’abismer
Ma nef qui flotte en si profonde mer... »¹³⁹ (I.13-14)

As we have seen, Ronsard’s etymologies in the poem are all directly connected to the question of royal genealogy. As such, we can hardly believe that he expected Charles IX to read them with anything short of complete seriousness. We must, therefore, accept that there is a significant tension between the prefatory and poetic narrative voices of the *Franciade*. The etymologies are presented within the poem itself as true, but the prefatory Ronsard knows them to be pseudo-scholarship. In acknowledging this disjuncture in the preface, Ronsard invites his learned readers to consider the *Franciade* as a kind of forgery, attributed to the royalist epic poet Ronsard by the humanist prefacer (and true author) Ronsard.

Let us return, now, to reconsider how the concept of humanist forgery helps us to understand the relationship between Ronsard’s voice in the preface, and his voice in the poem. Scholars like Anthony Grafton and Walter Stephens have argued that forgery was invented anew in the Renaissance, as the kinds of textual analysis skills that I have associated with humanist philology led to the development of greater sophistication in forgery techniques, and vice versa: forgers and critics provided a kind of mutual stimulus resulting in the development of a shared set of textual skills. One of the techniques that forgers developed, and which humanists had to learn to decipher, was the use of what Stephens calls “secondary sponsors”¹⁴⁰: that is, the forged text speaks with two kinds of “I,” one belonging to an authority who appears in paratext to testify to the reality of the text that follows, and the other the “I” of the supposed author. In the *Franciade*, Ronsard’s voice in the preface acts as a “sponsor” to the poem that follows, guaranteeing its authenticity and scholarly provenance; at the same time he also acts as a humanist critic, exposing the etymologies contained in the poem as “forged”—warning us not to mistake them for the real thing. This notion appears in a prefatory poem to the *Franciade* by Amadis Jamyn, which states:

Tu n’as, Ronsard, compose cet ouvrage,
Il est forgé d’une royalle main :
CHARLES sçavant, victorieux & sage
En est l’auteur, tu n’es que l’escrivain.¹⁴¹

While clearly intended to flatter Ronsard’s patron, Jamyn’s quatrain also functions as a disclaimer, disavowing Ronsard’s responsibility for the contents of his poem.¹⁴² Bifurcating his voice in this way allows Ronsard to justify the unauthenticated historical content required by the nature of national epic, while still accomplishing the ideological task of epic itself. Without this double voice, Ronsard’s false etymologies could appeal to the king, or to his skeptical humanist peers, but not to both; with it, Ronsard is able to make use of humanist philological techniques in ways that will read as playfully fictional to one kind of reader, and seriously factual to another.

¹³⁹ Pierre de Ronsard, *Œuvres complètes*, 5.700.

¹⁴⁰ Stephens, “When Pope Noah Ruled the Etruscans,” 609.

¹⁴¹ Pierre de Ronsard, *Les quatre premiers livres de la Franciade par Pierre de Ronsard* (Paris: G. Buon, 1573).

¹⁴² Thanks to the students and faculty of Pomona College for this observation, which emerged out of a talk I gave in the French department in September 2016.

V. Conclusion

I have discussed in this chapter the fact that “forgery” (in the sense of inventing facts, or conveniently overlooking the fact that certain facts could be disproven by critical method), far from being taboo, was a common part of many sixteenth-century humanists’ historiographical practice. The case study of the *Pseudo-Turpin* demonstrates that Renaissance forgers and critics shared more than methods. They were also united in the belief that humanist critical method need not be applied universally, but could be deployed selectively: one could tactfully refrain from pointing out that certain national myths could not be supported by the evidence, in the service of international diplomacy. Or, alternatively, critical methods could be used to brutally dismantle cherished national myths in cases of international rivalry.

In readings of Du Bellay and Ronsard, we see that the two authors have different relationships to the ongoing revolution in humanist historiography. Du Bellay, as we have seen, relies on a rhetorical concept of history, defining the distinctions between genres in terms of form, style, and imitative method rather than any particular relationship to historical truth. He sees the manipulation of genre as an essential tool in the construction of the French national canon, and his desire to see the gaps in the canon filled leads him to take a particularly tolerant view of pseudo-historiography. Ronsard, on the other hand, outlines a theory of epic in his prefaces that is based on neo-Aristotelian definitions of poetry and history, which place a greater onus on him to define the *Franciade* as *vraisemblable*, if not *vérité*, despite the fact that his story is obviously mythological. Ronsard’s solution to this problem is, first, to define the *vraisemblable* as that which is commonly accepted as history; and, secondly, to use his prefaces to provide humanist glosses for the pseudo-scholarship within the poem itself. Where the preface allows him to hint at, and sometimes outright state, his belief that historiography should be established by critical method, within the poem he is obligated to build his narrative upon sources that do not meet this threshold. This produces a bifurcation between the narrative voice of the prefaces, and that of the epic, produced by the competing demands of scholarship and patronage.

What both Du Bellay and Ronsard have in common, though, is the ways in which their works presage the emergence of romance as an alternative site of nationalist historiography. We will see the legacy of their approach to canon formation in the translations that I examine in the chapters to follow. Du Bellay’s approach to the manipulation of genre, in particular, has a transformative effect on how translation is practiced on romance texts. The Spanish and Italian romances that I discuss in chapters Two, Three, and Four are often translated into French by royal historiographers. These translators’ development of romance into a kind of alternative royalist historiography is a response to the tensions within French vernacular humanism that I have described in this chapter. Where Ronsard struggled to provide a responsibly scholarly gloss on the royalist pseudo-history contained within the *Franciade*, the royal historiographers who translate romance feel no such obligation. But these translators are, all the same, deeply indebted to the *Franciade* for the model that it provides: Ronsard showed a generation of writers how the language of humanist scholarship could be used to lend historical authority and scholarly credibility to royal fictions.

In the following chapter, I show how this alternative historiography owes its origins to a single, wildly popular romance translation, for which Joachim Du Bellay himself personally wrote laudatory poems: Nicolas Herberay des Essarts’ translation of the *Amadis de Gaule*. We

saw previously that Du Bellay was no great fan of translation; he says that even Homer and Virgil would have been unable to translate Petrarch “avec la même grâce et naïveté qu’il est en son vulgaire toscan,”¹⁴³ and in Chapter VI, titled “De mauvais traducteurs, et de ne traduire les poètes,” he encourages the worthiest French authors to leave translation to lesser mortals:

Celui donc qui voudra faire œuvre digne de prix en son vulgaire, laisse ce labeur de traduire, principalement les poètes, à ceux qui de chose laborieuse et peu profitable, j’ose dire encore utile, voire pernicieuse à l’accroissement de leur langue, emportent à bon droit plus de molestie que de gloire.¹⁴⁴

The workmanlike language that Du Bellay uses here in relation to translation (“labeur,” “laborieuse,” “molestie”) stands in direct contrast to the excessively long list of sterling attributes he uses to describe the prospective author of French epic (“...doué d’une excellente félicité de nature, instruit de tous bons arts et sciences...”¹⁴⁵) Du Bellay recognizes and respects translation as a task suited to humanist philological erudition; he later praises Lazare de Baïf as a “lumière française” specifically for his translation of *Electra*, saying that it is translated “quasi vers pour vers, chose laborieuse, comme entendent ceux qui ont essayé le semblable.”¹⁴⁶ But he frames this kind of imitation as a lesser kind of literary labor, belonging to the past of French literature rather than to the future. As we will see in the next chapter, though, just three years after the *Défense et illustration*, Du Bellay takes a considerably different position on translation. He overcomes his scruples on translation to become a vocal admirer of the *Amadis de Gaule*, a project that advances his goals of filling in the gaps in the French literary canon, and paving a path forward for French vernacular literature. Ultimately, the “long poem français” that Du Bellay called for turns out to be no poem at all, but a prose romance.

¹⁴³ Du Bellay, *Défense et Illustration de la la Langue française*, 233.

¹⁴⁴ Du Bellay, *Défense et Illustration de la la Langue française*, 235-236.

¹⁴⁵ Du Bellay, *Défense et Illustration de la la Langue française*, 265-266.

¹⁴⁶ Du Bellay, *Défense et Illustration de la la Langue française*, 291.

CHAPTER TWO

The King's Speech: Romance, Rhetoric, and Royal Power in the *Amadis de Gaule*

It has long been a commonplace of scholarship on romance in Renaissance Europe to frame the genre as a humanist *bête noire*, despite the fact that many prominent humanists worked on romance projects.¹⁴⁷ On the one hand, it is certainly true that many sixteenth-century French humanists despised these works. We have seen that Montaigne famously dismissed the romance genre as “tel fatras de livres à quoi l'enfance s'amuse,”¹⁴⁸ and toward the end of the sixteenth century, many members of the literary elite attacked the genre as frivolous or downright dangerous.¹⁴⁹ The danger that these humanists perceived from romance was in direct proportion to the genre's extreme popularity.¹⁵⁰ Though Montaigne thought romances fit only for children, a vast swath of adults—including the King himself¹⁵¹—were avid readers of romance. The reading and interpretation of exemplary texts was a cornerstone of Renaissance humanist pedagogy, and was viewed as a particularly important part of a monarch's moral education;¹⁵² so it should not, perhaps, surprise us that many humanists expressed deep concern over the fact that these readers were spending so much time with literature that seemed designed to entertain, rather than to instruct. On the other hand, it would be a mistake to think that all Renaissance humanists took the same position on romance. While many of the romances circulating in early Renaissance France were more or less printed versions of medieval manuscript texts,¹⁵³ the *Amadis de Gaule*—the most popular romance in sixteenth-century France—upended the romance industry altogether by modernizing the genre for a new age; and humanists played a critical role in this modernization. Thus, it is clear that in sixteenth century France, chivalric romance was not a genre universally despised by humanists. Rather, it was a genre that exposed the deep internal divisions within French humanism at this historical moment.

The *Amadis* was a massive 21-volume romance cycle that took all of Europe by storm. In France, each volume was translated from a vernacular source text. In the case of the first five books, the source texts were Spanish originals by Garcí Rodríguez de Montalvo (Montalvo's first

¹⁴⁷ As one example, Virginia Krause, in writing on Barthélemy Aneau's *Alector*, comments, “Given the climate around 1560, it is rather surprising that a serious humanist... should attempt to rehabilitate romance.” Virginia Krause, “The End of Chivalric Romance: Barthélemy Aneau's ‘Alector’ (1560),” *Renaissance and Reformation / Renaissance et Réforme* 23, no. 2 (Spring 1999): 46.

¹⁴⁸ Michel de Montaigne, *Essais de Michel de Montaigne* (Paris: Impr. nationale éditions, 1998), 291.

¹⁴⁹ See Michel Simonin, “La disgrâce d'Amadis,” *Studi Francesi* 28 (1984): 1-35; as well as Marc Fumaroli, “Jacques Amyot and the Clerical Polemic Against the Chivalric Novel,” *Renaissance Quarterly* 38, no. 1 (1985): 22-40, discussed further below.

¹⁵⁰ Similar debates were ongoing in Renaissance Italy around the comparison between Torquato Tasso's *Gerusalemme liberata* and Ludovico Ariosto's *Orlando furioso*. For more on the Italian context for these debates, see Chapter Three.

¹⁵¹ As we will see later in this chapter, while François I is perhaps best known for championing the translation of classical works into French, he also played an active role as a patron of romance translation, as did his descendants.

¹⁵² Cf. Timothy Hampton, *Writing from History: The Rhetoric of Exemplarity in Renaissance Literature* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1990). On reading, exemplarity, and the moral instruction of princes, see particularly Chapter 2, “Budé, Erasmus, Machiavelli: Reading from History” (31-80).

¹⁵³ Marie Thérèse Jones-Davies, ed., *Le Roman de Chevalerie au temps de la Renaissance* (Paris: Jean Touzot, 1987).

book was published in 1508), and later volumes came from subsequent continuations by other Spanish, Italian, and German authors. These continuations were produced up to the very end of the sixteenth century. The first eight books of the French *Amadis* were translated by Nicolas Herberay des Essarts, a somewhat mysterious figure about whom not much is known aside from his translations from Spanish to French, and the fact that he is often identified on his title pages as “commissaire ordinaire de l'artillerie du roi.” Herberay’s translations of the *Amadis* received near-universal acclaim, and were dedicated to royal patrons and published in prestigious folio editions.¹⁵⁴ Studies of Herberay’s contracts with his publishers have shown that he leveraged unequalled power to dictate his terms, likely in large part because of the royal favour lavished on the project by the king. The reason for this unusual favour is not entirely clear; one explanation has been advanced in the form of an unsubstantiated legend that Herberay first encountered the *Amadis* while imprisoned in Madrid with François I.¹⁵⁵ In any case, the first eight books of the series were conceived and executed as luxury objects, fit for kings.

Part of what made the *Amadis* volumes feel so new, and so unique, was the fact that the books’ material form was inspired by Renaissance humanist printing, rather than following the traditional formats used to print medieval romances. The Arthurian romances printed in the early sixteenth century prior to the *Amadis*, based on French vernacular manuscript sources, typically employed a Gothic black-letter typeface and a cramped two-column *mise en page* that preserved the look and feel of the medieval manuscript.¹⁵⁶ The *Amadis de Gaule*, by contrast, was a folio in roman type, in a spacious single column, with specially commissioned woodcuts. This strikingly modern appearance associated the *Amadis* with prestigious humanist editions of classical and Italian texts being produced by printers like Aldus Manutius, and considerably distanced it from previous printed medieval French prose romances.¹⁵⁷ As the books’ popularity grew, the original Paris publishers printed a number of re-editions in smaller formats. These publishers also built on the series’ runaway popularity by printing a compilation of the *Amadis* books’ speeches and letters, called the *Trésor des Amadis*.¹⁵⁸ After 1577, the *Amadis* publication industry moved from Paris to Lyon, where the books began to be produced in smaller, cheaper formats. The Lyonnais publisher F. Didier republished the 14 books already in circulation, as well as seven more, which were translations of continuations written in Italian, and a version of the *Trésor* covering all 21 books. The publishing arc of the *Amadis* thus begins with luxury editions produced for the monarchy itself, and ends with commercial editions catering to a much broader audience.¹⁵⁹ New volumes of the *Amadis* continued to find an audience for over sixty years (the last French volume of the *Amadis* was published in 1615, and the last edition of the *Trésor* in 1605). This extraordinary longevity is a testament to the books’ enduring impact on French literary culture,

¹⁵⁴ Specifically, the first four books are dedicated to the patronage of Charles, Duke of Orléans, while the fifth is dedicated to the king.

¹⁵⁵ Jane H. M. Taylor, *Rewriting Arthurian Romance in Renaissance France: From Manuscript to Printed Book* (Cambridge: Boydell & Brewer Ltd, 2014), 150-151.

¹⁵⁶ For more on this, see Taylor, Chapter 6, “‘Satyric Scenes in Landscape Style’: *Amadis de Gaule*,” in *Rewriting Arthurian Romance*, 147-183, as well as the larger discussion of the printing of medieval texts throughout her book.

¹⁵⁷ Taylor, *Rewriting Arthurian Romance in Renaissance France*, 147-150.

¹⁵⁸ The editors received another privilege in 1554 that covered both the translations themselves, and any “sommaries, abbregez ou extraictz” such as the *Trésor*. Michel Bideaux, “Fortune et reception critique,” in *Amadis de Gaule, Livre I* (Paris: Honoré Champion Éditeur, 2006), 69.

¹⁵⁹ On this narrative of the gradual “démocratisation” of the series, see also Benhaïm (2000) and Vaganay (1929).

although—as I noted above—this later period in the history of the series coincides with a loss of prestige among the literary elite.¹⁶⁰

In addition to the *Amadis* books' physical resemblance to humanist publications, there was another aspect of the works that caused them to be celebrated by many French humanists, even as others (like Montaigne) loudly voiced their disdain. While romances like the *Amadis* could not compete with classical works in providing historical exemplars, they could (and did) function as exemplars of vernacular rhetoric. We will see in this chapter that throughout the latter half of the sixteenth century, many French humanists recognized that the *Amadis* translation was playing a watershed role in advancing the capabilities of the French language toward those of Latin and Greek. This distinguished the *Amadis* from most other translations of the time, particularly other translations of vernacular source texts. We have seen, in Chapter One, that many humanists (like Joachim Du Bellay) were skeptical about the value of translation as a literary activity.¹⁶¹ It was customary for early sixteenth-century French translations to apologize, in their prefaces, for the French language's lack of linguistic *richesse*. Translators of vernacular works would also often attempt to justify their source texts' dubious educative value. For instance, Antoine Le Maçon, who produced the first full translation of the *Decameron* from Italian in 1545 at the behest of Marguerite de Navarre, says in his preface that he has “prins peine de ne dire en nostre langue plus ne moins que Bocace à fait en la sienne,” while at the same time justifying his choice of source material against those who say “que j'eusse mieulx fait d'employer le temps à quelque autre oeuvre de plus grand fruit.”¹⁶² Though Le Maçon goes on to defend Boccaccio from accusations of frivolity, this defensive stance was typical of translators working with vernacular source texts.

By contrast, Nicolas Herberay des Essarts (the first translator of the *Amadis*) was wholly unapologetic about his source material; and throughout the sixteenth century, Herberay had a reputation as one of the finest French prose writers of his time.¹⁶³ Jean Martin, the translator of *Le Songe de Poliphile* (1545), calls Herberay the “vray Cicero François,”¹⁶⁴ as do prefatory poems to Books VI, VII, and VIII of the translation,¹⁶⁵ and an ode by Joachim Du Bellay himself (written in 1552, three years after his critique of translation in the *Défense et illustration*) names Herberay the French Homer:

Or entre les mieux appris
Le chœur des Muses ordonne
Qu'à HERBERAY soit le pris

¹⁶⁰ In fact, three more translations (bringing the total to twenty-four) based on German continuations were printed in Strasbourg by Lazare Zetner in 1594; however, as I have not been able to review these personally, and they were not distributed in France until 1615, I do not discuss them here. Interestingly, these seem to be once again a return to prestige editions, in-8 (Benhaïm 160 n. 12).

¹⁶¹ Cf. Chapter One, “Conclusion,” 27.

¹⁶² Giovanni Boccaccio, *Le Décaméron de Messire Jehan Bocace...*, Transl. Antoine Le Maçon (Paris: Estienne Roffet, 1545), aiiiv.

¹⁶³ The prefaces to many sixteenth-century romances framed the books' eloquence as their primary benefit to the reader; this is the case in, e.g., prefaces to *Palmerin d'Olive* (1546), *Gérard d'Euphrate* (1549), *Primaléon de Grèce* (1550), and the *Nouveau Tristan* (1554). Cf. Marian Rothstein, *Reading in the Renaissance: Amadis de Gaule and the Lessons of Memory* (University of Delaware Press, 1999); see pp. 34-39. However, the *Amadis* was the only one of these works whose eloquence achieved widespread acclaim.

¹⁶⁴ Ctd. Rothstein, *Reading in the Renaissance*, 38.

¹⁶⁵ Mireille Huchon, “Amadis, ‘Parfaicte idée de nostre langue françoise,’” in *Les Amadis en France au XVIe siècle* (Paris : Éditions rue d'Ulm, 2000), 190.

De la plus riche couronne :
Pour avoir si proprement
De son propre acoutrement
Orné l'Achille Gaulloys,
Dont la douceur allechante
Donne à celui qui le chante
Le nom d'Homere François.¹⁶⁶

Humanists such as Henri Estienne, Etienne Pasquier, and Thomas Sébillet praised the language of the *Amadis* throughout the sixteenth century;¹⁶⁷ and three members of the Pléïade (including Du Bellay) wrote prefatory poems for various books in the translation, while other Pléïade members—such as Gohory—translated volumes themselves.

What exactly did these men see in the *Amadis* that Montaigne did not? In this chapter, I argue that the humanists who allied themselves with the *Amadis* project were those who, like Du Bellay, prioritized the development of the French literary canon over maintaining a hierarchy of genres. I showed in Chapter One that Du Bellay, in the *Défense et illustration*, argues that romance is a native French genre and should therefore be revitalized for a new age as national epic, even if that means discarding epic's traditionally historical dimensions.¹⁶⁸ Du Bellay envisions, in the *Défense*, a renewal of romance in the form of a “long poème français”; but Herberay des Essarts' translation provides an alternative, using romance to develop vernacular prose oratory instead. As we will see, Herberay pays particular attention, in his translation, to the rewriting of speeches and letters in his source text, revising them to fit humanist rhetorical parameters. Many of these speeches pertain to the relationship between the king and his subjects, or to questions of statecraft and governance, suggesting that Herberay des Essarts is re-imagining romance as a source of instructive exemplars (a role typically reserved for histories). Herberay's version of kingly education, however, is focused on oratorical rather than moral instruction. The compilation of Herberay's speeches in the *Trésor des Amadis* is part of this same project; the *Trésor* functions as a kind of vernacular commonplace book, thus institutionalizing the pedagogical functions of the *Amadis* and rebutting those who would see it as mere frivolous entertainment.

In the end, the popularity of the *Amadis* could not survive beyond the sixteenth century. For one thing, as we have seen in Chapter One, the end of the century coincided with a turn toward the redefinition of genres along neo-Aristotelian lines.¹⁶⁹ Another factor that led to the end of the *Amadis* in France was its popularization; what was once a vehicle for the education of kings became an instructional manual for socially ambitious merchants, leading to a corresponding (and fatal) diminishing of the series' prestige. However, we will see that one of the last translators of the *Amadis*, Gabriel Chappuys, was an apt pupil of Herberay; he understood that the *Amadis* constituted a lesson in how romance could take on many of the traditional functions of historiography. And he carried this lesson with him into his next romance project, which brought romance into direct contact with French royalist history: translating the *Orlando Furioso*.

¹⁶⁶ Ctd. Huchon, “Amadis, ‘Parfaicte idée de nostre langue françoise,’” 189-190.

¹⁶⁷ See Rothstein, *Reading in the Renaissance*, 34-39.

¹⁶⁸ Chapter One, 13-17.

¹⁶⁹ See my discussion of Ronsard's *Franciade* in Chapter One.

I. “Poésie en façon d’histoire”: Translation and the Historicizing of Romance

I described above how the *Amadis* was treated by many French humanists as a landmark in the development of the French language—specifically, French prose. The preface by the translator (and Pléiade member) Jacques Gohory to Book XIII of the *Amadis* makes it clear that the project was consciously conceived, at least by some of its translators, as a showcase for vernacular rhetoric:

Je feray doncques fin à ce discours par une demonstration de l’art Rethoricale qui consiste en la composition ou construction des Rommans, non croyable qu’à ceux qui en contemplent de pres toute l’architecture. Lesquels connaissent certainement que la delectation y estant pour fin proposée au Rommanceur, selon les institutions oratoires de Ciceron, le style aussi y est Floride, net et coulant... Il faut souvent que la version supplée à l’invention : et quant au style qu’elle varie infiniment par copie és deux sugets principaux des armes et d’amour.¹⁷⁰

Gohory’s argument here that “Il faut souvent que la version supplée à l’invention” is an interesting amendment to his colleague Joachim Du Bellay’s condemnation of translation as a lesser form of imitation in the *Défense et illustration*. Gohory, here, suggests that romance offers the translator a unique opportunity to focus on the development of style; for him, translating a romance is an exercise in *copia*, which challenges him to produce endless variations on the subjects of “armes et amour,” just as Erasmus’ *De copia* famously includes 150 variants on the phrase “*tuae litterae me magnopere delectarunt*.”¹⁷¹ While some humanists viewed romance’s prioritization of “style over substance” as dangerous, members of the Pléiade seem to have welcomed it as an opportunity to focus on vernacular rhetoric—on “version” rather than “invention.”

The relationship between translation and source text implied by this approach is related to the ambiguity that Terence Cave has identified within the term “*copia*”: Cave has observed that Renaissance authors use the term both to refer to a positive literary quality of “plenitude,” and to limn their anxiety around producing work that is merely a “copy.”¹⁷² But while this ambiguity operates, in the works that Cave examines, as a problem within original French compositions by authors like Rabelais and Montaigne, it takes on a different theoretical significance in relation to translation. Typical scholarly accounts of Renaissance translation take the status of the translation as “copy” for granted; they follow Renaissance translation theorists themselves in focusing on the concepts of loss and fidelity implied by formulae like “word-for-word” or “sense-for-sense” translation.¹⁷³ These formulae suggesting that the translator has a binary choice to be made between translating “*ad sensum*” or “*ut oratore*”; but the “copious” sense of the word “*copia*” is largely absent in these theories. The translator’s prefaces to the *Amadis* series provide an intriguing counter-example to this trend, in that they include almost no references to these standard prefatory formulae.

¹⁷⁰ Ctd. Huchon, “Amadis, ‘Parfaicte idée de nostre langue françoise,’” 184.

¹⁷¹ Desiderius Erasmus, “Copia: Foundations of the Abundant Style,” *Literary and Educational Writings 2*, ed. Craig R. Thompson, transl. Betty I. Knott (Toronto ; Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1978), section 33.

¹⁷² Terence Cave, *The Cornucopian Text: Problems of Writing in the French Renaissance* (Clarendon Press, 1979).

¹⁷³ Glyn P. Norton, *The Ideology and Language of Translation in Renaissance France and Their Humanist Antecedents* (Paris: Librairie Droz, 1984).

So what makes it possible for the translators of the *Amadis* to conceive their task as the production of plenitude, rather than as faithful copying? The answer to this question has to do with the way the *Amadis* project was framed, throughout the production of the series, as a kind of repatriation. We saw in Chapter One that Du Bellay framed the work of translation as difficult, servile, and ultimately not worth the effort it took (“chose laborieuse et peu profitable”). However, there is nothing servile about French translators’ approach to the *Amadis* project. Their loyalty is entirely to the repatriation of the romance genre as native French literary property; and as such, their concept of translation is entirely different from the one that typically emerges from Renaissance translators’ prefaces. We have already seen this argument advanced by the scholar and poet Jean Vauquelin de la Fresnaye; in the introduction to this dissertation, I discussed his claim (made in his 1605 *Art poétique*) that the *Amadis* was originally a French work, and that Herberay des Essarts’ Spanish source text was itself based on a French original. Vauquelin’s account of the book’s origin also serves as a defense of any and all unfaithfulness in Herberay’s translation:

Nostre Amadis de Gaule en vieil Picard rimé,
N’estoit moins que nos Pairs entre nous estimé.
D’Amadis, l’Espagnol a sa langue embellie,
Et sa langue embellit de nos Pairs l’Italie:
Et quand nous reprendrons ces beaux larcins connus,
De rien nous ne pouvons leur en estre tenus. (1005-1010)¹⁷⁴

Vauquelin explicitly states that the repatriative nature of the project demands an unfaithful approach to literary translation, as a means of reasserting French ownership of the *Amadis* material.

The concept that the *Amadis* had been “stolen” from France by Spain, and that it was now being returned to its original language, was repeated on numerous occasions in prefatory materials throughout the series. It is often paired with praise for Herberay’s translation, and the superior qualities of the French language on display in the *Amadis*. The prefatory poem by Michel Le Clerc to the first book is one illustrative example. Echoing the famous opening lines of Petrarch’s sonnet “Voi ch’ascolte in rime sparse il suono...”, Le Clerc invites the reader to bear witness to Amadis’ return home, and its implications for French superiority over the Spanish:

Qui voudra veoir maintes lances briser,
Harnois froisser, escuz tailler et fendre,
Qui voudra veoir l’amant amour priser,
Et par amour les combatz entreprendre,
Viegne Amadis visiter et entendre
Que des Essars par diligent ouvrage
A retourné en son premier langaige,
Et soit certain qu’Espagne en ceste affaire,
Cognoistra bien que France a l’avantage
Au bien parler autant comme au bien faire.¹⁷⁵

¹⁷⁴ Jean Vauquelin de la Fresnaye, *L’Art poétique*, ed. Georges Pellissier (Paris: Garnier Frères, 1885), 118.

Antoine Macault echoes these sentiments in his own prefatory poem to the same volume:

...Et vous oisifz cessartz
Suyvez ce translateur, qui des branchuz Essars
Du parler Espagnol, en essartant, deffriche
Nostre Amadis de Gaule: et le rend par ses artz
En son premier François, doux, aorné, propre, et riche.¹⁷⁶

In each of these poems, the superior linguistic quality of Herberay's translation is linked to the fact that his translation is, in fact, a repatriation. Not only is Herberay reclaiming the *Amadis* (its characters, and its story) as French property, but he is channeling the primal rhetorical power of that imaginary French source text—"son premier langaige," "son premier François"—and making it available to a sixteenth-century French audience.

The most influential of all such arguments is the one advanced within the text itself by Herberay des Essarts. In his preface to the first book, Herberay claims that the Spanish text he is translating was itself based on a French original:

... il est tout certain qu'il fut premier mis en nostre langue Françoisse, estant Amadis Gaulois, & non Espagnol. Et qu'ainsi soit j'en ay trouvé encores quelque reste d'ung vieil livre escript à la main en langaige Picard, sur lequel j'estime que les Espagnolz ont fait leur traduction, non pas du tout suyvant le vray original, comme l'on pourra veoir par cestuy, car ilz en ont obmis en d'aulcuns endroitz, et augmenté aux aultres....¹⁷⁷

Here, Herberay draws on the self-evident nature of the book's title (and the place-name "Gaul") to claim that the *Amadis* story is originally from France, and that the Spanish text is thus obviously a translation. Herberay's use of this "found manuscript" narrative is typically understood as the simple repetition of a trope common to medieval romance. Indeed, Montalvo's Spanish text begins with such a narrative, which Herberay does not translate, though his own preface obviously touches on similar themes:

...por gran dicha pareció en un tumba de piedra, que debaxo de la tierra en una hermita, cerca de Constantinopla fue hallada, y traydo por un úngaro mercadero a estas partes de España, en letra y pargamino tan antiguo que con mucho trabajo se pudo leer por aquellos que la lengua sabían...¹⁷⁸

However, in Herberay's case, the fact that the manuscript in question is French, and the fact that this preface contributes to a larger claim to French primacy over the *Amadis* made at great length

¹⁷⁵ Nicolas Herberay des Essarts, *Amadis de Gaule. Livre I*, Ed. Michel Bideaux (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2006), 161.

¹⁷⁶ Herberay des Essarts, *Amadis de Gaule, Livre I*, 163

¹⁷⁷ Herberay des Essarts, *Amadis de Gaule, Livre I*.

¹⁷⁸ "...very fortunately it came to light in a stone tomb discovered underground below a hermitage near Constantinople and was brought to this part of Spain by a Hungarian merchant, being inscribed on parchment so old that only with great difficulty were those who knew the language able to read it." Garci R. de. Montalvo, *Amadis of Gaul, Books I and II*, Transl. Edwin Place and Herbert Behm (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2003), 19-20.

in the prefatory materials, gives his deployment of the trope a particularly nationalistic tenor that is unprecedented up to this point (though it becomes quite important to the reception of *Orlando Furioso*, as I will show in the following chapter). It also demands to be taken more seriously than do medieval romance prefaces such as Montalvo's; Herberay claims to have seen the documents in question himself, and claims a certain philological authority over them, suggesting that he will correct the deficiencies in the original Spanish translation through his own French version.

In his preface, Herberay claims that his translational infidelities are not infidelities at all, but merely corrections to a deficient historical record; and the fact that Vauquelin de la Fresnaye affirms this right to infidelity in the exact same terms in his *Art Poétique* sixty-five years later demonstrates the power of this preface, at least in certain circles, not just as a romance trope, but as a contribution to the still-new narratives of French literary historiography. Indeed, it is only in the last century that modern scholars have fully discarded the possibility of a real Picard manuscript, in favor of the conclusion that the Spanish *Amadis* is based on Spanish or Portuguese sources (though, of course, it has indirect roots in medieval French romance).¹⁷⁹ Despite Herberay's claims to the contrary, modern scholars believe that the "Gaul" to which Montalvo's original Spanish text refers is most likely an imaginary sovereign nation, part of the geographical conventions of medieval romance,¹⁸⁰ rather than a historical pre-modern France.

Herberay's prefatory claim that the original manuscript was written in Picard is a particularly interesting departure from the typical medieval "found manuscript" narrative, which usually describes a text written in an ancient classical language. By choosing Picard instead, Herberay draws upon the belief held by many sixteenth-century theorists of language that Picard (understood as related to or as a dialect of Walloon) was the oldest and purest form of French. Ronsard makes reference to this belief in the second preface to the *Franciade*, saying, "...je t'adverti de ne faire conscience de remettre en usage les antiques vocables, et principalement ceux du langage wallon et picard, lequel nous reste par tant de siècles, l'exemple naïf de la langue françoise, j'enten de celle qui eut cours après que la latine n'eut plus d'usage en nostre Gaule."¹⁸¹ But Herberay, while trading on the reputed antiquity and prestige of Picard in his account of the *Amadis*' origins, does not imply a lack of comprehensibility or continuity between that version of French and that of the present. Rather, he attributes any discontinuity between the Picard text and his own to the infidelities committed in the Spanish translation. Vauquelin, in his *Art poétique*, can be seen reprising this strategy when he suggests that the theft of the *Amadis* is part of a larger tradition of linguistic theft, in which speakers of other Romance languages stole from the prestige of Walloon:

Or l'[W]ualon estant tout le premier vulgaire,
Et l'Italie, et l'Espagne, ont formé l'exemplaire
Du leur sur son Roman, ayant pris pour leçons
De nos chants et Sonnets les antiques façons:
Et puis comme celuy qui de ruse maline,
Derobe le cheval en l'estable voisine,
Luy fait le crin, la queue et l'oreille couper,
Et quelque temps après le revend pour tromper

¹⁷⁹ See Grace Williams, *The Amadis Question* (New York; Paris: Extrait de la Revue hispanique, 1909) and Edwin B. Place, "The Amadis question," *Speculum* 25, no. 3 (1950): 357-366.

¹⁸⁰ Edwin B. Place, "Amadis of Gaul, Wales, or what?" *Hispanic Review* 23, no. 2 (1955): 99-107.

¹⁸¹ Ctd. Vauquelin de la Fresnaye, *L'Art poétique*, 115 n. 959.

A son mesme voisin: ainsi nostre langage
Ils ont prins et planté dans leur terreur sauvage,
Et l'ayant deguisé nous le revendent or,
Comme fins maquinons plus cher qu'au prix de l'or. [II.959-970]¹⁸²

The two examples that Vauquelin offers, to substantiate his claim that French patrimony is being fraudulently re-sold back to the French, are Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso*¹⁸³ and the *Amadis de Gaule*. As we will see in the following chapter, it is the *Furioso*'s reception that is influenced by that of the *Amadis*, rather than the reverse; the literary historiography that Herberay offers for the *Amadis* is so compelling that it is adopted in the marketing and reception of the *Furioso*, and then adopted by Vauquelin to explain French literary historiography in a broader historical sense.

It may be that Herberay viewed Spanish romance as particularly rich terrain for this kind of literary pseudo-history. For one thing, the translation of a vernacular source text did not demand the kind of philological rigor that Herberay's fellow humanists might require for a translation of classical text.¹⁸⁴ But also, there was a particularly permeable relationship between romance and pseudo-history in sixteenth-century Spanish literary culture. As I have mentioned in my first chapter, Fray Antonio de Guevara's *Marco Aurelio*, which was first published as the *Libro aureo de Marco Aurelio* in 1524 and later as the *Reloj de principes*, was a particularly prominent Spanish pseudo-history. Herberay des Essarts was personally familiar with the work, as he retranslated the first book as the *Horloge des princes* in 1555.¹⁸⁵ Herberay's knowledge of this work is particularly suggestive, since the *Reloj de principes* is a clear predecessor for Herberay's work in the sense that it shows how history's traditional place in the education of monarchs can be usurped by other, pseudo-historical works. The prevalence of such practices, and their resemblance to pseudo-historiographical tropes in prose romance (such as Montalvo's "found manuscript" narrative at the beginning of his *Amadis*), was a source of real anxiety in Spain among humanist historiographers who worried that real and false historiography were becoming indistinguishable to the average reader.¹⁸⁶

In any case, given that so many Renaissance humanists in both Spain and France were engaged in pseudo-historical writing at the border between romance and historiography, we should not view Herberay's pseudo-historical narrative about the literary history of the *Amadis* as the mere reiteration of a medieval trope. Rather, given his evident interest in using the *Amadis* project as an exercise in vernacular rhetoric, it makes more sense to view the story of the Picard

¹⁸² Vauquelin de la Fresnaye, *L'Art poétique*, 115-116.

¹⁸³ Discussed in more detail in the following chapter.

¹⁸⁴ On the other hand, many Italian source texts were treated with similar translational reverence, even those—like Boccaccio's *Decameron*—that were treating fictional subjects in prose.

¹⁸⁵ René Bertaut de la Grise also produced a popular French translation of the *Marco Aurelio* in 1531, which saw 18 editions by 1593. José-Manuel Losada-Goya, *Bibliographie critique de la littérature espagnole en France au XVIII^e siècle: présence et influence* (Paris: Librairie Droz, 1999), 298.

¹⁸⁶ Louise Wilson, "The Publication of Iberian Romance in Early Modern Europe," in *Translation and the Book Trade in Early Modern Europe*, Eds. José María Pérez Fernández and Edward Wilson-Lee (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 204. There was reason for this concern, since Spanish historiographers' tendency toward rhetorical practices bordering on outright fictions was not limited to an outright forger like Guevara; even more mainstream sixteenth-century Spanish historiographers like Pero López de Ayala's *Cronicas de los reyes de Castilla* included examples of inventive and elaborate *sermocinatio*. Ayala's *Crónica de Don Pedro* includes two interpolated letters written in the voice of a fictional Moorish adviser to the king of Granada. These letters, rather than aspiring to historical credibility, include fables, proverbs, and prophecies. Cf. Robert B. Tate, "López De Ayala, Humanist Historian?" *Hispanic Review* 25, no. 3 (1957): 168-169.

manuscripts as an exercise in the kind of humanist forgery that I discussed in my first chapter. The ethics of such an exercise—which we might compare to the invented speeches in Lorenzo Valla’s treatise *On the Donation of Constantine* that I discussed in Chapter One—relied on a mutual understanding between a humanist reader and writer that they were exercises in prudential judgment. Victoria Kahn describes this dynamic at work in Quattrocento Italian humanism:

...the interpretive practice of reading requires the same acts of discrimination, the same judgments of decorum, as does the author’s practice of writing. Thus, the practice of interpretation, like the practice of writing, exemplifies for the humanist the inseparability of moral philosophy and rhetoric.¹⁸⁷

But the broader public introduced by both the vernacular, and the wide reach of the printed book, created the possibility for a carefully crafted humanist exercise in decorum to be misconstrued by the uninformed reader as truth—particularly when the text took the form of a temptingly entertaining romance narrative.

This was precisely the fear voiced by those humanists in France, most notably Jacques Amyot, who criticized the *Amadis*. Many scholars have attributed the eventual decline of the chivalric novel to Amyot; and he clearly allies himself with those who see a danger in the eroding boundaries between history and fiction. Amyot’s solution is to insist that readerly pleasure ought to come from the recognition of a work’s educative value, rather than from the author’s manipulation of the reader’s emotions through rhetoric. Indeed, the preface to Amyot’s translation of Plutarch’s *Lives* (first published in 1559) is rather severe in suggesting that his task as a translator is not to provide an enjoyable reading experience, but to accurately convey Plutarch’s rather dry language:

...je confesse avoir plus estudié à rendre fidelement ce que l’auteur a voulu dire, que non pas à orner ou polir le langage, ainsi que luy mesme a mieuls aimé escrire doctement & gravement en sa langue, que non pas doucement ny facilement. Mais en recompense il y a tant de plaisir, d’instruction & de profit en la substance du livre, qu’en quelque style qu’il soit mis, prouveu qu’il s’entende, il ne peut faillir à estre bien receu de toute personne de bon jugement...¹⁸⁸

Amyot argues, here, that the properly instructed reader ought to find pleasure in the work’s substance rather than its style; furthermore, he argues that the natural genre for the reader seeking instruction with a hint of enjoyment is history. For Amyot, romances are dangerous because of their emphasis on style over substance. The importance of history is especially acute for “princes et grands seigneurs,” as the events depicted in a history are similar to those that princes experience themselves.¹⁸⁹ This is one iteration of the Renaissance vocabulary of heroic

¹⁸⁷ Victoria Kahn, *Rhetoric, Prudence, and Skepticism in the Renaissance* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1985), 39.

¹⁸⁸ Jacques Amyot, “Au Trespuissant et treschrestien Roy de France Henry deuxieme de ce nom, Jacques Amyot Abbé de Belozane son treshumble & tresobeissant serviteur S.,” *Les Vies des homes illustres, grecs et romains [...]* seconde edition [...] (Paris: Michel de Vascosan, 1565), a.ii^v

¹⁸⁹ Fumaroli, “Jacques Amyot and the Clerical Polemic Against the Chivalric Novel,” 29, fn. 18.

exemplarity that Timothy Hampton has identified as a defining feature of the rhetorical dimensions of humanist reading practices.¹⁹⁰

With this in mind, it is perhaps surprising that Amyot himself translated a romance—Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*. Marc Fumaroli has shown that Amyot's translations of Heliodorus, though surprising coming from a Catholic Reformation bishop, were a strategic "counterattack" against the popularity of Herberay's *Amadis*: since people insisted on reading romance rather than history, Amyot set out to provide them with a suitable alternative.¹⁹¹ To his mind, Greek romance is preferable to Spanish romances like the *Amadis*. But even in the preface to his French translation of Heliodorus' *Aethiopica* (1547), Amyot takes the opportunity to emphasize that French chivalric romance utterly fails to live up to humanist literary standards:

...la plus grande partie des livres de ceste sorte, qui ont anciennement esté escritz en nostre langue, oultre ce qu'il n'y a nulle erudition, nulle cognoissance de l'antiquité, ne chose aucune (à brief parler) dont on peust tirer quelque utilité, encore sont ilz le plus souvent si mal cousuz & si esloignez de toute vraysemblable aparence, qu'il semble que ce soient plus tost songes de quelque malade resvant en fièvre chaude qu'inventions d'aucun homme d'esprit, & de jugement.¹⁹²

Here, Amyot borrows arguments from humanist poetics to point to the ways in which literary pleasure is difficult to reconcile with the demands of pious Christianity.¹⁹³

Fumaroli aptly observes that in the prefaces to the later volumes of the *Amadis*, the translators and editors of the series effectively adopt Amyot's classification of chivalric romance as an inherently inferior genre. They abandon their defences of the *Amadis* based on the translations' superior rhetorical qualities, and instead attempt to defend the *Amadis* as a fable, worthy for its allegorical value. Fumaroli argues that such translators, like Claude Colet, were overcome by their guilty humanist consciences.¹⁹⁴ However, it would be more accurate to say that humanist dimensions of the *Amadis* project could not withstand the series' commercial success. The moral danger that Amyot prophesied was based on a socially conservative view of humanist pedagogy, according to which not all readers could be trusted to carefully exercise prudential judgment in reading a potentially misleading text.¹⁹⁵ And indeed, in a certain sense the reception of the *Amadis* shows that these fears were justified; the wider public greeted Herberay's translation with great enthusiasm as a source of exempla for vernacular writing, while the ethical, behavioral dimensions of rhetorical reading largely fell by the wayside. Herberay's translations of speeches show that the *Amadis* project's emphasis on "style over substance" was ultimately meant to lead to a better understanding of the central role that rhetoric

¹⁹⁰ Timothy Hampton, *Writing from History: The Rhetoric of Exemplarity in Renaissance Literature* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990), cf. 4: "Heroism is a rhetoric—a deliberate rhetoric intended to provoke action. The image of the exemplary figure exhorts the reader, recalling in the most direct way Cicero's definition of rhetoric as 'speech designed to persuade'... or Augustine's characterization of the aim of rhetoric as 'inducement to action.'"

¹⁹¹ Marc Fumaroli, "Jacques Amyot and the Clerical Polemic Against the Chivalric Novel," 27.

¹⁹² Jacques Amyot, "Le Proësme du translateur." *L'Histoire aethiopique de Heliodorus* (Paris: J. Longis, 1547), A.ii^v-A.iii^r. Ronsard's arguments here bear a strong resemblance to Ronsard's critique of *Orlando Furioso*, which I discuss in Chapter One.

¹⁹³ Fumaroli, "Jacques Amyot and the Clerical Polemic Against the Chivalric Novel," 40.

¹⁹⁴ Fumaroli, " Jacques Amyot and the Clerical Polemic Against the Chivalric Novel," 35-36.

¹⁹⁵ On the social conservatism of humanist pedagogy, see also Anthony Grafton and Lisa Jardine, *From Humanism to the Humanities: Education and the Liberal Arts in Fifteenth- and Sixteenth-Century Europe* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1986).

plays in statecraft and courtly life. That this fact was at first widely understood by Herberay's elite readers is clear in the way that the speeches from the various books of the *Amadis* are initially organized in the *Trésor des Amadis* according to function. However, the later evolutions of the *Trésor* show that the concept of the collection as a rhetorical commonplace book ultimately gave way to a conception of the *Trésor* as, simply, a cheaper, abridged version of the novels for less well-heeled readers.

II. Inventing Vernacular Pedagogy: The *Trésor des Amadis* as Commonplace Book

As I have previously mentioned, there were two distinct phases in the publication of the *Trésor des Amadis* (the full title of which is *Le Trésor des Amadis, contenant les Epistres, Complaintes, Conciōs, Harengues, Deffis, & Cartelz: recueilliz des douze liures d'Amadis de Gaule, pour servir d'exemple, à ceux qui desirent apprendre à bien ecrire Missives, ou parler François*). The first, which included examples from the first twelve books—all eight translated by Herberay, and a further four—was first published in 1559, and then reprinted almost every year until 1571.¹⁹⁶ This version is, in most editions, organized according to a series of “formules” for different social circumstances, which were appended by Christophe Plaitin, an Anvers printer, in 1560.¹⁹⁷ The *table des matieres* of a 1563 re-edition of this *Trésor*, published by Jacques Kerver and Jean Ruelle,¹⁹⁸ lists all the “lieux communs... selon l'argument qu'on veut deduire” [A.ii.r]. Thirty different “lieux communs” are included; some of the most populous topics include “Manieres d'escrire, ou dire propos amoureux”; “Complaintes, & regretz divers”; and “Maniere de deffier quelqu'un, pour soy ou pour autre.”

The second *Trésor*, on the other hand (which was published in various Lyonnais editions from the publication of the twelfth book of the *Amadis* onward), omits the “lieux communs” as an organizing principle. Though this second *Trésor*, too, limits itself to speeches and letters, it simply presents them in the order that they appear, thus offering a somewhat abridged version of the plot rather than a series of topics. This second phase of the *Trésor* coincides with the period during which the *Amadis* was under attack by a variety of critics such as Amyot, and the books' miniscule format (in-16), much cheaper production, and less prestigious dedicatees reflect a considerable decline in their status. Nevertheless, both versions of the *Trésor* were immensely popular; they were printed in many editions, and were received and translated abroad separately from the *Amadis* itself in either French or Spanish. In fact, the first version of the *Trésor* was translated into English in 1567 before any English translation of the *Amadis* itself.¹⁹⁹

In sum, then, the publication of the first edition of the *Trésor* is part of an effort on the part of the *Amadis*' original editors to capitalize on what was clearly viewed as one of the most important aspects of the books: their utility as models of vernacular rhetoric for use by the French monarchy and its court. The second Lyonnais version of the *Trésor*, by contrast, belongs to a period in which the diminution of the series' reputation among courtly elites coincided with

¹⁹⁶ Véronique Benhaïm, “Les Thresors d'Amadis,” in *Les Amadis en France au XVIe siècle* (Paris : Éditions rue d'Ulm, 2000), 160.

¹⁹⁷ Benhaïm, “Les Thresors d'Amadis,” 170.

¹⁹⁸ *Le Tresor des Amadis, contenant les Epistres, Complaintes, Conciōs, Harengues, Deffis, & Cartelz: recueilliz des douze liures d'Amadis de Gaule, pour servir d'exemple, à ceux qui desirent apprendre à bien ecrire Missives, ou parler François*. Avec vne table, etc. (Paris : Jaques Kerver; Iean Ruelle, 1563). British Library 1163.a.41.

¹⁹⁹ Benhaïm, “Les Thresors d'Amadis,” 163. A German translation was also published in 1596, and reprinted four more times.

continued commercial demand. The audience of this second version was different; where the first version was often specifically dedicated to “l’instruction de la Noblesse de France,”²⁰⁰ the second version was directed at a much wider audience. There is evidence that this version, while it might have been used by courtiers, was also used by those adjacent to, or aspiring to, courtly power; for instance, from 1580-1610 the *Trésor* (at this time being printed in the second version) was used by Flemish instructors of “écoles françaises” for young noble ladies, as well as for the instruction of sons of merchants.²⁰¹

Scholarship on the *Trésor* has tended to treat these two versions of the text together, as works that transmit the courtly manners of the nobility to a broader social world. Edwin B. Place has described the *Trésor* as a courtesy book after the manner of Castiglione’s *Il Cortegiano*, suggesting that its primary function was to teach the nobility how to behave in a courtly manner.²⁰² Véronique Benhaïm has remarked on the importance of the *Trésor* in making the *Amadis* accessible to a larger social spectrum of readers due to its more affordable and accessible format: “[Le Trésor] transmet ainsi l’*Amadis* et ses vertus civilisatrices à un public ‘populaire’, nouveau venu dans l’univers des livres imprimés, composé non seulement des dames, mais encore de leurs domestiques, de marchands, d’élites villageoises et de collégiens.”²⁰³ This interpretation of the *Trésor* as an instrument in the democratization of courtly manners, however, is much more applicable to the second Lyonnais version of the *Trésor* than to the first Parisian version, which was explicitly aimed at the nobility who were the target readership of the early books of the *Amadis* translated by Herberay.

Furthermore, little scholarly attention has been paid to the fact that the organization by “formules” and the suggestion that the *Trésor* could help one learn to “parler François” would suggest that the book is intended for instruction in linguistic behavior, rather than courtly behavior more generally. The *Epistre au Lecteur* of the 1563 edition of the *Trésor* published by Jacques Kerver and Jean Ruelle²⁰⁴ observes that those desirous of such a book include “plusieurs personnes non de petite autorité,” and describes the *Trésor* as “quelques formules d’escrire lettres, faire harangues & dresser complaints.” In fact, the organization of the *Trésor* is very similar to that of Renaissance humanist commonplace books such as *De Copia*. In *De Copia*, Erasmus, speaking of the dangers of rhetorical excess of which Cicero is an example, says, “...this does not concern me, since I am not prescribing how one ought to write or speak, but merely indicating what is useful for practice [...]”²⁰⁵ Ann Moss has shown that Latin

²⁰⁰ Benhaïm, “Les Thresors d’Amadis,” 172.

²⁰¹ Benhaïm, “Les Thresors d’Amadis,” 173.

²⁰² Cf. Edwin B. Place, “El ‘Amadís’ de Montalvo como manual de cortesanía en Francia,” *Revista de Filología Española* 38 (1954): “...el *Trésor d’Amadis* enseña al caballero y a la dama por inducción—es decir, por medio de ‘arengas’ ejemplares sacadas del *Amadis*—la manera correcta de hacer frente a cualquier situación que exija el uso de la palabra (o de la pluma) con acierto, elegancia, y—las más veces—honradez” (153).

²⁰³ Benhaïm, “Les Thresors d’Amadis,” 163.

²⁰⁴ *Le Tresor des Amadis, contenant les Epistres, Complaintes, Conciōs, Harengues, Deffis, & Cartelz: recueilliz des douze liures d’Amadis de Gaule, pour servir d’exemple, à ceux qui desirent apprendre à bien ecrire Missives, ou parler François. Auec vne table, etc.* (Paris : Iaqués Kerver; Iean Ruelle, 1563).

²⁰⁵ Desiderius Erasmus, “Copia: Foundations of the Abundant Style,” in *Literary and Educational Writings* 2 (Ed. Craig R. Thompson, Toronto; Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1978), 299. Further, the fact that all the examples in the *Trésor* come from a single work could remind us of the controversies that produced Erasmus’ 1528 dialogue the *Ciceronianus*, which warns of the dangers of imitating a single model.

commonplace books played an essential role in Renaissance humanist pedagogy²⁰⁶; however, the *Trésor* is a unique example of such a book in the vernacular.

The *Trésor* is also unique in merging the organization of the commonplace book with the attention to social distinction that is more commonly found in Renaissance humanist epistolary pedagogy, such as Erasmus' *De conscribendis epistolis*, which states that "...the language of a letter should adapt itself to the addressee and the subject as a *Polypus* does to a particular soil, or as Mercury could appear in any dress – as long as the language is pure, educated, and reasonable."²⁰⁷ Humanist epistolary pedagogy hewed, in complex ways, to a formalism that was both medieval and Ciceronian—such as the inclusion of the *salutatio*, *captatio benevolentiae*, *narratio*, and *conclusio*, medieval adaptations of Cicero's six parts of oratory; as well as the use of appropriate titles and deferential references to preserve appropriate distinctions in social rank.²⁰⁸ Similarly, the first version of the *Trésor* advertises its speeches' nuanced attention to social rank as a major selling point: sensitivity to the nuances of speech within a variety of different asymmetrical social relations is a primary concern. The 1563 *Trésor*'s prefatory letter by the editor stresses that it includes formulae for speaking (or writing) well to a variety of kinds of people:

Je me suis finalement resolu faire ce petit recueil des douze livres d'Amadis de Gaule : autant estimez non seulement de nous, mais aussi des estrangers, tant pour la varieté des choses que pour le langage propre & poly... nous avons dressé une table dirigée par lieux communs des matieres plus insignes : a ce que tu puisses aisement trouver les formes propres pour parler : entretenir civilement & en bons termes les personnes de quelque estat ou condition qui soient, ou escrire la conception, selon l'argument que tu voudras traiter.

In accordance with this prioritization of social proprieties alongside rhetorical niceties, many of the "lieux communs" in the *table des matières* describe specific social and political relationships, such as "Harangues pour inciter ses vassaux, amis, ou aliez à prendre les armes, & encourager les soudars pretz de combater." It is clear, then, that the *Trésor des Amadis*—particularly in its first incarnation, which organizes the speeches according to *lieux communs*—should be seen as very much inspired by the humanist pedagogical tools of the commonplace book and the *ars conscribendi epistolis*.

What makes the *Trésor* particularly remarkable in this respect is that it is providing examples taken from a single work, and a work in the vernacular at that. The extent to which this conception of a vernacular rhetorical manual is unusual, if not unique,²⁰⁹ can be seen in the way

²⁰⁶ Ann Moss, "Commonplace-Books at School," in *Printed Commonplace-Books and the Structuring of Renaissance Thought* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 134-185.

²⁰⁷ Ctd. Claudio Guillén, "Notes toward the Study of the Renaissance Letter," in *Renaissance Genres: Essays on Theory, History, and Interpretation*, Ed. Barbara Kiefer Lewalski (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1986), 84.

²⁰⁸ See Katherine Kong, *Lettering the Self in Medieval and Early Modern France* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2010), 4-6 and Gideon Burton, "From *Ars dictaminis* to *Ars conscribendi epistolis*: Renaissance Letter-Writing Manuals in the Context of Humanism," in *Letter-writing manuals and instruction from antiquity to the present: historical and bibliographic studies*, Ed. Carol Poster and Linda C. Mitchell (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2007), 88.

²⁰⁹ According to Moss, "The language of commonplaces in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and for most of their previous existence, was in Latin." (*Printed Commonplace-Books*, 2). See pp. 207-214 for Moss's discussion of the limited reception of commonplace books in the vernacular, which does not mention the Amadis *Trésor* or subsequent collections inspired by it.

that subsequent works inspired by the *Trésor* shy away from following its humanist organizational principles, resembling simple abridgements rather than commonplace books or epistolary manuals. Among these works were a *Concions et harangues de Tite-Live* (Amelin, 1554) and a *Trésor des Histoires tragiques* (1581).²¹⁰ But perhaps the most curious, in terms of the reception of the *Amadis* among Renaissance humanists, is the *Thresor des Vies de Plutarque*, first published in Antwerp by G. Silvius in 1567, which takes its material from Jacques Amyot's translation of the *Parallel Lives*.²¹¹ Amyot's name is not advertised in the paratext to this *Thresor*. Rather, the full title of the collection vaunts its collection of "...les beaux dictz & faicts, sentences notables, responses, aphophthegmes, & harangues des Empeureurs, Roys, Ambassadeurs & Capitaines, tant Grecs que Romains: ausi des philosophes & gens sçavans." Thus, while including some of the oral and written rhetorical forms advertised in the *Amadis Trésor* ("Harangues, Epistres, Concions, Lettres missives, Demandes, Responses, Repliques, Sentences, Cartels, Complaintes"), the Plutarch *Thresor* also adds sayings and pronouncements that are valuable primarily by virtue of the illustrious figures who uttered them, rather than as examples of eloquence in their own right. Nor does this *Thresor* even restrict itself solely to rhetorical examples, advertising both "beaux dictz & faicts."

This makes sense in light of the dedicatory letter from Silvius to François de Hellefaut, Abbé de Saint Pierre à Gand, in which Silvius praises Amyot's translation, and says that the virtue of this collection is to make it more affordable and, thus, accessible. Here, Silvius seems to be very much envisioning the Plutarch *Thresor* as a digest of the Amyot translation, rather than as a manual of rhetorical pedagogy. The letter to the reader frames things somewhat differently, emphasizing the importance of developing the faculty of prudence, and the limited value of works such as, we may understand, the *Amadis* in this respect:

... quant à la conversation mondaine, l'on ne sauroit d'ailleurs puiser tant de beaux propos pour deviser estant requis, sauf hors de telz Autheurs & semblables à cestuy-cy, qui vous en est proposé, au pris de ceux qui ne portent qu'une vaine delectation... : parquoy les hommes lettrez reprouvent les premiers, & les delicatz espritz ou mondains rejettent les autres. Car en verité l'home prudent pense devant qu'il parle, ou que ce soit, prenant esgard au lieu, au temps, & aux autres circonstances. L'un des sept sages de Grece confesse, qu'il vault mieux taire, que malement parler.²¹²

Despite this seeming concession to the importance of rhetoric, though, the overall structure of this *Thresor* makes clear that Silvius, like Amyot in the prefaces I discussed above, views literary style as secondary to the consideration of instructive examples of behaviour drawn from history.

The entries in the Plutarch *Trésor*, rather than being categorized according to function as they are in the *Amadis Trésor*, are labelled according to the biography from which they are sampling (for example, "L'extraict de la vie de Theseus"). The speeches, sayings, responses, and so on typically comprise only a small part of the full entry, most of which is devoted to a prose narrative giving context for the saying itself, and finally leading into the quotation with a line such as, "Les paroles de la prophetie estoient telles..." or "Antigonus a dit une belle sentence

²¹⁰ Benhaïm, "Les Thresors d'Amadis," 174.

²¹¹ Benhaïm, "Les Thresors d'Amadis," 174.

²¹² "Aux Lecteurs," in *Le Trésor des vies de Plutarque...* (Anvers : G. Silvius impr., 1567).

touchant les traistres, à scavoir...” Many entries include multiple quotes; and many of the quotations are in verse, while others are whole dialogues, as in the excerpt from the life of Cicero. In short, the Plutarch *Trésor*, by extensively contextualizing each example, makes it clear that the sayings within derive their value from their historical significance, rather than having pedagogical value in themselves as examples of skilful rhetoric. Moreover, each speech is categorized according to the historical personage who spoke it, rather than grouped with other rhetorically similar examples, making it even more clear that while the Plutarch *Thresor* may be intended as a condensed history—and thus, a source of moral instruction—it is not imitating the kinds of rhetorical pedagogical materials that so clearly inspire the *Trésor des Amadis*.

The *Trésor des Amadis*, then, is part of the humanist *Amadis* project in the sense that it underlines the utility of Herberay’s translation as a source of instructive rhetorical examples. But the *Trésor* itself is only made possible by the fact that speeches are a particular focus of Herberay’s translation. Other studies of Herberay’s translation have illustrated a number of areas in which he tends to make changes. In Book I, moral and religious passages in the original tend to be removed;²¹³ in the fourth book, Herberay updates the references to military equipment and battle strategy and, very famously, adds an entire chapter describing the grounds and structures of the Palais d’Apolidon (a description that is accompanied by detailed architectural engravings).²¹⁴ However, mine is the first study to focus on Herberay’s translations of speeches, despite the fact that the *Trésor des Amadis* reveals this to be an area of considerable interest for the book’s readers, and despite the fact that (as I have shown above) the invention of speeches is an important aspect of the tradition of humanism within which Herberay’s translation takes place.

In the section that follows, my close readings of Herberay’s translation focus on speeches that are listed under a single “lieu commun” in the *Trésor*. This topic is, I would argue, the most important category of speeches in the *Trésor*, by virtue of being very first entry in the *table des matieres*, and also the entry with the most examples attached to it: the “Maniere de declarer son avis, le demander, ou donner conseil de quelque chose à ses seigneurs, amis, parens, aliez, ou sujets,” which includes at least 33 different speeches from the first twelve books.²¹⁵ Nearly all of these are classified as either a “Harangue” or a response to one.²¹⁶ A closer look at the examples included in this category shows that nearly all of the speeches pertaining to giving or

²¹³ Paula Luteran, *The Theory of Translation in the Sixteenth Century: Analyzing Nicholas Herberay des Essarts’ Amadis de Gaule* (Lewiston; Queenston; Lampeter: The Edwin Mellen Press, 2005), cf. 105.

²¹⁴ Luce Guillerm, “Introduction,” in *Amadis de Gaule, Livre IV* (Paris: Honoré Champion Éditeur, 2005).

²¹⁵ The Table des Matières makes an exact count difficult, as it gives only the page numbers on which the example is to be found, and there are several pages that include more than one example that might fall into this category. I have used my discretion to include those that appear relevant to me and exclude those that do not; therefore, the numbers I give here include a slight margin of error.

²¹⁶ The precise definition of “harangue” is somewhat elusive. In the *Trésor* it is used for matters both political and personal, including affairs of the heart. However, in Early Modern dictionaries, the word seems to have a specifically political connotation. The full title of the *Thrésor* advertises the following types of examples: “Epistres, Complaintes, Conciõs, Harengues, Deffis, & Cartelz.” My examination of the examples themselves indicates that the salient generic categories distinguished within the *Trésor* are, in fact, “Harangues,” “Lettres,” “Regretz,” “Repliques/Responces,” and “Complaintes.” The *Dictionnaire de l’Académie Française* (1694) defines a “harangue” as “Discours fait à une Assemblée, à un Prince ou à quelque autre personne élevée en dignité, ou à un peuple assemble,” and has no listing for “concion”; Jean Nicot’s *Thresor de la langue françoise* (1604) defines a harangue as an “Oratio ad populum” but in the definition of “concion” the two seem roughly equivalent. (The listing for “concion” gives the example, “Il fait ordinairement concions au peuple et harangues, In rostris habitat, Concionalis, Concionabundus.”)

receiving advice in the *Amadis* come from the earliest books in the series: the vast majority are from Book III (9 examples) or Book IV (14 examples), and only 5 of the 33 examples come from all of Books V-XII. This indicates that these speeches are of particular importance to Herberay, and the other humanists who participated in the earlier books of the project, and of much less interest to the writers who worked on the project in its later, more commercial stages. This analysis will show us that as a translator, Herberay was deeply concerned with showing that rhetoric was an indispensable part of statecraft—a highly necessary art that any good king must master.

III. How to Talk Like A King: Nicolas Herberay des Essarts' Translations of Speeches

While both contemporary scholarship on the *Amadis* and criticism of it in the sixteenth century have focused on its illustration of matters of love, the prominence of the category of harangues shows that the early books in the cycle—particularly books III and IV—have a strong focus on matters of governance. This is not just a concern of Herberay's translation; it also emerges out of the plot of Montalvo's source material. In Books III and IV of the *Amadis*, a full-fledged crisis of monarchy emerges, centering on the problematic ruler Lisuarte, the king of Great Britain. In books III and IV, Lisuarte—unaware that his daughter Oriane is secretly married to the hero Amadis—has engaged her against her will to the Emperor of Rome. Further, he has decreed that upon her marriage, Oriane will no longer inherit Britain; rather, the succession will pass to her younger sister, Leonore. To prevent this, Amadis and his knights (who are already estranged from Lisuarte for other reasons) kidnap Oriane on her way to Rome. Eventually, this sparks full-scale war between Amadis and his followers, and the combined military might of Rome and Britain. In the course of these events, both Amadis and Lisuarte receive a great deal of political advice, and one function of these many speeches is to draw a contrast between the two: Amadis is shown to be a gracious leader who carefully considers his subjects' counsel, and Lisuarte a monarch who, if not quite a despot, brings much trouble down on his own head through his failure to listen to his advisers. Furthermore, Amadis strives to make peace and avoid further conflict, while Lisuarte's hot-headedness brings about an avoidable war.

Where the first two books are largely concerned with knight-errantry and battles between individual knights, the second two books turn toward more modern concepts of warfare between nations. Speeches play an important role in the politics of this warfare. Similarly, letters become striking and prominent features in Book IV, where they play a crucial role in illustrating Amadis's and Lisuarte's differing approaches to diplomacy. This emphasis comes from the source material, but Herberay is very active in rewriting or modifying these speeches and letters, a fact that is not apparent from his overall translational approach in this book. Luce Guillerm observes that Herberay reduces the length of the original Book IV by a third, perhaps in order to maintain a homogenous length across the series.²¹⁷ As such, it is his large cuts that are most evident, such as the removal of the frequent descriptions of court scenes. Reading Herberay's versions of the political speeches catalogued in the *Trésor*'s "Maniere de declarer son avis, le demander, ou donner conseil" alongside Montalvo's, however, sheds light on two new aspects of Herberay's translation that have not previously been discussed. First, Herberay's translation often modifies speeches to make them adhere better to the norms of Renaissance humanist rhetoric; and second, he modifies both the speeches themselves, and the narration of their

²¹⁷ Guillerm, "Introduction," 24.

reception by other characters, in order to illustrate the severe political consequences of great rulers' indifference to the rules of proper rhetorical behaviour. The lesson that we are meant to draw from this is left to the reader, and not commented upon by any authorial narration. Other scholars have observed that Herberay systematically removes Montalvo's frequent first person sermonizing, from short interjections to whole chapters,²¹⁸ suggesting that he does so because they are simply not to contemporary French tastes, or not entertaining enough.²¹⁹ Rather, I would suggest that this is part of a concentrated effort to displace all displays of eloquence onto the characters themselves. The *Trésor* includes only examples of speeches and letters in the voices of characters, and while this may not seem surprising at first glance, it is in fact a significant departure from the Spanish original, which reserves its most showy rhetoric for Montalvo's first person narrations.

In practice, this often means that translational excisions tend to happen where Montalvo's authorial voice is especially prominent. For instance, at the end of Chapter 35 of Book I,²²⁰ Montalvo gives one of many first-person moralizing discourses on how the events of the story illustrate the vicissitudes of Fortune. In the original text, this is delivered in a first-person plural voice, and addressed directly to the monarchs whom this particular episode is meant to instruct: "Qué diremos aquí, emperadores, reyes y grandes que en los altos estados soys puestos?" Montalvo goes on to issue these "emperadores, reyes y grandes" a number of commands: "Guardaos, guardaos, tened conoscimiento de Dios... Y, sobre todo, considerad los sus secretos y grandes juyzios, que seyendo este rey Lisuarte tan justo, tan franco, tan gracioso, permitióle serle venido tan cruel revés..."²²¹ Herberay, by contrast, makes the speaker issuing this moral judgment an impersonal third person: "Certes qui bien considerera en cest endroit les tours de fortune, il pourra aisément juger qu'elle est aussi muable (voire plus) envers les grandz princes et seigneurs, que les moindres..."²²² This introduction further softens the directness of the address to "grandz princes et seigneurs," first suggesting that their vulnerability to "les tours de fortune" may be equal to that of everyone else before daring to add that it may be even greater, whereas in Montalvo the whole emphasis of the speech is that these great princes are particularly vulnerable. Montalvo's imperative address to these princes, cautioning them to beware their position, is completely absent from Herberay's translation; he replaces it with a more detailed description of the difficulties of Lisuarte's position in the story. The closest Herberay comes to the kind of direct sermonizing that comprises the majority of this passage in the original text is when he says, "N'est ce pas donc belle exemple pour ceulx qui sont aujourd'hui appelez aux plus haultz honneurs du monde ? ausquelz ils s'aveuglent tant que (peult estre) ilz en oublient Dieu."²²³ In the original text, Montalvo poses rhetorical questions that he answers himself as a way of emphasizing his message: "Qué hará conra aquellos que todo esto al contrario tienen? Sabéys qué? Que así como su voluntad fue deste cruel peligro miraglosamente se

²¹⁸ Véronique Duché, "Introduction," in *Le Cinquiesme Livre d'Amadis de Gaule* (Paris: Éditions Classiques Garnier, 2009).

²¹⁹ Luteran suggests that "Herberay des Essarts did not wish to preach to his readers" because to do so was not entertaining (*The Theory of Translation in the Sixteenth Century*, 108).

²²⁰ Chapter 34 in the Spanish text.

²²¹ Garcí Rodríguez de Montalvo, *Amadis de Gaula*, Ed. Jesús Rodríguez Velasco (Madrid : Fundación José Antonio de Castro, 1997), 281.

²²² Nicolas Herberay des Essarts, transl., *Le Premier livre de Amadis de Gaule* (Paris: Estienne Groulleau, 1548), folio CXX^v.

²²³ Herberay, transl., *Le Premier livre*, folio CXX^v.

remediassse...”²²⁴ Herberay’s “N’est-ce pas donc belle exemple...”, by contrast, engages the reader in a more cooperative way, using the question to appeal to a shared judgment rather than to impose his own. In short, throughout the passage Herberay’s rewriting significantly downplays the narrator’s role in interpreting the events of the story, displacing that role instead onto the reader.

The first speech categorized under the “Maniere de declarer son avis, le demander, ou donner conseil...” heading in the *Trésor* is an example of amplification on Herberay’s part, and illustrates well the way Herberay brings rhetorical polish to his source material. This speech, which in the *Trésor* is called “La Harengue de Lisuard Roy de la grande Bretagne à ses sujets & amis, les exhortant de luy bailler conseil,”²²⁵ illustrates Lisuarte’s skill in speaking to his subjects, in stark contrast to the rhetorical ineptitude that will characterize him in later books. In the original Spanish text, after the speaker and audience are established (1), Lisuarte enumerates the blessings God has given him (2), says that these blessings require him to achieve great things (3), asks his men to tell him how he can accomplish this (4), and assures them he will carry out their suggestions (5). Montalvo gives information about the speaker and audience through narration, accomplishes all of the four remaining functions within a single line of dialogue:

(1) Con sus ricos hombres el rey Lisuarte quedó por les hablar, y díxoles:

(2) --Amigos, así como Dios me ha hecho más rico y más poderoso de tierra y gente que ninguno de mis vecinos, (3) así es razón que guardando su servicio procure yo de hazer mejores y más loadas cosas que ninguno dellos; (4) y quiero que me digáis todo aquello que vuestros juyzios alcancaren por donde pueda a vos y a mí en mayor honra sostener, (5) y dígovos que lo así haré.²²⁶

Herberay des Essarts’ translation of the speech, though including the same five main parts, is more than twice as long as the original, and takes care to clearly demarcate the different parts of the speech. These parts correspond, much more than in Montalvo’s original, to the five elements of a letter according to the *ars dictaminis*—that is, the *salutatio*, the *captatio benevolentiae*, the *narratio*, the *petitio*, and the *conclusio*.²²⁷

(1) Lors chacun fut ententif d’escouter ce qu’il vouloit dire, & commença tel propos : (2) « Mes amys, nul de vous n’est ignorant les graces, qu’il a pleu à nostre Seigneur me faire, me rendant le plus grand Seigneur terrien qui soit au jourd’huy en toutes les Isles de l’Ocean : (3) parquoy il me semble raisonnable, que tout ainsi que nous sommes en ces

²²⁴ Montalvo, *Amadís de Gaula* (Ed. Castro), 281.

²²⁵ *Trésor* (1563), 4b.

²²⁶ Montalvo, *Amadís* (Ed. Castro), 260-261.

²²⁷ Katherine Kong, *Lettering the Self in Medieval and Early Modern France*, 4. The interaction between medieval *ars dictaminis* and humanist oratory in the Renaissance is quite complex, and to fully explore the nuances of how these different categories were articulated throughout the period is beyond the scope of this chapter. For my purposes here, it suffices to note that Herberay is clearly revising Montalvo’s speeches (which do not, as far as I can tell, adhere to any particular oratorical framework) into a form that more closely resembles oratory as it was practiced by humanists. For more on the humanist engagement with medieval and classical epistolary theory, cf. Judith Rice Henderson, “Defining the Genre of the Letter: Juan Luis Vives’ ‘De Conscribendis Epistolis,’” *Renaissance and Reformation/Renaissance et Réforme* 7, no. 2 (1983): 89-105 and Ronald Witt, “Medieval ‘Ars Dictaminis’ and the Beginnings of Humanism: A New Construction of the Problem,” *Renaissance Quarterly* 35, no. 1 (1982), 1-35.

païs les premiers, que aussi nous ne soyons seconds à nul autre Prince, pour luy en rendre graces immortelles par bonnes & vertueuses œuvres, auxquelles nous devons nous arrester. (4) A ceste cause je vous prie & commande (d'autant que les Roys sont cheffz des Monarchies, & vous les membres) que vous avisiez tous ensemble à me conseiller en voz consciences, sur ce qu'il vous semblera pour le meilleur que je dooy faire, tant pour le soulagement de mes subjetz, que pour l'entretienement & augmentation de nostre estat. (5) Vous asseurant (mes amys) que je suis deliberé de vous croyre, comme mes loyaux & fideles subjetz : pourtant je vous prie de rechef, que sans aucune crainte chacun avise particulièrement & en general, à ce qu'il vous semblera nous devoir estre plus recommandé. *Puys se teut.*²²⁸

In his translation of the speech, though covering the same ground as Montalvo does, Herberay takes every opportunity to transfer the subject position (both grammatically and more broadly in the sense of agency) to the speech's audience, Lisuarte's subjects. He tempers the impression of a hierarchical relationship in which the king is placed above his subjects, while at the same time skillfully minimizing any comment that would commit the king to a specific course of action. For instance, the Spanish introductory sentence says that Lisuarte gathers them to speak, while the French says that the men were listening closely. In the second sentence, the Spanish subject is "Dios" (who has bestowed great gifts on Lisuarte); in the French, Herberay translates the emphasis to the listeners' own knowledge ("nul de vous n'est ignorant..."). In the third part, Lisuarte transfers this glory onto his listeners by changing the subject to "nous" ("nous ne soyons seconds à nul autre prince") and in the fourth part, when he finally commands them as his subjects to advise him, Herberay amends the commandment with the qualifier "d'autant que les Roys sont cheffz des Monarchies, & vous les membres." Finally, in the fifth part of the French version, Lisuarte declares that he believes in his subjects' goodwill, and encourages them to speak without fear; both of these comments are Herberay's additions to the Spanish. However, interestingly, the French version does not include the promise given in the Spanish text that the king will carry out his subjects' suggestions. Thus, the French version of the text succeeds in elaborately flattering the listeners, and giving them a sense of ownership in the king's many blessings, and solicits their advice but manages to avoid committing the king to following that advice. While the structure of the speech as given in Montalvo is certainly organized in a thoughtful manner with regard to its rhetorical aims, Herberay's achieves a level of sophistication—and, perhaps, sophistry—that is lacking in the original Spanish text.

In Books III and IV, as I have previously mentioned, a significant shift takes place in Lisuarte's character. Exiling Amadis and his companions from his court is the first of many mistakes Lisuarte makes that lead to major crises in his kingdom. There are many instances in which Herberay makes changes and additions to emphasize the good judgment of Lisuarte's courtiers in this matter, and Lisuarte's obstinacy and poor judgment in refusing to heed them. Thus, despite Guillerm's observation that Herberay tends to condense Montalvo's original in the third and fourth books, this is not universally true; there are also numerous instances of amplification, where doing so serves the purpose of emphasizing Lisuarte's need for good advice. For instance, the first chapter of Book III contains a speech listed in the *Trésor's* "Maniere de declarer son avis," which is a speech from Arban of Norgales to King Lisuard, in

²²⁸ Herberay, transl., *Le Premier livre*, folio CX^v.

which Norgales implores Lisuard to allow Amadis to return to court.²²⁹ Montalvo's introduction of the speech is brief, and emphasizes the king of Norgales' fealty to Lisuarte: "Arbán, rey de Norgales, que amava el servicio del rey, le dixo..."²³⁰ Herberay, on the other hand, emphasizes Norgales' qualifications to give advice, and implies the king's need for such advice: "Or estoit la present le Roy Arban de Norgales (l'un des plus saiges & vertueulx princes de la terre), lequel voyant la soudaine entreprise que faisoit le Roy, luy dit..."²³¹ By clarifying that Norgales is "l'un des plus saiges & vertueulx princes de la terre," Herberay indicates to the reader that the speech to follow will be wise and worth heeding; Montalvo's description that Norgales "amava el servicio del rey," by contrast, says little about how the character's rhetoric should be interpreted.

Herberay makes a similar change in Chapter 14, where Galaor delivers a long speech arguing against the marriage that Lisuarte has arranged between his daughter, Oriane, and the emperor. In Montalvo's original, at the end of the speech, Lisuarte tactfully avoids expressing his disinterest in Galaor's arguments, and asks Galaor to leave the written version of his speech behind, as he is about to leave: "El rey, cuando esto le oyó, fue mal pagado de sus razones, aunque no se lo demostró; y díxole: --Don Galaor amigo, pues que vos ir queréis, dexadme el scripto."²³² Where this version of events emphasizes Lisuarte's ability to conceal his true emotions in favour of political expedience, Herberay's translation does exactly the opposite, emphasizing Lisuarte's lack of control over his emotions. The translation also attributes the idea of leaving a written version behind to Galaor, and considerably amplifies it:

Bien monstra lors le Roy Lisuart à sa contenance qu'il nestoit pas content de la remonstrance que luy faisoit Galaor. Ce qu'il aperceut aussi tost, parquoy continuant son propos luy dit. Sire, le Roy Perion mon pere m'a mandé l'aller trouver en Gaule, le plustost qu'il me sera possible, & pource que je suys deliberé partir demain, affin que ne pensez que je ne vous aye conseillé fidelement, s'il vous plaist je vous laisseray par escrit tout ce que je vous ay dit, pour le communiquer à ceulx que vous deliberez assembler. Je vous en prie, respondit le Roy...²³³

Thus, what is—in Montalvo's version—a brief moment that emphasizes the king's emotional continence and foresight, becomes in Herberay's translation an extended illustration of Galaor's sensitivity and thoughtfulness as a courtier in the service of a difficult king. Furthermore, where in Montalvo's original the reason for leaving behind a written version of Galaor's comments is left unspoken, Herberay provides a *narratio* to support Galaor's need to leave, followed by the *petitio* that the written version of the speech be shared with the king's chosen advisors. It is clear, in Herberay's *Amadis*, that the most prudent characters choose to navigate political problems with carefully chosen, thoughtfully deployed rhetoric. When they cannot do so in person, as in Galaor's case, they send their words in writing. In the third and fourth books, Lisuarte (who, as we saw above, was shown to be capable of masterful rhetoric in the earlier books) loses control

²²⁹ *Trésor* (1563), 37a. This page contains another speech which could, potentially, be the one referenced by the index ("Reprehension du Roy Lisuard ausditz Broquadan & Gandandel, les redarguant de couardise & lacheté"); however, as that speech does not seem to pertain to advice of any kind, it seems much more likely to me that the indexer intended the one that I discuss here.

²³⁰ Montalvo, *Amadis* (Colección Austral), 10.

²³¹ Herberay, transl., *Le Troisieme livre*, FI^v.

²³² Montalvo, *Amadis* (Colección Austral), 238.

²³³ Herberay, transl., *Le Troisieme Livre*, folio LXXIII^{r-v}.

over his rhetorical self-presentation entirely, committing the shocking political *faux pas* of communicating his feelings nakedly, through body language.

Herberay emphasizes the potentially disastrous consequences of this kind of communication at numerous points in his translation. In Book IV, for example, Herberay transforms a relatively neutral statement in Montalvo's original about the proper relations of kings and ambassadors into another indictment of Lisuarte's moral and rhetorical failings. In this episode, the courtier Quadregant who attempts to remind the king of the respect due to an ambassador:

A los grandes príncipes conviene oír los mensajeros que a ellos vienen quitada y apartada de sí toda pasión, porque si la embaxada que les traen les contenta, mucho alegres deven ser averla graciosamente recebido. Y si al contrario, más con fuertes ánimos y rezios coraçones deven poner el remedio, que con respuestas desabridas. Y a los embaxadores se requiere decir honestamente lo que les es encomendado sin temer ningún peligro que dello les pueda venir.²³⁴

In Montalvo's original, the advice is divided between king and ambassador, discussing both parties' roles in ensuring a satisfactory outcome. In Herberay's translation, by contrast, the gracious treatment of ambassadors is not merely "advisable" ("conviene...") but a virtue ("vertu"):

Sire, cest une vertu treslouable & digne de recommandation entre les Roys & princes, d'entendre par grand patience ce que les ambassadeurs des esrangers ont charge de leur declairer, ostans d'entour eulx toute passion, à ce que si l'ambassade qui leur est faite les contente, ilz en recoivent plus de joye, & soient les ambassadeurs mieulx recueilliz & favorisez, & au contraire s'ilz leur dient chose qui leur desplaie, que ce nonobstant ilz sçachent dissimuler leur colere, & leur donner response gratieuse, pour le respect de l'estat auquel ilz sont appellez.²³⁵

Moreover, Herberay removes the portion of Montalvo's speech directed at the ambassador, and adds another reference to the importance of concealing kingly displeasure ("dissimuler leur colere, & leur donner response gratieuse")—which is a particular failing of Lisuarte's, as we have already seen. Lisuarte responds to Quadregant's speech with another speech of his own, in which he insists that he does not owe the rebel knights any courtesy until they have made him reparations. We are meant to view this response as ungracious and inappropriate, as we can see by the fact that the *Trésor* does not categorize it in the section where Quadregant's speech (and the others I have discussed in this section) are found, though the title of the section, "Maniere de declarer son avis, le demander, ou donner conseil de quelque chose à ses seigneurs, amis, parens, aliez, ou subjets," could certainly accommodate it. Rather, Lisuarte's response is found in the section titled "Maniere d'accuser ou reprocher quelque chose à quelqu'un."²³⁶

²³⁴ Montalvo, *Amadis* (Colección Austral), 360.

²³⁵ Herberay, transl., *Le Quatriesme Livre*, folio XXII^r.

²³⁶ *Le Tresor des Amadis, contenant les Epistres, Complaintes, Conciōs, Harengues, Deffis, & Cartelz... Auec vne table, etc.* (Paris: Jaques Kerver; Jean Ruelle, 1563). « Responce du Roy Lisuard à Quadragant, luy exposant le grand tort & injure que luy ont fait les Chevaliers de l'Isle ferme, & qu'il ne les recevra en grace que jusques à ce qu'ilz ayent reparé l'injure qu'ilz luy ont faite. » (82b)

In contrast to these many translational changes emphasizing Lisuarte's lack of courtesy and lack of regard for his counselors' advice, Herberay's translation of Book IV contains many examples from Amadis's court in exile that demonstrate a productive give and take of advice between a monarch and his courtiers. For instance, the "Harengue de Nascian l'hermite à Amadis, ou il l'admoneste de remettre toutes ses affaires en Dieu, par le moyen duquel il a cuité tant de dangers & perilz evidens, & qu'il pourchasse la paix envers le Roy Lisuard, le plus qu'il pourra" is followed directly by "Responce d'Amadis à Nascian l'hermite, ou il reconnoist sa faute, avec promesse d'amendement. Au 4. Livre, chap. 19. « Mon pere, si je servois nostre Seigneur selon les graces."²³⁷ The last speech in this category from Books I-IV is by Amadis, entitled "Harengue d'Amadis à ses compagnons, leur offrant recompense de leurs travaux endurez à la guerre pour l'amour de luy."²³⁸ Amadis' particular skill in epistolary rhetoric is also highly significant. Four chapters of the original Spanish text (Chs. 88-91) are, in the fourth book of the French Amadis, condensed and combined into a long compilation of letters sent by Amadis to his various allies and enemies. While these letters are present in the original, they are expanded and made especially prominent in translation, where they are highlighted and set apart from the rest of the text through the use of special headings; and rather than being contextualized within the narrative, Herberay condenses the exchange into just the letters themselves. Amadis' letter to the Emperor of Constantinople illustrates the changes that Herberay makes to bring its style into conformity with Renaissance humanist epistolary conventions:

Treshault & excellent prince, le Chevalier à la verde espée (le propre nom duquel est Amadis de Gaule) vous envoie treshumble salut. Et pource sire, que traversant pays apres la deffaite de l'Endriague, il vous pleut me recevoir en vostre ville de Constantinople, la ou apres l'honneur & bon recueil que vous m'y donnastes, me offrites (par vostre liberalité) de m'ayder, & donner secours ou le cas si offroit, en faveur des services que je vous avoys faitz par la reduction de la contrée, qui par vous mesmes fut nommée depuis l'Isle sainte Marie. Or est l'occasion advenue, que vous avez moyen, s'il vous plaist, d'accomplir ceste vostre promesse, avec la plus juste querelle qu'il est possible d'entreprendre, ainsi que vous dira maistre Helizabel, lequel je vous supplie, Sire, croire entierement, de la part de celui qui baise les mains de vostre majesté.
[F.XIIIv]

Muy alto emperador: aquel cavallero de la Verde Spada que por su proprio nombre Amadís de Gaula es llamado mando besar vuestras manos y le traer a la memoria aquel ofrecimiento que más por su gran virtud y nobleza que por mis servicios le plugo de me fazer. Y porque agora es venido el tiempo en que principalmente a vuestra grandeza y a todos mis amigos y veladores que justicia y razón querrán seguir, como el maestro Elisabad más largo le dirá, he menester, le suplico mande dar fe y aya su embaxada aquel efeto que yo con mi persona y todos los que han de guardar y seguir pornían en vuestro servicio.²³⁹

²³⁷ *Trésor* (1563), 91a-91b.

²³⁸ *Trésor* (1563), 97b.

²³⁹ Garcí Rodríguez de Montalvo, *Amadís de Gaula*, Ed. Juan Bautista A Valle-Arce (Madrid: Editorial Espasa-Calpe, 1991), 33.

Once again, here, Herberay takes Montalvo's two long sentences and divides them into shorter units that clearly correspond to the parts of the *ars dictaminis*. In particular, the *narratio* describing the circumstances that led the Emperor to pledge Amadis his help—virtually absent from Montalvo's version of the letter, and which Montalvo minimizes by saying that the pledge was given “más por su gran virtud y nobleza que por mis servicios”—is the most significant area of expansion in Herberay's translation. Recounting Amadis' defeat of the Endriague, and the Emperor's promise, makes Amadis' letter more persuasive not just to the Emperor, but to the reader, who is able to recall the events in question and thus conclude that Amadis' request is justified.

Examining Herberay's translations of speeches, particularly those that pertain to giving political counsel, shows us that he consistently departs from Montalvo's original to enhance the persuasive eloquence of the speeches, using techniques drawn from humanist rhetorical pedagogy. Herberay also declines to use the first-person authorial voice, as Montalvo does, to comment on the lessons that the reader (usually, for Montalvo, the royal reader) is meant to take from the story's events. Rather, Herberay's translation ensures that the reception of speeches by other characters, and particularly the circumstances that unfold as kings and princes either heed or refuse their courtiers' advice, gives the reader all the necessary information he needs to reach his own conclusions. In a number of cases, Herberay differentiates himself from his source by demonstrating, in the context of the story, kingly failures of eloquence—or failure to properly receive eloquent advice—and the dire political consequences that ensue. This reflects Herberay's understanding of the proper relationship between a writer and a reader of rhetorical historiography, which relies upon the reader's careful exercise of prudence.

IV. After Herberay: Gabriel Chappuys and the End of the Amadis

The conception of the *Trésor* as a whole changes drastically between the edition first printed in 1559, which included examples from the first twelve books, and the final version printed in 1605²⁴⁰ including examples from all twenty-one. Where the 1563 *Trésor* states that the superiority of the *Amadis de Gaule* is recognized “non seulement de nous, mais aussi des estrangers,” the preface to the 1605 edition is much more defensive, noting that “aucuns (estimans faire plus grande chose) ont aucunement desdaigné l'œuvre... Aucuns aussi ont eu ceste opinion que ledict livre ne devoit estre receu pour le propos fabuleux & lassifs y contenuz, & que cela est defendu par la sainte Escriture.” It goes on to defend the subject of the book; while much of the defense rests on claims that its subject matter is too light to be taken seriously, a portion also revolves around the way the book can be used to give examples of calls to religious warfare:

...il demonstre qu'il est raisonnable aux Rois & grands seigneurs de prendre les armes pour defendre leurs sujets, ou (quand la guerre cesse en leurs pays) de courir à main armee contre les Payens, Turcs, Sarrasins & infideles, pour en ce faisant glorifier & illustrer nostre religion tressaincte & Chrestienne.²⁴¹

²⁴⁰ *Thresor de tous les livres d'Amadis de Gaule, Contenant les Harangues, Epistres, Concions, Lettres missives, Demandes, Responses, Repliques, Sentences, Cartels, Complaintes & autres choses les plus excellentes : tres-utile pour instruire la Noblesse Françoisse à l'eloquence, grace, vertu & generosité* (Lyon: Pierre Rigaud, 1605).

²⁴¹ *Thresor de tous les livres d'Amadis* (1605), 3-4.

While this claim could be well-illustrated by the political and military “lieux communs” from the first edition, such as those that we have studied above, strikingly, this later edition of the *Trésor* completely dispenses with the “Table des Matieres” that were the first version’s *raison d’être*. The table of contents simply lists the speeches from each book in the order that they appear. This edition includes the same speeches from Books I-XII that were printed in the earlier edition. The speeches from the later books (XII-XXI) are mainly examples of interesting dialogue exchanges (consisting of a first sally and a reply) pertaining to personal or romantic rather than political matters. Despite this radical reconceiving of the book’s organization, the prefatory alexandrine still advertises that the *Trésor* is a book that can serve as a model for speeches and letters or simply for the French language:

... s'il est au Latin & au Grec comparé,
 Il merite apres eux d'honneur le premier titre,
 Pour faire doctement ou Harengue ou Epistre,
 A ce moyen (Lecteur) il faut quelque tu sois
 Estudier icy pour bien parler François.²⁴²

Despite this echo of the rhetorical *Amadis* found in the first version of the *Trésor* (and in Herberay’s translation), this period in the Lyonnais publication of the *Trésor* represents an end to the series’ humanist aspirations.

The translation of the series itself during this period, similarly, takes a different direction. Gabriel Chappuys was the translator of seven books at the end of the *Amadis* cycle (XV-XXI), making him the most important translator in the series, apart from Herberay, who translated eight books. Following his period of work as a translator in Lyon, Chappuys went on to Paris, where he succeeded Belleforest as Historiographe du Roi, and later Secrétaire-interprète. Christine De Buzon says of Chappuys, “De sensibilité post-tridentine, il a contribute autant qu’il a pu à conforter l’autorité du roi et du pape.”²⁴³ One of the clearest ways that this concession to authority manifests itself is in Chappuys’ dedication to preserving the impression of an uninterrupted, continuous line of *Amadis* instalments. De Buzon observes that Chappuys achieves this effect by making connections between his dedicatees and those of the earlier volumes, “reliant ainsi les personnalités choisies dans une chaine de lecteurs amis.”²⁴⁴ Sometimes this chain of relationships is genealogical, as when one of Chappuys’ dedicatees is related to one of Herberay’s; at other moments, Chappuys merely uses Herberay’s illustrious dedicatees (most notably François I, to whom Chappuys’ uncle Claude was the royal librarian) to cast glory on his own patrons, and on his own translation. Chappuys’ source material is also conducive to his desire to shore up religious and royal authority, as the later *Amadis* volumes focus explicitly on encounters between Christian knights and infidels, ending in conversion, a religious dimension that is almost entirely absent from the early volumes.²⁴⁵ All of Chappuys’ translations coincide with the reign of Henri III, the monarch he would later go on to serve as

²⁴² *Thresor de tous les livres d'Amadis* (1605), 6.

²⁴³ Christine De Buzon, "Le règlement de lecture des Amadis à Lyon: quelques épîtres de Gabriel Chappuys," *Réforme Humanisme Renaissance* 71 (2010): 127.

²⁴⁴ De Buzon, "Le règlement de lecture," 129.

²⁴⁵ De Buzon, "Le règlement de lecture," 136.

historiographer; religious conflict would, of course, have been a theme with particular contemporary relevance at this time.

The concept of the *Amadis* as a rhetorical handbook is also considerably diminished, if not entirely absent, in Chappuys' translations. In the preface to Book XVIII, Chappuys, in a dedicatory letter to M. de Tillières, denies that the *Amadis* has any pedagogical significance:

...il est vray, Monseigneur, que plusieurs pourroyent bien faire leur profit de ce livre, que je vous dedie, comme seroyent ceux qui sont apprentis en toute maniere de courtoisie, art des aremes, et façon de bien parler: mais vous sçavez tout cela presque des vostre enfance, pource que des vostre enfance vous y avez esté instruit, nourry et entretenu.²⁴⁶

Chappuys, instead, emphasizes the value of the actions depicted in the story as “exemple de toute honnesteté, force, prudence.”²⁴⁷ Rather than serving as a model for readers' own rhetorical conduct, the *Amadis* is proclaimed to be, above all, a recreational work, whose value rests primarily in the pleasure it brings to its readers. Similarly, in the dedicatory letter to Nicolas Spina in Book XXI, Chappuys specifies that the book is “seulement pour vostre plaisir & recreation,”²⁴⁸ describing it as a book about “les vertuz & perfections des grands, illustres, amoureux, luyaux, magnanimes, vertueux, genereux & gentils,” just as his dedicatee is “l'exemple d'amitié, loyauté, magnanimité, vertu, generosité & gentillesse.”²⁴⁹ Here, Chappuys is essentially adopting the perspective that Jacques Amyot had earlier put forward with regard to the Greek romance—namely, that though the events described are “fabulous,” they nevertheless have moral value in that they depict virtuous acts and the deeds of great men. However, this point of view on the series is quite different from the one that Herberay and the other early contributors to the *Amadis* advanced, which saw virtue in the rhetorical excellence of the series, and illustrated the power of a wise courtier's rhetoric to critique or correct the actions of great men.

At the beginning of this chapter, I argued that the kind of freewheeling translational infidelity Herberay practices derives from his conception of the *Amadis* series as a historiographical project. This would suggest that Chappuys, whose prefaces clearly categorize the *Amadis* as an entertainment with no serious humanistic purpose, would translate it more faithfully, and this is exactly what we see. In contrast to the trend we saw in Herberay's translations, which tend to make considerable additions, cuts, and other changes to the rhetorical technique used in speeches and letters, Chappuys' translational changes in these areas are much more modest. A later edition of the *Trésor*, published after the publication of 21 books including all of Chappuys' translations, includes a speech from Book XXI that is categorized in the same group as the speeches I analysed above. Unlike those speeches, this one, “Harangue du Prince Dorigel, aux Roys & Princes, touchant le fait de la guerre,” features not a courtier giving advice to monarchs about conduct in wartime, but royals discussing such matters among themselves; in this case, Prince Dorigel is urging his fellow monarchs to band together against the pagans. Chappuys' translational changes are of a much more superficial nature than Herberay's were, such as reordering the phrase “quando udirà esser preso il suo Regno, non à dubbio, che lascierà

²⁴⁶ De Buzon, “Le règlement de lecture,” Ctd. 134.

²⁴⁷ From the preface to Book XX; Ctd. De Buzon, 135.

²⁴⁸ Dedication to Nicolas Spina, *Le vingt-uniesme et dernier livre*, *2^v.

²⁴⁹ Dedication to Nicolas Spina, *Le vingt-uniesme et dernier livre*, *3^t.

quella impresa...²⁵⁰ to “lequel sans doute laissera ceste entreprise, quand il entendra que son Royaume est pris...”²⁵¹ Chappuys’ translation tends toward light explicitation, such as translating “questi”²⁵² as “les Seigneurs;”²⁵³ one of the few places where he makes a significant cut is in translating “parenti Christiani”²⁵⁴ as simply “parens.”²⁵⁵ But in these speeches, there is none of the wholesale rewriting, or rhetorical intervention, that we saw in Herberay’s translations of similar moments.

Though Chappuys’ translation is very different from Herberay’s in many respects, he does make two different, equally fictional claims about the origins of his source text. The first is the editorial pretense that the original was written in Spanish, though the continuations from which Chappuys is translating were in fact written in Italian.²⁵⁶ This is particularly surprising since tensions with Spain remained high during this time (and would worsen in the 1580s, with Spanish funding of and involvement in the Catholic League’s efforts against Henri III²⁵⁷). Nevertheless, the pretense of a Spanish original is reinforced by the paratext: Book XXI, for instance, explicitly states on its cover page, “Traduict d’Hespagnol en François,” and the royal privilege for this book states that it is “traduict d’Espagnol en François par Gabriel Chappuys Tourangeau.”²⁵⁸ Second, Chappuys includes his own fictional authorial paratext claiming to have uncovered his source material in an old manuscript. But unlike Herberay, whose attribution of the manuscript to medieval French sources was so crucial to the initial conception of the *Amadis*, Chappuys returns to the trope of a Byzantine source. Book XV, the first that Chappuys translated, begins with a preface in which he explains the fact that his volume does not pick up exactly where Book XIV left off by saying that the original of his text was a manuscript unknown to the previous translator:

Amy lecteur, on t’avoit promis à la fin du quatorziesme precendent qu’il seroit traité au quinziesme, de Spheramonde & d’Amadis d’Astre, mais c’estoit pource que la continuation des faits de don Silves, que tu verras icy, estoit incogneuë au translateur du livre susdit, laquelle depuis est venue en lumiere & a esté tiree des annales de Constantinople.... [a3v]²⁵⁹

Chappuys’ use of the found manuscript topos does not reprise Herberay’s argument in Book I that the Spanish *Amadis* was based on Picard originals, but rather Montalvo’s prefatory claim that the story comes from a tomb “debaxo de la tierra en una hermita, cerca de Constantinopla...” Despite the vocal admiration for Herberay that Chappuys expresses in his dedicatory letters, he does not share Herberay’s vision of the *Amadis* series as a venue for the

²⁵⁰ M. Mambrino Roseo da Fabriano, *Della historia del principe Sferamundi Figliuolo di Don Rogello di Grecia, parte sesta* (Lucio Spineda: Venetia, 1610), 391b.

²⁵¹ *Thresor de tous les livres d’Amadis de Gaule...* Dernière Edition (Lyon : Pierre Rigaud, 1605), 682a.

²⁵² Mambrino Roseo, *Della historia del principe Sferamundi*, 391b.

²⁵³ *Thresor* (1605), 682a.

²⁵⁴ Mambrino Roseo, *Della historia del principe Sferamundi*, 391b.

²⁵⁵ *Thresor* (1605), 682a.

²⁵⁶ De Buzon, “Le règlement de lecture,” 128. The *Amadis* Books XXII-XXIV (the French translations of which were published in 1615), originally written in German and not translated by Chappuys, maintain the same pretense.

²⁵⁷ Mack P. Holt, *The French Wars of Religion, 1562–1629* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 121-122.

²⁵⁸ Gabriel Chappuys, transl., *Le vingt-uniesme et dernier livre d’Amadis de Gaule...* (Lyon: Loys Cloquemin, 1581).

²⁵⁹ Gabriel Chappuys, transl., *Le quinziesme liure d’Amadis de Gaule...* (Lyon : Benoist Rigaud, 1578).

development of vernacular rhetoric. Nevertheless, the nationalist significance of translating from Spanish originals remains, despite the fact Chappuys is actually translating from Italian.

By the end of the *Amadis* series, the humanist game that Herberay played in his preface, which relies on a corresponding readerly comprehension of the significance of his fictionalization of the translation's origins, has become a mere reiteration of the found manuscript trope. Likewise, the use of translation as an exercise in French copia had, by the end of the series largely devolved into the kind of slavish translational "copying" that Herberay's translation of the earlier books sought to challenge. However, the humanist legacy of Herberay's translation of the *Amadis* lives on—and, in some ways, takes on even greater significance—in its influence on Gabriel Chappuys' next major project: a French translation of the *Orlando Furioso*. The *Amadis* provided an important example of how prose romance, as a genre, could be made into something quite stylistically and rhetorically similar to a history. This example turned out to be useful when it came to translating the *Orlando Furioso*—originally an Italian verse romance-epic—into a French prose cycle. This cycle then incorporated into its romance narrative the events at Roncesvalles narrated in the *Pseudo-Turpin*. No longer accepted as history proper, the *Pseudo-Turpin* found a new home in romance, all thanks to the *Amadis*.

CHAPTER THREE

Vindicating Turpin:

From Romance to History in French Prose Translations of *Orlando Furioso*

In Chapter One, I described the *Pseudo-Turpin* as an example of how medieval pseudo-history continued to be accepted as history throughout the early Renaissance. Ludovico Ariosto's romance-epic poem *Orlando Furioso* (1532) is usually seen as the work that turned the tide, exposing Turpin, the Archbishop of Rheims, once and for all as the fraud that he is.²⁶⁰ In the *Orlando Furioso*, Turpin is depicted as a celebrity pseudo-historian, and becomes something of a running joke throughout the poem: the most fantastical, non-verisimilar details are justified as references to Turpin's chronicle. Sergio Zatti has argued that this dynamic makes Turpin the "guarantor of artificiality" in the *Furioso*: Turpin's questionable authority is invoked in order to point out the dubiousness of all poems and histories' claims to represent absolute truth.²⁶¹ This dismantling of the privileged relationship between epic and history, Zatti suggests, leads to a flattening of the traditional hierarchy of literary genres: if romance and history are equally fantastical, as Ariosto argues them to be, then romance can no longer be singled out for its lies.²⁶² "According to Turpin" is a traditional refrain in medieval literature that becomes, in Ariosto's hands, a punch line; and the joke is on those who would believe any poet or historiographer who claims to be telling the truth.

What made Turpin such a ripe target for Ariosto's irony was the fact that, as I discussed in Chapter One, he remained a relatively well-regarded historian in the early Renaissance, despite the fact that humanist critical methods could have easily revealed his work to be that of a forger. Turpin had a relatively uneventful life as a historical archbishop, but was reincarnated later in the Middle Ages as a character in the French epic tradition of Charlemagne's conquest of Spain. Exemplified most famously by the *Chanson de Roland*, this tradition states that Turpin the warrior-bishop died at the Battle of Roncesvalles, along with Charlemagne's heroic nephew Roland.²⁶³ And Turpin was further transformed later in the Middle Ages as the putative author and narrator of the Latin chronicle the *Pseudo-Turpin*, which was in reality composed by a cleric sometime in the twelfth century. This cleric's version of events describes Turpin as outliving Charlemagne and narrating an eyewitness account of the Battle of Roncesvalles.²⁶⁴ The *Pseudo-Turpin* makes Turpin not just a warrior-bishop, but also a historian of those events to which he

²⁶⁰ Cf. Sergio Zatti, "Turpin's Role: Poetry and Truth in the *Furioso*," in *The Quest for Epic: From Ariosto to Tasso*, ed. Dennis Looney (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006).

²⁶¹ Zatti, "Turpin's Role: Poetry and Truth in the *Furioso*," 70.

²⁶² Zatti argues that Ariosto "defines a concept of poetry that, leaving aside the nobility or antiquity of a tradition, reveals itself as a fictive operation, as a fairy tale or a lie: one's own case just as much as the case of other poets, equally true of the modern romance as of the ancient epic" ("Turpin's Role," 89).

²⁶³ For the definitive account of the *Chanson de Roland*'s textual history, see the general introduction to the recent edition by Joseph J. Duggan, *La Chanson de Roland - The Song of Roland: The French Corpus*, Vols. 1-3 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2005). This edition also includes critical editions of the various versions of the text.

²⁶⁴ For a concise account of modern scholarship on the dating of the *Pseudo-Turpin*, cf. Marie de Menaca, "Du «Liber Sancti Jacobi» au «Codex Calixtinus»: réécriture d'un texte et ses raisons politiques et religieuses," *Cahiers de linguistique hispanique médiévale* 14, no. 1 (1989): 121-146, particularly 129-131. See also the introduction to the critical edition by Cyril Meredith-Jones, *Historia Karoli Magni et Rotholandi; ou, Chronique du Pseudo-Turpin* (Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1972).

was an eyewitness. With this text, Turpin the historian became internationally famous. The *Pseudo-Turpin* was widely translated, and was used as the basis for both chronicles and epics in a variety of languages through the fifteenth century.²⁶⁵

Ariosto uses Turpin to argue that romance has no ethical obligation to represent historical truth, since historians tell lies just as poets do. As we have seen in the previous chapter, though, the French project of the *Amadis de Gaule* was pushing the generic boundaries of romance in precisely the opposite direction, by showing that chivalric romances could take on many of the traditional rhetorical forms and functions of history. In this chapter, I show that this French historicization of romance has a profound impact on the French reception of the *Furioso*. In the sixteenth and early-seventeenth century prose translations of the *Furioso*, Ariosto's dismantling of Turpin's authority is systematically reversed. By the late sixteenth century, Turpin is no longer tenable as a historian, even in France. But through these translations of the *Furioso*, he becomes the symbolic forefather of a new French national literature, which derives its authority from a proudly ideological and royalist relationship to historical truth. "According to Turpin," in this corpus of texts, comes to mean "According to France."

In this chapter, I argue that the fact that Turpin's comeback takes place at this particular moment, through the medium of translation, is no accident. Rather, it is a result of the paradox that Carolingian history came to play a critical symbolic role in Renaissance international politics at the very moment that its underlying medieval sources were brought into question by humanist textual methodologies. Many of the *Furioso* translators were historiographers, or else aspired to be, and their translations reflect the ways in which certain Carolingian episodes and characters—Charlemagne, Roncesvalles, Roland, Turpin—had become flashpoints in the reframing of the textual past to suit the political needs of the present. These characters and episodes could no longer properly belong to the genre of the Renaissance historiography, but the *Furioso* translators made them into something historiography-adjacent. The *Furioso* itself is clearly distinct, in form and subject, from the medieval epics and chronicles from which its characters derive. But the French prose translators ultimately restore those original forms and subjects to the *Furioso*, ultimately weaving Ariosto's romance adventures into the story of Roncesvalles.

This generic transformation of the *Furioso* from romance to pseudo-historiography is made possible by the translations of the French *Amadis*. But at the same time, translation plays a different role here than it did in that project. As we saw in the previous chapter, Nicolas Herberay des Essarts' interventions, which brought the *Amadis* closer to the form and function of rhetorical historiography, were directly inspired by rhetorical techniques deriving from humanist historiographical writing. For Herberay, as we saw, rewriting his source text was not a matter of infidelity, but rather, a proclamation of allegiance to the Spanish source text's own imagined French sources. Here, on the other hand, the translators' approach to Ariosto's source text involves no rewriting whatsoever; on the contrary, they are faithful, sometimes to the point of absurdity. The explanation for this fidelity, I will show here, is that in lieu of the kind of rhetorical translation that Herberay practices, the *Furioso* translators employ practices like *ordinatio* and *compilatio* that were traditionally used alongside prose translation in the

²⁶⁵ On French translations, cf. Gabrielle Spiegel, *Romancing the Past: The Rise of Vernacular Prose Historiography in Thirteenth-Century France*. Berkeley; Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1993. (French, Spanish, and Italian receptions of the *Pseudo-Turpin* are discussed further in this chapter, as well as in Chapter One of this dissertation). There is also a body of scholarship on English translations of the *Pseudo-Turpin*, e.g. Stephen H. A. Shepherd, "The Middle English 'Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle,'" *Medium Aevum* 65, no. 1 (1996): 19-34.

transmission of Carolingian material in France from the Middle Ages through the fifteenth century.²⁶⁶ Using these medieval practices of textual transmission on the modern Renaissance *Furioso*, the translators are able to weave Ariosto's work into the fabric of an existing French literary tradition. In doing so, they transform the genre of the *Furioso* and claim the text for France.

This process only becomes visible if we consider the prose translations of the *Furioso* as a distinct corpus of texts. The sixteenth-century verse translations of the *Furioso*, as well as the commentaries on Ariosto found in theoretical works by the likes of Du Bellay and Ronsard, take a mostly apolitical approach to the historiographical dimensions of the poem, viewing it instead as a source of models for lyric imitation. In the sixteenth century, verse-writers' attentions were devoted to partial, fragmentary lyric translations and imitations of the *Furioso*, rather than to translating the poem as a complete narrative. As we will see, these lyric imitations are the aspect of the *Furioso*'s French reception that has received the vast majority of critical attention in the past. But it is the prose translations, I argue here, that determine the prominent role of the *Furioso* in French literary history in the seventeenth century and beyond. In fact, for the first two hundred years of the *Furioso*'s French reception, the only complete translations of the poem were in prose, a fact that warrants much more consideration than it has received so far. By considering these complete prose translation as a corpus distinct from the verse translations, we can see that prose translators alter the genre of the *Furioso* not through translational interventions in the text itself, but through manipulation of the translation as a textual object—through intertextuality, paratext, and especially the appending of other texts as continuations or prequels.

Indeed, perhaps the most striking aspects of the prose translations, when we look at them as a group, is the fact that each of them is closely related—either in its publication history, its paratext, or both—to other texts (translations and continuations), such that they form a multi-volume Roland cycle.²⁶⁷ The three cycles, and their associated translations of the *Furioso*, are:

- I. First French Orlandos (1544-1550):
 - a. An anonymous 1544 prose translation of the *Furioso* edited by Jean Des Gouttes and published by Sulpice Sabon, with a privilege issued to the *marchand-libraire* Jehan Thelusson in Lyon.²⁶⁸

²⁶⁶ Another reason that these translators differ from Herberay in their approach is likely the different, more authoritative status of the *Furioso*, Ariosto, and Italian-language literature in general, compared to Montalvo's *Amadis*. Working with a highly respected source text, even a vernacular one, brings the translators' approach to the text itself more in line with the fidelity-oriented practices of Renaissance translators of classical texts. For more on the authoritative status of Italian texts in France in the sixteenth century, and a detailed overview of French translations from Italian, cf. Giovanni Dotoli, ed., *Les traductions de l'italien en français au XVIème siècle* (Fasano (Br-Italia): Schena ; Paris, France : Presses de l'Université de Paris-Sorbonne, 2009).

²⁶⁷ In addition to these prose translations, which form the core of my study, I also analyze a partial 1555 verse translation by Jean Fornier as a point of comparison at various points in the chapter.

²⁶⁸ Major secondary works on this translation include: M. M. Fontaine, "Jean Martin Traducteur," in *Prose et prosateurs de la Renaissance* (Paris: Sedes, 1988), 109-122; Élise Rajchenbach-Teller, "Le Roland Furieux, Lyon, Sulpice Sabon pour Jean Thelusson, 1543-1544," *Réforme, Humanisme, Renaissance* 71, no. 1 (2011): 45-54; Rosanna Gorris-Camos, "Traduction et illustration de la langue française. Les enjeux du Roland furieux lyonnais de 1543," in *Lyon et l'illustration de la langue française à la Renaissance*, ed. G. Defaux (Lyon, ENS Éditions, 2003), 231-260; and Rosanna Gorris, "Non è lontano a discoprirsì il porto: Jean Martin, son oeuvre et ses rapports avec la ville des Este," in *Jean Martin: un traducteur au temps de François Ier et de Henri II* (Paris: Presses de l'École normale supérieure, 1999), 43-83. A major focus of this scholarship is the attempt to identify the anonymous translator, a question I do not address here; the sources above raise such possibilities as Jean Martin, Maurice Scève, Jean Des Gouttes himself, Jacques Vincent, or a team consisting of some or all of these.

- b. A 1549-1550 prose translation of the *Innamorato* by Jacques Vincent.
- II. Gabriel Chappuys “rejuvenation” (1576)
 - a. An edited version of the Sulpice Sabon translation of the *Furioso*
 - b. A prose translation of Giovambattista Pescatore’s Italian continuation to the *Furioso*
 - c. A prose translation of Ariosto’s *Cinque canti*
- III. François de Rosset retranslation and new continuation (1615-1618)
 - a. A new prose translation of the *Furioso*
 - b. A new prose translation of the *Innamorato*
 - c. An original prose continuation to the *Furioso*

Of the three sets of translations I describe above, the first is the only one to have received significant critical attention, and the fact that these prose translations all appear as part of cycles has not been studied.²⁶⁹

Each of the translations’ prefaces suggests different areas of interest, translational motivations, and orientations to questions of genre and fidelity. Rosset’s translation is both the latest of the three and the most overtly historiographical, with Rosset explicitly framing his work as a kind of audition for future royal historiographies. Chappuys’ translation is perhaps the least historiographical, and most oriented toward recreating the Italian reception of the *Furioso* in a French edition; but Chappuys himself held a highly prestigious position as Historiographe de France under Henri II.²⁷⁰ Moreover, Chappuys himself, as we saw in the previous chapter, was a very prolific (if somewhat lackadaisical) translator of the French *Amadis* cycle, one of many points of contact between the *Amadis* and *Furioso* translations that I will describe in this chapter. But it was the first French prose translation, written anonymously, published by Sulpice Sabon, and dedicated to the Ferrarese Cardinal Hippolyte II d’Este (at the time archbishop of Lyon), which created the formal, intertextual, and paratextual links to the *Amadis* that would make Rosset’s later translation-*cum*-historiography possible. The *Amadis* provides a model of a translated prose romance with historiographical ambitions, particularly one framed as a nationalist corrective to Spanish literary overreaching.

Though his source text is Italian, Rosset (particularly in his original continuation) ultimately frames his translation of the *Furioso* as a nationalist corrective to Spain as well. Recuperating Turpin as a figure of French literary authority, Rosset uses him to rebut Spanish nationalist versions of Charlemagne’s conquest of Spain. By reuniting Ariosto’s Roland with his death at the Battle of Roncesvalles, Rosset reasserts France’s literary authority over Carolingian myth, just at the moment when it moves from the realm of the historiographical into the fictional. Turpin never made an entirely successful historiographer, dogged since the Middle Ages by accusations of forgery and bias. But as the emblem of a new literary ethos of repatriation, which selectively mines the French medieval tradition to stake a prior nationalist claim on contemporary Spanish and Italian works, Turpin is just right.

²⁶⁹ I discuss the scholarship around these various translations in Section III of this chapter, “Toward an Orlando Cycle.”

²⁷⁰ This title was both unusual and highly prestigious, in comparison to the more common and less lucrative “Historiographe du roi.” Chantal Grell describes 113 “historiographes du roi” compared to 16 “historiographes de France” under the Ancien Régime. See Chantal Grell, “Les historiographes en France: XVIe-XVIIe Siècles,” in *Les historiographes en Europe de la fin du Moyen Âge à la Révolution*, edited by Chantal Grell (Paris: Presses de l’Université Paris-Sorbonne, 2006), 130.

I. Peripheral Charlemagnes: Turpin in Europe Before the Furioso

Before considering the international dimensions of Carolingian history's political resurgence in the Renaissance, it is important to first clarify how the genre and historical authority of the *Pseudo-Turpin* were understood in sixteenth-century France just prior to the publication of the *Furioso*. As I discuss in Chapter One, the *Pseudo-Turpin* was not unveiled as a forgery by French Renaissance humanists (though some Spanish humanists did accuse it of being forged). On the other hand, this does not mean that French readers were unaware of, or naïve to, the fact that the *Pseudo-Turpin* drew from both epic and historical sources. Rather, the *Pseudo-Turpin* functioned throughout the French Middle Ages as a tool for the advancement of political claims, in a way that later made it easier for seventeenth-century French translators to situate Turpin as a voice of nationalist ideology rather than history. Ariosto and other Italian authors would cast Turpin as the quintessential "lying historiographer." But in reality, Turpin's status in medieval France was less as an *auctoritas*, than as a symbol of the ways in which literary genres could be manipulated to serve political goals. Throughout the Middle Ages, various versions of the story of Charlemagne's Spanish campaign were commissioned and written to bring peripheral parts of the medieval Francophone world into symbolic contact with the core mythos of the Gallican kingship.

To the extent that the epic and historiographical versions of the story in the Middle Ages were distinct, the difference between them was largely one of form and language rather than one of subject or verifiability. According to scholars like Joseph Duggan, the *chanson de geste* in general had the status of a "popular historiography,"²⁷¹ and fifteenth-century French works on Charlemagne, like David Aubert's *Croniques et Conquestes de Charlemagne* (1458) and Jean Bagnyon's *Fierabras* (1478) drew freely from both epic and historical sources to an extent that makes them hard to categorize as one or the other. Bagnyon's *Fierabras*, first printed in Geneva in 1478, is a useful illustration of how the medieval *Pseudo-Turpin*'s version of the Roland story was still circulating in Renaissance France just prior to the *Orlando Furioso*. Bagnyon's material comes from a combination of translations of Vincent de Beauvais' *Miroir Historial*, a *mise-en-prose* of the *chanson de geste* *Fierabras*, a French translation of the *Pseudo-Turpin*, and Bagnyon's own inventions,²⁷² and was still being published in new French editions as late as 1617.²⁷³

In *Fierabras*, Bagnyon weaves together the *chanson de geste* account of Roncevaux with famous episodes from the *Pseudo-Turpin*, such as Roland's religious battle with the giant Ferragus. Despite the fact that the *Pseudo-Turpin* itself is deeply woven into the composition of the *Fierabras*, Bagnyon refers relatively infrequently to Turpin as an authority. This is, perhaps, a sign of Turpin's diminished standing as a historiographer in the fifteenth century. But at the same time, the fact that Bagnyon need not cite Turpin as a source also indicates the *Pseudo-Turpin*'s broad success in propagating its pseudo-historical version of events so widely that they

²⁷¹ Cf. J.J. Duggan, "Medieval Epic as Popular Historiography: Appropriation of Historical Knowledge in the Vernacular Epic," *Grundriss der romanischen Literaturen des Mittelalters, t. 11/1, La littérature historiographique des origines à 1500 (Partie historique)*, edited by H.U. Gumbrecht, U. Link-Heer et P.M. Spangenberg (Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1986), 285-311. See also Giovanni Palumbo, "David Aubert historien? Le récit de la bataille de Roncevaux dans les *Croniques et Conquestes de Charlemaigne*," *Le Moyen Age* CXII, no. 3 (January 15, 2007): 589.

²⁷² Hans-Erich Keller, Introduction to *L'histoire de Charlemaigne (parfois dite Roman de Fierabras)*, edited by Hans-Erich Keller (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1992), xii-xxviii.

²⁷³ It also appeared in the *Bibliothèque Bleue* in 1860. Hans-Erich Keller, "Introduction," xxix-xxx.

need not even be attributed to Turpin himself. There are some exceptions. For instance, Bagnyon evokes Turpin by name when discussing intimate details about Charlemagne, no doubt because the *Pseudo-Turpin* claims that Turpin has close firsthand knowledge of Charlemagne as his personal companion. One example of this can be found in Book I, Chapter 2 (titled “De la corpulence du roy Charles et de la maniere de son vivre”), where Bagnyon says: “...Turpin, saint honme, arcevesque de Rains, qui regnoit par lors et fut par pluseurs fois en la compaignie de Charles, il dist qu’il estoit homme bien pris de corps et grant de personne et avoit le regart fiers et malicieux.”²⁷⁴ In general, though, Bagnyon refers much more frequently to Beauvais’ *Miroir Historial* (itself partly based on the *Pseudo-Turpin*) than to the *Pseudo-Turpin* itself.

In any event, Bagnyon’s narration includes numerous reflections on his authorial labors, and we therefore know that he does not see it as his task to weigh the reliability of his sources. Rather, he says that he has used them all, his ultimate goal being to bring the material into the vernacular in a single coherent and orderly narrative. For instance, in his authorial prologue to the second book, he states :

...ce que j’ay dessus escript, je l’ay pris en ung authentique livre nommé *Miroir Historial* et és croniques anciennes et l’ay tant seullement transporté du latin en françois. Et la matiere suyvant est d’un roman fait a l’ancienne façon, sans grant ordonnance, dont j’ay esté juste a le reduyre en prose par chappitres ordonnés.²⁷⁵

Bagnyon describes his treatment of his source materials, at various points, as “ordonner,” “reduyre la rime en prose,” “transport[er]du latin en françois,” and “diviser la matiere par chapitres,” among other terms. In his work, translation is one of a number of practices, including *ordinatio* and *compilatio*, that he uses to shape a variety of sources into a single “orderly” final product. While Bagnyon does not define the kind of order he hopes to restore, his version of the narrative makes it clear that it is an ideological and symbolic order, just as much as a textual or narrative one. Henri Bolomier—Bagnyon’s patron, to whom the *Fierabras* is dedicated—was the Canon of Lausanne, a position previously held by Peter II, Count of Savoy, commonly called “le petit Charlemagne.” According to Hans-Erich Keller, the editor of the *Fierabras*, it is “tout à fait probable”²⁷⁶ that Bolomier’s desire to reinforce and celebrate this connection was the reason he commissioned the *Fierabras*, though Bagnyon does not explicitly say so in his introduction. Rather, he makes reference to Bolomier’s desire for the material to be “ordonné”: “Et pour ce que le dit messire Henry Bolomier a veu de ceste matiere desjoincte, sans grant ordonnance, a sa requeste, selon la capacité de mon petit entendement et selon la matiere que j’en ay peu trover, j’ay ordonné cestuy livre.”²⁷⁷

Bagnyon’s service to his patron thus takes the form of “putting in order” a narrative that clarifies the genealogical relationship between Charlemagne and the Trojan kings, and also between Bagnyon’s patron and Charlemagne. Bagnyon’s primary task, as he views it, is to demonstrate his patrons’ proximity to the prestige and power of the Gallican kingship. The very first chapter of the *Fierabras* is titled “Des roys de France payens jusques au roy Cloÿs,” which narrates the story—familiar to us from my discussion of the *Franziade* in Chapter One—of how

²⁷⁴ Jehan Bagnyon, *L’histoire de Charlemaigne*, 15.

²⁷⁵ Jehan Bagnyon, *L’histoire de Charlemaigne (parfois dite Roman de Fierabras)*, ed. Hans-Erich Keller (Geneva : Librairie Droz, 1992), 27.

²⁷⁶ Hans-Erich Keller, “Introduction,” xi.

²⁷⁷ Jehan Bagnyon, *L’histoire de Charlemaigne*, 1-2.

Francus founded France and gave his name to it.²⁷⁸ This is a piece of pseudo-historiography that the *Pseudo-Turpin* does not include; thus, Bagnyon's concern is less with distinguishing fact from fiction, than from choosing the parts from each narrative that help advance his favored genealogy. Translation is one of several techniques that he employs in this process of textual transformation. And Bagnyon's textual practices in turn bear a strong resemblance to the practices of the prose translators of the *Furioso*. These later translators work with very different source texts, but they, too, change verse into prose; they, too, re-combine and re-order the material, all to craft a different, more politically advantageous historical narrative for their patrons. The *Furioso* translations thus bring these medieval textual practices into the Renaissance literary world.

Despite the general disfavor with which the *Pseudo-Turpin* was viewed in medieval Spain (which I discussed in Chapter One), there was a rebirth of interest in Carolingian historiography in the Renaissance. The reasons for this were twofold. First, literary trends in France—particularly, but not exclusively, the French *Amadis*—had created a renewed sixteenth-century vogue in Spain for chivalric romance. This category was broad enough to include Carolingian epic, which was, from the late the Middle Ages onward, considerably hybridized with vernacular romance in addition to historiography. And second, there was a newfound appetite for imperial models as Spain sought to expand its empire. Just as the patrons of the *Fierabras* and of the Flemish translations of the *Pseudo-Turpin* had drawn analogies or genealogical connections between Charlemagne and themselves, many Spaniards saw homonymous and imperial parallels between Charlemagne and the Ghent-born Francophone Charles V.²⁷⁹ A translation of Bagnyon's *Fierabras* was published in Castille in 1521 as the *Historia del emperador Carlomagno y de los doze pares de Francia* (attributed to a Nicolas de Piamonte), one year after Charles V assumed the title of Holy Roman Emperor previously held by Charlemagne himself.

However, unlike in medieval France, where translations and rewritings played such a crucial role in aligning the *Pseudo-Turpin* with the agendas of particular political camps, Spain had its own autochthonous versions of the Roland story to draw upon. As such, translations of French Carolingian works (such as the *Fierabras*) played a less significant role than updated Spanish *chanson de geste* versions of the Roland story, which (unlike the *Pseudo-Turpin*) were always fairly popular in medieval Spain. These epics placed particular emphasis on the Battle of Roncesvalles, portraying it not as a tragic setback in Charlemagne's ultimate conquest of Spain (as in the French versions of the story) but as a definitive, humiliating defeat for France at the hands of the Spanish. Many of these Spanish *chansons de geste* centered on the character Bernardo del Carpio, who originally featured in other Spanish epics but was woven into Spanish versions of the Roland story in epics and chronicles as early as the ninth century.²⁸⁰ With Charlemagne's resurgent sixteenth-century popularity in Spain, Bernardo too experienced a revival as the subject of romances, plays, and novels.

The Bernardo del Carpio epics that appeared later in the century, as Vilà puts it, “no se circunscribe al género épico, pero tuvo en él, por el mismo fin patriótico, el terreno más abonado y dispuesto para su recuperación, especialmente de la parte de su leyenda que lo erige como

²⁷⁸ Jehan Bagnyon, *L'histoire de Charlemaigne*, 3.

²⁷⁹ See López Martínez-Morás, “Le Pseudo-Turpin en Espagne,” 487-488.

²⁸⁰ Cf. Albert B. Franklin, “A Study of the Origins of the Legend of Bernardo Del Carpio,” *Hispanic Review* 5, no. 4 (October 1937): 286-303.

héroe nacional.”²⁸¹ An important tradition had grown around the legend that he defeated Roland in single combat toward the end of the Battle of Roncesvalles. For instance, in the wildly popular sixteenth-century poem *Bernardo, o victoria de Roncesvalles* by Bernard de Balbuena, Bernardo del Carpio (who in this version of the story is depicted as the nephew of King Alfonso II of Asturias) kills Roland during the Battle of Roncevaux.²⁸² Thus, while in the *Bernardo* Charlemagne remains an aspirational figure potentially connected to the present Holy Roman Emperor, Roland represents France and is soundly defeated. John Tolan observes that this nationalistic angle is particularly important to Balbuena, who—as a resident of New Spain—views Roncesvalles as the starting point of the new Spanish empire.²⁸³ Lara Vilà also suggests that for many sixteenth-century Spanish readers, there was a resonance between the Spanish victory at Roncesvalles and the battle of Pavia, where François I was captured, in 1525.²⁸⁴

But while Charlemagne remained a popular figure in Spain, and Roland a symbol of French military defeat, Turpin as a character represented historiographical dishonesty in the service of French nationalism. At the end of Balbuena’s *Bernardo*, after the battle between France and Spain, Balbuena argues that the humiliating defeat of the French colors Turpin’s later account of the story with retaliatory bias: “...he alone Spain left as a witness and chronicler of its victory, though he with his pen was to act not at all as a friend; he knew how to obscure Spain’s glory.”²⁸⁵ As we will see, Rosset’s prose translation of the *Furioso* redirects this claim against Balbuena himself. The charge of nationalist bias becomes an engine of literary exchange between France and Spain, beginning with sixteenth-century versions of the Roland story, but continuing well beyond them.

In medieval Italy, the historiographical dimensions of the Roland story were much less contested than in Spain, despite the fact that (as I discuss in Chapter One) the story had significant diplomatic importance. Perhaps for this reason, Italian adaptations were both more common, and less focused on the Roncesvalles episode, demonstrating a greater concern with formal and generic experimentation than with nationalistic revision. This was not for lack of awareness of the significance of Roncevaux in the Rolandian tradition; stories of Roland and his role in Charlemagne’s Spanish campaign, including the Battle of Roncevaux, were well known in Italy as early as the thirteenth century, in the form of copies of the French manuscript, as well as Italian translations and adaptations.²⁸⁶ By the fifteenth century, there were many Italian

²⁸¹ Lara Vilà, “De Roncesvalles a Pavia: Ariosto, la épica española y los poemas sobre Bernardo Del Carpio,” *Criticón* [online] 115 (2012): 11. Published January 15, 2012, consulted February 28, 2017. DOI : 10.4000/criticon.85.

²⁸² Al[exandre] Cioranescu, “La première édition du Bernardo,” *Bulletin Hispanique* 37, no. 4 (1935): 484. Though the earliest surviving printed edition of the *Bernardo* dates to 1624, Cioranescu notes that Rosset’s references to the *Bernardo* in this continuation must point to the existence of an earlier edition.

²⁸³ John Tolan, “The Battle of Roncesvalles as National Polemic.” In *Bridging the Atlantic: Toward a Reassessment of Iberian and Latin American Cultural Ties*. Marina Perez de Mendiola, ed. Albany: SUNY Press, 1996, 22-23. See also Bailey, Matthew, and Ryan D. Giles. *Charlemagne and His Legend in Early Spanish Literature and Historiography*. Boydell & Brewer, 2016. Also López Martínez-Morás, Santiago. “Le Pseudo-Turpin en Espagne.” *Cahiers de recherches médiévales et humanistes. Journal of medieval and humanistic studies*, no. 25 (June 30, 2013): 471–94. doi:10.4000/crm.13124.

²⁸⁴ Lara Vilà, “De Roncesvalles a Pavia: Ariosto, la épica española y los poemas sobre Bernardo Del Carpio,” *Criticón* [online] 115 (2012): 1-21. Published January 15, 2012, consulted February 28, 2017. DOI : 10.4000/criticon.85.

²⁸⁵ Ctd. Tolan, “The Battle of Roncesvalles as National Polemic,” 24.

²⁸⁶ Dante’s *Commedia* famously mentions the story twice, referring to the traitor Ganelon in *Inferno* XXXII and to Roland and Olivier in *Paradiso* XVIII.

versions of the Roland legend, including Tuscan prose adaptations, the *canterina* which were recited in villages by *jongleurs*, the Franco-Venetian *Entrée d'Espagne*, and *La Spagna*, written in *ottava rima*. These Italian versions developed two distinct takes on the Roland legend: one focusing on the traditional subjects of the battle of Roncevaux and Roland's heroic death (derived from the French *chansons de geste*); and one, an innovation of the Italian adaptations, focusing on other aspects of Roland's life, including his birth, his youth, and his amorous adventures.²⁸⁷

This latter group of Italian Roland stories fundamentally changed the character of Roland, and the kinds of stories associated with him: for instance, the *Entrée d'Espagne* and the prose romances introduced Roland's travels in pagan countries, while the *cantari* began to commingle the Carolingian story with aspects of the Arthurian Matter of Britain. Italian adaptations were also the first to broach the subject of Roland's childhood. While the Roncevaux episode does appear in some of these stories, it plays a much less significant role.²⁸⁸ The Carolingian and Arthurian subjects were also considerably hybridized in France in the late Middle Ages. But it was the Italian innovations to the Roland story that played an instrumental role in developing the character beyond, and separate from, his historiographical origins, with a turn toward romance that was definitively enshrined in the fifteenth century in Boiardo's *Orlando innamorato*. Around the same time that Jean Bagnyon's *Fierabras* was connecting the material in the *Pseudo-Turpin* to the story of Francus and the founding of France, Boiardo was developing a Roland story that moved away from the epic and historiographical material altogether.

In Spain and France, Roncevaux is the crux of bilateral nationalistic disagreement over representations of the medieval past. In Italy, by contrast, the political stakes of the medieval Roland tradition centered on an internal struggle between the demands of contemporary diplomacy and those of humanist methodology. Matteo Boiardo's *Orlando Innamorato* and Ludovico Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso* write the characters of the Roland story out of their customary historiographical episodes altogether, and into the world of romance. But they differ in their perspectives on their works' relationship to the French literary Rolandian tradition, embodied in part by the character of Turpin. As we will see, the French translations rewrite Ariosto's critique of Turpin in part as a response to Spanish criticisms of the character's historical authority. In doing so, they appeal to the *Furioso*'s genealogical relationship to the *Innamorato* as a means of re-inscribing the *Furioso* within a medieval textual tradition that Ariosto himself often militated against.

II. Impossible Genealogies: France and Turpin in Ariosto and Boiardo

In the next section, we will look at how the French translations of the *Orlando Furioso* effectively betray Ariosto's vision of romance as a vehicle for the critique of literary truth. First, though, we must take a closer look at how that vision emerges in Ariosto's text itself. By juxtaposing Boiardo's and Ariosto's treatments of Turpin, we will be able to throw Ariosto's

²⁸⁷ Aline Laradji traces this transformation in *La légende de Roland: de la genèse française à l'épuisement de la figure du héros en Italie* (Paris: Harmattan, 2008). "En se déplaçant de la France vers l'Italie, la figure de Roland se transforme: le héros français épique devient un chevalier errant, comme les personnages de la matière de Bretagne. Le Roland italien ne combat plus pour son Dieu et son seigneur, comme dans le système féodal français, mais c'est la puissance de l'Amour qui le pousse aux voyages et aux duels." (Laradji, 7).

²⁸⁸ Aline Laradji, *La légende de Roland*.

disdain for nationalist pseudo-history—and his frequent attribution of this kind of nationalism to France and French literature—into sharper relief. Let us begin, then, by considering the ways in which Boiardo humorously perpetuates, rather than ironically overthrowing, Turpin’s authority over the Matter of France and its characters. At the very beginning of the *Innamorato*, Boiardo describes his poem as a kind of continuation to the version of the story embodied by the Archbishop Turpin, suggesting that he is offering a portion of the *Pseudo-Turpin* that was previously unknown to the public. This gesture resembles the pseudo-philological “found manuscript” prefaces in Spanish and French romances, which I discussed in the previous chapter, though Boiardo does not refer to a specific new source text. He does say that Turpin knew (and perhaps even wrote) the story contained in *Orlando innamorato*, but kept it hidden because it would be “dispettosa” to depict a Roland conquered by love:

Questa novella è nota a poca gente,
 Perché Turpino istesso la nascose,
 Credendo forse a quel conte valente
 Esser le sue scritture dispettose,
 Poi che contra ad Amor pur fu perdente
 Colui che vinse tutte l’altre cose:
 Dico di Orlando, il cavalliero adatto.
 Non più parole ormai, veniamo al fatto. (I.i.3.1-8)

Boiardo then goes on to launch his story with the line, “La vera istoria di Turpin ragiona...” (I.i.4.1), which affirms the truth of Turpin’s version of events, and claims that what follows is somehow based on that version. Of course, in reality, no part of the story of the *Innamorato* comes from the *Pseudo-Turpin*, beyond the characters and their general circumstances. But despite this “joking irony,” common to many fifteenth-century representations of Turpin,²⁸⁹ Boiardo affirms that Turpin—at least, Turpin the character—is a historiographer, and describes him as the source for the *Innamorato*.

Boiardo is not employing the strategies of *ordinatio* and *compilatio* that characterize works like Bagnyon’s *Fierabras*, which genuinely use the *Pseudo-Turpin* as a source. However, he is imitating those works and their textual practices, even going so far as to claim on the frontispiece to the *Innamorato* that it is translated “da la verace Cronica de Turpino.”²⁹⁰ He is using the tradition of Turpin’s unreliability to his own fictional ends. Sergio Zatti has observed that Boiardo’s use of Turpin makes him not the authenticator of facts external to the *Innamorato*, but the “fictive governor of narrative order” within the *Innamorato* itself. The self-conscious transitions, omissions, inaccuracies, and postponements so characteristic of the Renaissance chivalric poem are often attributed to Turpin.²⁹¹

Ariosto, on the other hand, uses Turpin to signal Ariosto’s total rejection of the poet’s obligation—or even capacity—to represent historical truth: for Ariosto, in Zatti’s words, “Poetry neither reflects history, nor betrays it; it simply confirms or denies other poetry.”²⁹² Ariosto does make the traditional references to Turpin’s authority that come from the *chanson de geste* tradition and are used with similar irony by Boiardo. But though Turpin is the most overt

²⁸⁹ Zatti, “Turpin’s Role,” 62.

²⁹⁰ Zatti, “Turpin’s Role,” 66.

²⁹¹ Zatti, “Turpin’s Role,” 68.

²⁹² Zatti, “Turpin’s Role,” 93.

intertextual presence in the *Furioso*, Ariosto chooses not to allude to the *Furioso*'s connection with the text that he is actually continuing: Boiardo's. Boiardo's absence, and Turpin's presence, are both manifestations of Ariosto's disinterest in making the *Furioso*'s textual genealogy part of its narrative. Boiardo gestures to the trope of the found manuscript, and also to the real, if distant, historiographical origins of the Charlemagne-and-Roland story, in referencing Turpin at the beginning of his poem. Ariosto, on the other hand, begins the *Furioso* without providing any explanation for the philological or historical origins of the story he presents. In Ariosto's hands, Turpin becomes a kind of empty signifier, whose invocation only reinforces his obsolescence. Ariosto's refusal of any historiographical role for his poem produces a departure from the romance convention of describing (even fictionally, as Boiardo does) the external circumstances of his text's production.²⁹³

The differences between Ariosto's and Boiardo's portrayals of Turpin reflect, in a broader sense, how each of them views the Roland story's relationship to a French literary tradition. This question is closely tied to the role of patronage in both works. The house of Este, patrons to both Boiardo and Ariosto, strongly identified with the French monarchy and the courtesies and values described in French chivalric literature. They viewed their court's culture of courtesy as one of the features that distinguished it from the Medici;²⁹⁴ Hippolyte d'Este (the dedicatee of the first French prose translation of the *Furioso*) was fond of dressing as a knight errant when he attended masquerades in Fontainebleau and Lyon.²⁹⁵ Boiardo's *Innamorato*, while it does not draw directly on French sources, does describe the characters and the story as French—through his attribution of the text as a whole to Turpin, but also in his treatment of the historiographical dimensions of the Roland material. Though the *Innamorato* is not itself historiographical in subject, neither does it seek to debunk the cherished notion of a genealogical relationship between its Carolingian characters and their contemporary French monarchic descendants. Rather, Boiardo imitates this dynamic, by creating a parallel fictional relationship between the *Innamorato* characters Bradmante and Ruggiero and their supposed descendants, the house of Este.²⁹⁶ This strategy strengthens the already-considerable connections between his patrons, the house of Este, and the nobility of France, flattering rather than contesting the pseudo-historiographical connection between the Roland story and the French monarchy.

²⁹³ At the same time, the *Furioso* does frequently describe and call attention to its internal formal markers. Albert Ascoli has suggested that structural aspects of the *Furioso*, particularly Ariosto's innovations to Boiardo's interlacing techniques, consist of a response to the ongoing "historical violence" of his time. Cf. Albert Russell Ascoli, "Ariosto and the 'Fier Pastor': Form and History in Orlando Furioso," in *Renaissance Quarterly* 54, no. 2 (July 1, 2001): 497. According to Ascoli, the structural means through which Ariosto addresses these crises also serve as a means of containing the threat they represent to his cultural and political world. One further dimension of this strategy of formal containment, which has important implications for French translations of the poem, is that it governs the *Furioso*'s intertextual relationship to its medieval sources.

²⁹⁴ « Les Este regarderont toujours avec un fier dédain ces 'marchands' des Médicis et admireront en revanche, même après que les rigoureuses lois d'une politique d'équilibre international les auront éloignés du camp français, les idéaux de gloire chevaleresque que les rois de France incarnaient » Rosanna Gorris Camos, "Traduction et illustration de la langue française," 234.

²⁹⁵ « Hippolyte ne s'était-il pas lors des innombrables mascarades, organisées à Fontainebleau, à Lyon, à « Sciatellaro », déguisé en chevalier, *a guisa de que' cavalieri erranti de' quali si legge nei libri di romanzi*, avec son emprise de la *biscia con tre gigli... sua arma*, sans hésiter à se présenter *vestito da albero, in capo un vaso dal quale uscivan rami*, tout comme Astolphe qui « au sixiesme chant [est] transformé en arbre » ? » Rosanna Gorris, "Non è lontano a scoprirsì il porto," 62.

²⁹⁶ See Jo Ann Cavallo, "Chapter Seven: Rugiero (Atlas Mountains, Northern Africa)," in *The World Beyond Europe in the Romance Epics of Boiardo and Ariosto* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013), 95-111.

Ariosto continues and deepens the Bradamante and Ruggiero genealogy that Boiardo established. But he also comments repeatedly on the inherent, and transhistorical, distorting effect of patronage on literary truth. In the authorial proem to Canto XV, Ariosto discusses the battle of Polesella, in which Alfonso I d'Este triumphed over the Venetians. This victory, Ariosto says, “fu degna loda” (XV.2.1)²⁹⁷ and indeed, he praises the victory in detail not only here, but also in Canto XL. By contrast, in Canto XXXIV, Ariosto famously suggests that to flatter one's patrons is to lie.²⁹⁸ Certainly, we could read the contrast between these two stances as an implicit criticism of the Este, or an indication to the watchful reader that Ariosto is being insincere in his own flattery of his patrons. Here, however, I would like to suggest that Ariosto's distaste for patronage is also at least partly a distaste for the insignificance and vanity of a connection between the events of the poem and the present based on mere genealogy. The allegorical connection Ariosto draws between the bravery of Charlemagne's army and the glory of Alfonso I's victory at Polesella is a more sincere form of praise than the genealogical connection between Bradamante and Ruggiero and the house of Este, because it is based on analogous deeds rather than mere similarity of background.

Ariosto's distaste for genealogy can be applied more broadly to the way he treats the question of his material's French origins. At multiple points, he denies that there is any kind of direct genealogical connection between the “France” of the poem and that of the contemporary sixteenth-century political world. He derides any suggestion that such qualities can be transmitted through generations by blood alone, rather than by the imitation of virtuous acts. We can see this tendency most clearly by contrasting it with the way Boiardo treats France and the French. Boiardo does not hesitate to depict Charlemagne and his court as French, often as a means of tying Charlemagne to French Arthurian romance (which, as we have seen, was highly popular with the Este). In the *Innamorato*, Boiardo portrays Paris as Charlemagne's seat, explicitly referring to Charlemagne as “re di Franza” (III.i.3.2) rather than as the Holy Roman Emperor. Paris is not just a battleground, but also a city with peacetime culture and diplomacy, largely deriving from Arthurian romance; indeed, Boiardo first introduces Charlemagne as a French Arthur holding court in Paris at his “menza ritonda” (I.i.13.3). This positioning of Charlemagne as the ancestor of the modern-day French continues even in moments where the political anxieties of the present intervene in the chivalric material of the poem. Boiardo famously ends his poem by referring to Charles VIII's invasion of Italy as the reason he cannot continue:

Mentre che io canto, o Iddio redentore,
 Vedo la Italia tutta a fiamma e a foco
 Per questi Galli, che con gran valore
 Vengon per disertar non so che loco;
 Però vi lascio in questo vano amore
 De Fiordespina ardente a poco a poco;
 Un'altra fiata, se mi fia concesso,
 Racontarovi il tutto per espresso. (III.9.26, p. 848)

In this passage, there is a seamless continuity between the Carolingian France of the poem and the modern-day France represented by Charles VIII. By referring to them as “Galli,” Boiardo

²⁹⁷ Ludovico Ariosto, *Orlando Furioso*, Edited by Lanfranco Caretti (Torino : Einaudi, 1992), 382.

²⁹⁸ On this point, see David Quint, “Astolfo's Voyage to the Moon,” *Yale Italian Studies* 1 (1977): 398-408.

reinforces the idea that sixteenth-century France is directly descended from the Gallic characters of the poem. Further, Boiardo's reference to the Gauls' "gran valore" (even if tinged with tragic irony) makes a connection between the chivalric virtues of Charlemagne's knights and the battlefield ethics of Charles VIII's soldiers. Present-day events have the power to interrupt the narrative of Boiardo's poem, but he does not attempt to question the relationship between the France of the past and that of the present.

In the *Orlando Furioso*, by contrast, Paris's significance for Charlemagne is purely strategic and military, and the city functions in Ariosto's poem as a common, but essentially arbitrary, stop in the characters' global peregrinations. Ariosto—while acknowledging the characters' and the story's geographical connections to France—portrays the "France" of the chivalric past as a synecdoche for Christendom and the Roman empire, rather than a precursor to the French nation of the sixteenth century. Where references to modern-day France—rare, in general—do appear, Ariosto aligns sixteenth-century France with the pagan forces besieging Christendom in the poem. Ariosto resists all references, both formal and thematic, that would suggest a historical or textual continuity between the events and characters of his poem and present-day France. Instead, he advances a view of epic history that makes allegorical connections between exemplary figures in the past and present on the basis of their similar deeds and qualities, rather than on the basis of genealogical inheritance or shared nationality. Paralleling the sixteenth-century Spanish versions of the Matter of France that posit Charles V as the true inheritor of Charlemagne, Ariosto describes Italy as the true inheritor of the chivalric qualities of his characters, on allegorical rather than genealogical grounds.

The first and most notable way that Ariosto differentiates his poem from historiographical accounts is by not identifying Charlemagne as French, contrary to the prevailing view in France in the sixteenth century and the portrayal of Charlemagne in fifteenth-century Florentine historiographies as seen above. In Ariosto's poem, there is a clear distinction maintained between Charlemagne himself and the French people, who are simply one part of his empire, despite the narrative and strategic centrality of France—specifically Paris—in the events of the poem. This distinction can be seen as early as the first canto, where Ariosto introduces the two opposing sides of the battle he will recount: "...che furo al tempo che passaro i Mori / d'Africa il mare, e in Francia nocquer tanto, / seguendo l'ire e i giovenil furori / d'Agramante lor re, che si diè vanto / di vendicar la morte di Troiano / sopra re Carlo imperator romano" (I.1.4-8).²⁹⁹ Later, describing Roland and Angelica for the first time, Ariosto says, "in Ponente con essa era tornato, / dove sotto i gran monti Pirenei / con la gente di Francia e de Lamagna / re Carlo era attendato alla campagna..." (I.1.5-8).³⁰⁰ In each of these instances, though Charlemagne is mentioned in relation to France, he is not described as French himself. Though the Moors are menacing "Francia" and Charlemagne is in the Pyrenees "con la gente di Francia," Charlemagne is called "imperator romano" and his army is described as both French and German. A similar lack of national specificity applies to the Saracens; for example, though Ferrau is identified in the first canto as the "cavalier di Spagna" (I.18.6),³⁰¹ thereafter he is more frequently referred to as "pagan." Though individual characters' nationalities are sometimes mentioned, their countries of origin seem to play little to no role in their characterization.

Characters' differences of faith, on the other hand, are of the utmost importance. Religious conflict can sometimes be overcome by the shared values of chivalry, but these kinds

²⁹⁹ Ariosto, *Orlando Furioso*, 3.

³⁰⁰ Ariosto, *Orlando Furioso*, 5.

³⁰¹ Ariosto, *Orlando Furioso*, 9.

of truces are usually shown to be both exceptional and temporary. This is very clear in the famous passage where Ruggiero and Ferraú cease fighting in order to search for Angelica together, at which the narrator marvels:

Oh gran bontà de' cavallieri antiqui!
Eran rivali, eran di fè diversi,
e si sentian degli aspri colpi iniqui
per tutta la persona anco dolersi;
e pur per selva oscure e calli obliqui
insieme van senza sospetto aversi" (I.22.1-6).³⁰²

The rivals' recognition of their mutual status as chivalric heroes is enough, in this case, to bring about at least a temporary peace. But although the narrator celebrates the cooperation between "rivali... di fè diversi," the elegiac tone of his exclamation suggests that such a suspension of romantic and religious conflict would be impossible in the present day. Portraying the Christians and Saracens as separated by a vast and usually unbridgeable gulf allows Ariosto to suggest that national differences within each religious camp are trivial in comparison. Though Ariosto does identify the territory under attack by the Saracens as "France," France is not a coherent and autonomous nation but a metonym of the Christian empire as a whole, and the French and German people fight as one under the banner of Charlemagne, the Holy Roman Emperor.

The episode of the siege of the city of Paris by the Saracens reinforces the total lack of congruity between the "France" of the poem and present-day France in political terms. The pathos of the Paris siege, and the extreme cruelty of the invading forces, are highlighted in Canto XVI, in which a squire despairs that the battle has been lost, saying, "Satanasso (perch'altri esser non puote) / strugge e ruina la città infelice" (XVI.87.1).³⁰³ But Ariosto makes it clear that France is not the contemporary inheritor of the experience of foreign invasion, nor of the chivalric bravery with which the *Furioso*'s characters respond to it. Rather, in the sixteenth century it is Italy that is experiencing ongoing occupation by a number of different foreign nations, of which France is one. The proem to Canto XVII contains Ariosto's most direct reference to the current political relationship between France and Italy, though even here he does not mention France by name:

Or Dio consente che noi siàn puniti
da populi di noi forse peggiori,
per li multiplicati et infiniti
nostri nefandi, obbrobrïosi errori.
Tempo verrà ch'a depredar lor liti
andremo noi, se mai saren migliori,
e che i peccati lor giungano al segno,
che l'eterna Bontà muovano a sdegno. (XVII.5.1-8)³⁰⁴

This proem, by referring to invasions of Italy within the description of the siege of Paris, aligns modern-day Ferrara with the Paris of the poem, and modern-day France with the "Satanasso"

³⁰² Ariosto, *Orlando Furioso*, 10.

³⁰³ Ariosto, *Orlando Furioso*, 438.

³⁰⁴ Ariosto, *Orlando Furioso*, 441.

besieging the city. This reversal of roles is made clear by the despairing squire of Canto XVI who names the invader “Satanasso”: he does not fear for the future of Paris or of France, but for the Roman and Christian empires for which Paris is merely a synecdoche. The analogy between this threat and the plight of present-day Ferrara is suggested by the squire’s repetition of the word “oggi”: “Oggi il romano Imperio, oggi è sepolto; / oggi ha il suo popul Cristo abandonato: / il demonio dal cielo è piovuto oggi, / perché in questa città piú non s’alloggi” (XVI.86.5-8).³⁰⁵ This repetition calls attention not just to the “today” of the poem, but also to contemporary events, thus highlighting the temporally relative nature of the experience of invasion: yesterday’s invaded can be the invaders of “oggi.” Ariosto forces the reader to consider what relationship the “Satanasso” invading Italy in the sixteenth century—an unholy alliance between the French and the Ottoman empire—could possibly have to the Parisians of the *Furioso* who valiantly seek to repel Saracen invaders. In this way, Ariosto calls into question the legitimacy of a political and moral identity based on genealogy. What does it matter that the French kings are descended from Charlemagne, Ariosto asks, if their behavior is so diametrically opposed to his?

As we turn now to consider the early prose translations of the *Furioso* in France, then, it is precisely this complexity in the *Furioso*’s relationship to France and French sources that will interest us. How does this complexity fare in relation to the tradition of Carolingian genealogy that (as we have seen) was so symbolically and politically important in France? This is a question that the prose translations are able to answer in a way that other facets of Ariosto’s French reception do not.

III. Toward an Orlando Cycle: Early French Translations of Ariosto and Boiardo

The first full verse translation of the *Furioso* did not appear until 1787,³⁰⁶ over 270 years after the work was first published in Italy. The first prose translation of the *Furioso*, while still relatively slow to appear, preceded the first complete verse translation by over 200 years; the Sulpice Sabon translation, the first of the three in my corpus, was published in 1544. Italian-language French editions were also very tardy; they only began appearing over a decade after the first full translations.³⁰⁷ Of course, there were undoubtedly Italian editions of the *Furioso* circulating in France prior to the French editions, though the scale of this diffusion is unknown.

³⁰⁵ Ariosto, *Orlando Furioso*, 438.

³⁰⁶ This seems incredible, and it has been surprisingly difficult to establish which was the first full verse translation, but the 1787 translation (by Panckoucke and Flanery) represents my current best conclusion based on review of the French *Furioso* translations listed in the Bibliographie Italo-Française Universelle (1271-1275), as well as the *Bibliografia ariostesca* (172-176). I have also reviewed the bibliography in Cioranesco’s *L’Arioste en France*, which lists a 1571 “traduction en vers” by Guillaume Landré under “Traductions perdues” (257), citing La Croix du Maine’s comment that Landré “a traduit en vers français le livre de Roland le Furieux,” but Cioranesco does not state whether it is a full translation (and, given prevailing trends and the fact that it was never reprinted, it seems likely to me that this was a partial translation). There is also a 1685 translation by Louise-Geneviève Gomez de Vasconcelle listed in all three bibliographies that I have not been able to review, but as it is not listed as a “traduction en vers” in any of the three entries, I think it is likely that this is a prose translation. Strangely, as far as I can tell, none of these three sources describes any one work as the first full verse translation; however, the verse translations prior to the 1787 translation (by Panckoucke and Flanery) are described as partial. I am not yet able to explain why this fact is apparently not established in the secondary literature.

³⁰⁷ This edition was published by Sébastien Honorat in Lyon. Jean Balsamo, “L’Arioste et le Tasse. Des poètes italiens, leurs libraires et leurs lecteurs français,” in *L’Arioste et le Tasse en France au XVIe siècle*, Cahiers V.L. Saulnier 20 (Paris: Rue d’Ulm, 2003), 13.

But there are no indications that the *Furioso* was considered a hot literary property in France immediately upon its publication in Italy. The reception of Boiardo's *Innamorato* was even slower; in 1544, it had not been fully translated into French at all. The French reception of Tasso's *Gerusalemme Liberata*, in the 1580s-1590s, forms a useful point of contrast here; as Jean Balsamo observes, in Tasso's case the translations and the Italian editions formed a single, more or less simultaneous, French editorial project, both undertaken by the same publisher.³⁰⁸ Daniel Javitch has argued that "the absence of a proper verse translation... definitely delayed the French recognition of the *Furioso* as a modern epic."³⁰⁹ However, the French culture-makers who did recognize the *Furioso* as an epic (or at least an attempt at one), like Ronsard and Du Bellay, had no immediate need for a verse translation. Their primary interest in the *Furioso* was as a source for partial, fragmentary lyric imitations, rather than as a complete narrative. These Pléiade lyric imitations have received a considerable amount of attention from critics, and are perhaps the best-known dimension of the *Furioso*'s French reception.

On the other hand, the prose translations that preceded the first "proper verse translation" recognized in the *Furioso* not an epic, but a prose chivalric romance in the vein of the *Amadis*. This study is the first to read these prose translations as a corpus. My aim, in considering these prose translations separately from the verse translations produced in the same century, is to show how they form a unique reception that gradually situates the *Furioso* within French national and literary historiography, in part by moving the work's genre toward prose romance. This reception differs considerably from the way the *Furioso* was received in France in the original Italian, and in verse translations. These three translations are all in prose, are complete translations, and belong to multi-volume cycles; and they also contain paratexts and other extra-textual indicators that closely associate them with Spanish romance; as well as paratexts that theorize the form and genre of the *Furioso* and attempt to place it within a larger literary tradition. These are the aspects of the translations that I will analyze in this section.

Also in this section, I will attempt to account for the fact that despite the important theoretical claims made in the paratexts to these translations, the first two—the anonymous Sulpice Sabon translation and Gabriel Chappuys' rejuvenation—take a very passive approach to the translation itself, aside from the notable departure of translating in prose. Rather than attempting to transform the original work through translational interventions at the level of rhetoric, as Herberay des Essarts did in the *Amadis*, these works largely limit such interventions to the prefatory and paratextual. This is especially striking in light of the counter-example provided by the *Amadis* translations, which are often invoked in the paratexts of these *Furioso* translations. The case of Rosset's translation—the third cycle—is somewhat different, and I will discuss it separately in the following section. For Rosset, an active approach to retranslation helps to burnish his linguistic credentials as a provincial outsider, and also lends legitimacy to his reinterpretation of the *Furioso* as part of the French Carolingian tradition.

To show that these prose translations constitute a unique French historiographical reception of the *Furioso*, it is necessary to first consider in more detail why there were no complete verse translations of the poem. In contrast to the tendency toward multi-volume expansion that I have noted in the prose translations of the *Furioso*, there are no complete

³⁰⁸ "...à l'inverse du *romanzo* de l'Arioste, le texte italien et la traduction semblent avoir été originellement liés en France dans un projet éditorial cohérent et avoir répondu à la demande des lecteurs mêmes" (Jean Balsamo, "L'Arioste et le Tasse," 15-16).

³⁰⁹ Daniel Javitch, *Proclaiming a Classic*, 134.

sixteenth-century verse translations of even the *Furioso* itself,³¹⁰ let alone the *Innamorato* or any of the Italian verse continuations. While there was evidently little initial appetite in France for these Italian poems as epic models, the *Furioso* was immensely popular as a source of Ariostan lyric. As such, the version of the *Furioso* that these translations produced was fragmentary and wholly divorced from the narrative of the integral work. The French verse translations that do exist are often only of a single canto, or a single speech; those that come closest to completion are a 1555 translation by Jean Fornier (15 cantos), and a 1580 translation by Jean de Boyssières (12 cantos). In the long period before the first full verse translation, there are many translations of a few cantos that describe themselves as “essai[s] de traduction en vers,” but are never completed. There are also other partial translations, such as Mellin de Saint-Gelais’ “La Genève,” which excise a specific character’s story from the various places where it appears in Ariosto’s interlaced narrative, and translate those episodes as a single narrative.

Many of the verse translations, however, are short excerpts that speak to the popularity of the *Furioso* as a lyric model. These verse translations do not contextualize the excerpt within the larger story of the *Furioso*, as they are more concerned with how to render Ariosto’s lyric technique in French; of particular interest was the challenge of maintaining the Italian octave strophe using French feminine rhymes.³¹¹ Claude de Taillemont, for example, translated only Canto V in 1556, as an exercise in translating *ottava rima* into *douzains*.³¹² A number of such partial verse translations were collected in Lucas Breyer’s celebrated *Imitations de quelques chans de l’Arioste* in 1572. Members of the Pléiade were active participants in this lyric reception. Joachim Du Bellay’s *Olive* includes a number of imitations of passages from the *Furioso*; JoAnn DellaNeva points out that almost half of the poems in the first edition of the *Olive* contain Ariostan imitations. Only nine of these are from the *Furioso* while the rest are taken from the sonnets in Ariosto’s *Rime*³¹³; this speaks to the way Du Bellay read the *Furioso* as a repository of lyric models, no different in this respect from Ariosto’s *canzoniere*. Ronsard’s *Amours*, too, imitates the same passages from the *Furioso* that Du Bellay does in the *Olive*, as DellaNeva has shown.³¹⁴

For Ronsard, this use of the *Furioso* makes sense, as he repeatedly criticized the poem’s epic qualities in the context of his own endeavor to produce a vernacular epic with the *Franciade*. I alluded in Chapter One to Ronsard’s preface to the 1572 edition of the *Franciade*, in which he criticizes the *Furioso* as a negative example of poetic imagination run amok:

...le Poëte qui escrit les choses comme elles sont ne merite tant que celuy qui les feint & se recule le plus qu’il luy est possible de l’historien : non toutefois pour feindre une Poësie fantastique comme celle de l’Arioste, mais le corps est tellement contrefaict & monstrueux qu’il ressemble mieux aux resveries d’un malade de fièvre continue qu’aux

³¹⁰ Again, to my current knowledge.

³¹¹ For a comparative analysis including several of these partial translations, see Jean Vignes, “Traductions et imitations françaises de l’*Orlando furioso* (1544-1580): étude comparative,” in *L’Arioste et le Tasse en France au XVIe siècle* (Paris: Rue d’Ulm, 2003), 75-98.

³¹² “Dès lors, sa traduction fait figure d’exercice de style. Il s’agit moins de raconter une belle histoire que de proposer à un public averti une sorte de déchiffrement.” Vignes, “Traductions et imitations françaises,” 84.

³¹³ JoAnn DellaNeva, “Teaching Du Bellay a Lesson: Ronsard’s Rewriting of Ariosto’s Sonnets,” *French Forum* 24, no. 3 (September 1, 1999): 286.

³¹⁴ DellaNeva, “Teaching Du Bellay a Lesson,” 288, 298.

inventions d'un homme bien sain.³¹⁵

In light of this criticism, we can understand Ronsard's imitations of Ariosto as appreciations of the latter's lyric technique, despite the fact that Ronsard obviously wishes to paint the *Furioso* as an epic failure. The terms that Ronsard uses to critique the *Furioso* echo the ongoing debate among Italian literary theorists regarding the *Furioso*'s lack of adherence to the neo-Aristotelian prescriptions for epic, identifying Ronsard himself (and, by extension, the *Franciade*) with the Aristotelian position. But Du Bellay's case is somewhat different. Of course, in the *Défense et illustration de la langue française*, in the chapter entitled "Du long poème français," Du Bellay famously exhorts his fellow countrymen to take up epic as the crowning ornament of a prospective, fully illustrated French. Du Bellay speaks of Ariosto as having equaled Homer and Virgil, and encourages his fellow countrymen to follow his example:

Comme lui donc, qui a bien voulu emprunter de notre langue les noms et l'histoire de son poème, choisis-moi quelqu'un de ces beaux vieux romans français, comme un *Lancelot*, un *Tristan*, ou autres: et en fais renaître au monde une admirable *Iliade* et laborieuse *Énéide*.³¹⁶

Du Bellay, too, is adopting here the terms of the debate over the *Furioso* between Italian "modernists" and "neoclassicists" (as Javitch labels them³¹⁷); unlike Ronsard, he identifies himself with the modernist position, defending the *Furioso* as a legitimate model for vernacular epic on the order of Virgil or Homer. Even more significant, for Du Bellay, is the fact that Ariosto's poem is based on French material, thus showing the potential for other medieval French works to lend their subjects to the creation of French epic. The fact that chivalric romances—the Lancelots, the Tristans—have not previously been considered "epic" is, for Du Bellay, an opportunity rather than a problem. The form of the "long poème" is more important than that the subject matter be traditionally "epic" in nature.

But what Du Bellay and Ronsard have in common, in their treatment of Ariosto, is that they view him as a model for lyric and, in Du Bellay's case, epic—but describe nothing essentially historiographical about the *Furioso*, although it treats characters from the Matter of France who feature prominently in French medieval historiography. (Indeed, Ronsard in the passage above uses Ariosto as a model for what happens when a poet strays too far from the historical.) It is easy to understand, considering the role that the *Furioso* played for the Pléiade in this cultural moment, why a full French verse translation of the *Furioso* was not forthcoming, since they used the work primarily as a source of excerpted lyric models. But it is notable that, in the course of discussing the *Furioso*'s genre, neither author mentions the closest contemporary French analogue to the *Furioso*—the prose chivalric epic exemplified by the *Amadis*—since, as we have seen in the previous chapter, members of the Pléiade played integral roles in promoting and translating the French *Amadis*. Framing their interventions on the *Furioso* in terms of the

³¹⁵ Pierre de Ronsard, *Oeuvres complètes V*, ed. Paul Laumonier (Paris: Société des textes français modernes, diffusion Classiques Garnier, 2015), 5.674. Rigolot (1988) has observed that these somewhat contradictory statements also illustrate Ronsard's desire to reconcile two currents in the theory of imagination in the sixteenth century: "One has a moral and didactic origin and would condemn 'phantasie' as 'mistress of false-hood'; the other proceeds from the rhetorical tradition and would welcome the ability of the mind to recreate ideas in different forms" (29-30).

³¹⁶ Joachim Du Bellay, *Défense et Illustration de la Langue française*, ed. S. de Sacy (Paris: Gallimard, 1967), 266.

³¹⁷ Daniel Javitch, *Proclaiming a Classic*, 8.

contemporary Italian debate over its genre, they do not seem at all interested in considering the *Furioso* as part of the generic hybridization of prose romance and historiography represented by the *Amadis*.

This omission becomes even more striking in light of the many paratextual allusions to the *Amadis* made by the anonymous first prose translation by Sulpice Sabon in 1544. Indeed, there is reason to believe that the first complete *Furioso* translation was published at this particular moment (which was, as I discussed above, belated by comparison to the Italian publication) precisely because of the runaway popularity of Herberay's *Amadis de Gaule*, starting in 1540.³¹⁸ Rather than portraying the *Furioso* as a serious work of humanist epic, this edition very clearly presents it as a close cousin of the *Amadis*. A *huitain* on the title page of the Sulpice Sabon translation draws an immediate connection between the two works for the prospective reader:

Si d'Amadis la tresplaisante histoire
Vers les Francoys a eu nouvellement
Tant de faveur, de credit, et de gloire
Parce qu'elle est traducte doctement,

Le Furieux, qui dit si proprement
D'Armes, d'Amours, et de ses passions
Surpassera, en ce totalement
Avillissant toutes traductions.³¹⁹

This *huitain* refers to the subjects that the two works have in common (“Armes... Amours, et... passions”), and also focuses particularly on the quality of each work’s translation, and how these translations are a credit to France and the French. There is no reference to any generic or formal distinction between the two, aside from the fact that the *Furieux* “dit si proprement” while the *Amadis* is, perhaps, dismissed as a “tresplaisante histoire.” But the debate over the classification of the *Furioso* as epic or romance, so critical to literary discourse in Italy throughout the sixteenth century, seems wholly irrelevant here, with the *Furieux* clearly classified as a chivalric romance in the vein of the *Amadis*. In fact, early readers sometimes had the *Furieux* bound with Spanish romances, such as *Gérard d’Euphrate*, *Palmerin*, *Primaléon*, and the *Amadis* itself.³²⁰ As I have mentioned, another way that this translation (and those that follow) makes its source material more closely resemble the French *Amadis* is by uniting Ariosto’s *Furioso* with other works to form a multi-volume prose Roland cycle. Though the 1544 translation did not include the *Innamorato*, its privilege (which is dated 1543) specifically covers both the *Furioso* and the *Innamorato*, and Jacques Vincent would indeed go on to use this privilege to produce a prose translation of the *Innamorato* in 1549-1550.³²¹ Readers often chose to bind the two translations together, thus anticipating later editors’ decision to translate and publish the two works in a single edition.

³¹⁸ Another persuasive reason, as Rosanna Gorris Camos argues, is that it follows the 1540 *entrée triomphale* of Hippolyte d’Este as the new archbishop of Lyon. See Rosanna Gorris Camos, “Traduction et illustration de la langue française,” 238.

³¹⁹ Ctd. Rajchenbach-Teller, “Le *Roland Furieux*, Lyon, Sulpice Sabon pour Jean Thelusson, 1543-1544,” 45.

³²⁰ See Balsamo, “L’Arioste et le Tasse,” 18.

³²¹ Rajchenbach-Teller, “Le *Roland Furieux*, Lyon, Sulpice Sabon pour Jean Thelusson, 1543-1544,” 49.

Another paratextual way that the Sulpice Sabon *Furieux* resembles the *Amadis* is in its *mise-en-page*. In the previous chapter, I discussed how the appearance of Herberay's *Amadis* drew upon humanist editions of classical texts, rather than on the older *mise-en-page* traditionally used for editions of vernacular romances. It is very clear that both the 1544 translation of the *Furioso* and Jacques Vincent's translation of the *Innamorato* are inspired by the appearance of Herberay's *Amadis*, rather than by other recently-published French works treating the Roland story. For instance, an edition of Jean Bagnyon's *Fierabras* published in Rouen ca. 1530 is printed in two columns in Gothic type with heavy woodcuts; this *mise-en-page*, inspired by the appearance of medieval manuscripts, was standard for all medieval literary works that appeared in French print prior to the *Amadis*.³²² Both the Sulpice Sabon translation and Jacques Vincent's *Innamorato*, however, employ a single-column layout with italic type and engravings, just as Herberay's *Amadis* does. In fact, some of the engravings from Herberay's *Amadis* were used to illustrate Vincent's translation,³²³ which illustrates how the perceived thematic overlap between the two projects influenced the material appearance of the Italian Roland stories throughout the sixteenth century.

The effect of these paratextual references to the *Amadis* is immediately to frame the *Furieux* in the same terms, as a modernized version of a medieval romance. But perhaps the most important translational choice that reinforces this impression of congruity between the two works is one of form, namely the decision to translate in prose. While recent scholarship has taken new notice of the phenomenon of medieval *mise-en-prose* and begun to analyze the practices particular to this kind of translation, little such attention has been paid to verse-to-prose translation in the Renaissance.³²⁴ One reason for this is no doubt that the Renaissance prefaces to such translations devote so little time to theorizing and explaining this choice. The Sulpice Sabon translation, however, is something of an exception to this rule. The editor Jean Des Gouttes' preface does spend time discussing the choice, and though he begins with commonplaces, he ultimately describes a concept of prose as a form with a certain monumentalizing function, in opposition to the ephemerality of verse. Curiously, despite the obvious signals that the choice to translate the Sulpice Sabon translation in prose was at least partly influenced by the popularity of the *Amadis*, there is no mention of the *Amadis* in the editor Jean Des Gouttes' dedicatory letter to Hippolyte d'Este. At first, Des Gouttes claims that the translation was executed in prose simply due to time constraints. He cites the anonymous translator's estimate that to properly render the *Furioso* in French verse would be "le labour de douze ou quinze ans: temps & terme de vie, que Nature (possible) ne luy concederoit," and claims that the eager and important people who were clamoring for the translation would not wait that long.³²⁵

After these commonplaces, however, Des Gouttes' argument for prose takes the form of a historiographical opposition between two contrasting medieval literary traditions: Provençal lyric and French romance. He claims (contrary to his previous statement that prose was merely a

³²² Jean Bagnyon, *Fierabras* (Rouen: I. Burges le Jeune, [1530?]), BL General Reference Collection 12450.c.14.

³²³ Michel Bideaux, "Introduction Générale," *Amadis de Gaule, Livre I* (Paris: Honoré Champion Éditeur, 2006), 74.

³²⁴ For medieval *mise-en-prose*, cf. Catherine M. Jones, *Philippe de Vigneulles and the Art of Prose Translation* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2008). One exception to the lack of such studies in the Renaissance is the volume edited by Maria Colombo Timelli et al., *Mettre en prose au XIVe-XVIe siècles* (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2010).

³²⁵ "Doncques nostre present Translateur totalement pressé de mes prieres, et affectueux desirs, pour le plus expedient, et pour aussi satisfaire plus promptement à l'affection de maintz gros personnaiges mes amys : qui quasi impatientement attendoient si bel OEuvre, il l'a estendue en prose [...]" Ctd. Rajchenbach-Teller, "Le Roland *Furieux*, Lyon, Sulpice Sabon pour Jean Thelusson, 1543-1544," 47.

matter of convenience) that the anonymous translator chose prose “parce qu’il congnoissoit aussi que telles histoires (mesmes en nostre langaige) ont je ne scay quoy plus de gracieux.”³²⁶ What, exactly, is this “je ne scay quoy” that prose romances possess? According to Des Gouttes, it is the power to endure over time, unlike the evanescent, even corruptive nature of poetry:

... Et que ainsi soit, tesmoins en sont maintz Poëtes Provensaulx, & Picquardz, qui a cause de leur peu de grace, & rudesse de vers n’ont peu durer jusques a ce present siecle plus heureux, ayant toutes langues, soient grammaticalles ou vulgaires, tousjours esté corrompues par la necessiteuse contraincte, ou trop grande liberté de Poësie.³²⁷

This corruptive quality seems to belong simply to form itself—to poetry, and not to prose—rather than to the language in which that form is expressed, since Des Gouttes sees no apparent contradiction in going on to claim that the translation is word-for-word, so that “le lecteur François pourra aussi enrichir (ou il est indigent) son parler de ceste copieuse phrase Thuscane.” Des Gouttes anticipates criticism from readers who may protest that the translation uses too many foreign or unfamiliar words. He defends against this critique by saying that Boiardo did the same in writing the *Innamorato*: he adopted the characteristics of medieval French prose style, known for its plain verisimilitude “sans aulcun fard de rethorique”:

Ce que je croy encor à faict le Conte Boiard en son Roland enamouré, pour de plus pres ensuyvre Lancelot du Lac, & Tristan principal & seul object de cest Œuvre : & aultres Chroniques de la table ronde toutes nues en leur naturelle simplicité, pour attirer (comme est dict) les auditeurs a leur prester plus de foy.

While, of course, Des Gouttes is flattering his Italian patron by claiming that the Italian text is so perfect that there is no need to depart from it, he is also advancing a theory of the prestige and enduring influence of French prose style.

This line of thought suggests that translating the *Furioso* back into French prose is a repatriation of the plain, simple French style—specifically associated with the prose chivalric romance—that was previously borrowed into Italian by Boiardo. Prose translation is, in this way, a strategy that unites the best of each language: both Ariosto’s “copieuse phrase Thuscane” and the French “naturelle simplicité.” While Des Gouttes’ preface bears some resemblance to the rhetoric of literary repatriation that we saw in Herberay’s *Amadis*, he also pays tribute to a history of Italo-French literary exchange, as is fitting for a translation commissioned by the Este archbishop of Lyon. Whereas Herberay’s preface refers to the supposed original Picard manuscripts of the *Amadis* as a way of claiming that his material is originally French, Des Gouttes’ preface distances itself from the “maintz Poëtes Provensaulx, & Picquardz” who seem so irrelevant to the present. Instead, Des Gouttes emphasizes the enduring nature of the medieval French romance tradition, by arguing for its stylistic influence on Boiardo’s (and, by extension, Ariosto’s) poems. Thus, by translating in prose, the Sulpice Sabon translation is simply restoring this original French “je ne scay quoy.” However, as we will see, the translation itself hews so

³²⁶ Sulpice Sabon, ed., “Epistre Dedicatoire à Reverendissime Seigneur Monseigneur Hippolyte d’Este, Cardinale de Ferrare, Archevesuque de Milan, & de Lyon, Primat de l’une & l’aultre Gaule, Jehan des Gouttes salut & felicité,” in *Roland Furieux. Composé premierement en ryme Thuscane par messire Loys Arioste, noble Ferraroys, & maintenant traduit en prose Françoisse...* (Lyon : Sulpice Sabon, 1544).

³²⁷ Sulpice Sabon, “Epistre Dedicatoire,” *Roland Furieux*.

closely (and awkwardly) to the Italian that it is hard to see how it bears out Des Gouttes' prefatory claims on a stylistic level, aside from the simple fact of being in prose.

Gabriel Chappuys' "rejuvenation" of the Sulpice Sabon translation, first published in 1576 and reprinted numerous times until 1618, is less concerned with questions of style than with the intellectual project of bringing together a "complete" version of the *Furioso* in accordance with Ariosto's supposed intentions. The Chappuys translation was clearly conceived from the outset as a multi-volume work, which includes not just the *Furioso*, but also a translation of Ariosto's *Cinque canti* (an incomplete, posthumously published sequel to the *Furioso*, which had not yet been made public at the time of the Sulpice Sabon translation) as well as Chappuys' prose translation of Giovambattista Pescatore's *ottava rima* Italian continuation to the *Furioso*, *La morte di Ruggiero*. The three books in Chappuys' translation maintain a consistent *mise-en-page* and title page, further enhancing the impression that they are multiple volumes of a single complete work, as with the *Amadis*. According to the title page, the three works in Chappuys' cycle represent the full scope of the *Furioso* as Ariosto originally intended; the title promises *Roland Furieux*, "Augmentee de la suite, & des cinq Chants qui restoient de l'oeuvre entier: qui est tout ce qu'à fait ce docte & divin Poëte, sur l'invention admirable de ce sujet."³²⁸ In contrast to the Sulpice Sabon translation, which links Boiardo to Lancelot and Tristan, the paratext to Chappuys' translation takes pains to situate Ariosto's work in relation to classical authors, particularly Virgil and Ovid. In the margins of the translation, whenever Ariosto is imitating one of these authors, the edition prints Italian translations of the original Latin. The purpose of these marginal aids, as Chappuys explains in his preface, is so that "celuy qui entend la langue Italienne & Latine, peut mieux sentir & cognoistre en ces imitations la grande conformité de l'Arioste, avec ces susdits Poëtes."³²⁹ Here, Chappuys is clearly participating in the tradition of seeking to ally Ariosto more closely to the epic tradition, while also showing that the French have imitated Virgil in similar ways. For instance, Chappuys points out that the episode in which Melissa shows Bradamante her descendants is borrowed from Virgil, and there is a French equivalent in Ronsard's *Franciade*:

...vous cognoissez que Arioste est imitateur de cest excellent poëte Virgile, où la sage enchanteresse Melisse demonstre à Bradamonte ses successeurs : ce que depuis mesmes nos poëtes François, & principalement Pierre de Ronsard la lumiere de nostre poësie à bien imité en sa Franciade.³³⁰

Of course, Chappuys himself was a notable translator of the later volumes of the *Amadis* (as I discussed in the previous chapter), beginning that portion of his career with his translation of Book XV of the *Amadis* just a year after translating the *Furioso*. Despite that, here in the preface he seems much more concerned with strengthening the relationship between the French literary tradition and the Latin-Italian epic.

It is striking, then, that Chappuys' preface does not directly address the choice to translate in prose, or the fact that recasting the *Furioso* in prose seems to make it a more obvious generic

³²⁸ Gabriel Chappuys, transl., *Roland furieux, par messire Loys Arioste, ... traduit naïvement de l'italien en françois (par Gabriel Chappuys). Édition augmentée de la Suite (de J. B. Pescatori) et des cinq chants qui restoient de l'oeuvre entier...* (Rouen : C. Le Villain, 1618).

³²⁹ Chappuys, *Roland furieux*, iii^r.

³³⁰ Chappuys, *Roland furieux*, ii^r.

relative of romances like the *Amadis* than of verse epics like the *Franciade*. The fact that Chappuys chooses to translate the *Cinque canti* and the Pescatore continuation in prose as well only adds to the similarities with the *Amadis* in making the *Furioso* a multi-volume prose work. The only mention that Chappuys makes of the work's form is in stating that he believes a future translation of the *Furioso* that could equal the stylistic grace of the original could be in verse or in prose:

Au demeurant si vous trouvez ceste traduction en quelques endroits mieux limée qu'elle n'estoit paravant, vous nous en sçavez quelque gré, esperant faire peu à peu parler cest autheur avec le temps si bien François, **ou en vers, ou en prose**, qu'il n'aura gueres moindre grace en ceste nostre langue, qu'en la sienne Toscane propre & naturelle.³³¹

Here, we might hear an echo of the first canto of the *Furioso*, when Ariosto's narrator says he will treat "cosa non detta in prosa mai, né in rima." But where, for Ariosto, this reference to form is a claim to originality of subject, Chappuys describes only formal ambivalence—even indifference. In his "Au Lecteur," Chappuys describes his labor on the translation much more as the correction of French linguistic error, than as an attempt to render either the sense or the words of the original. He assures the reader that the present edition of the translation rectifies the defaults of the Sulpice Sabon edition, saying that "...il est repurgé de maintes fautes qui avoient esté faites, tant par le traducteur, que par les Imprimeurs," and that the present edition "n'est pas si defectueuse que les precedentes, & ... les surpasse de beaucoup."³³² According to Chappuys, the quality that makes his edition so superior, aside from its linguistic correctness, is the addition of new engravings "qui luy donnent un merueilleux lustre." In short, Chappuys seems much less interested than was the author of the Sulpice Sabon preface in articulating the specific, distinctive qualities of Ariosto's language, the French language, or the medium of prose. Rather than looking to the past, he looks to a future moment when "peu à peu... avec le temps" French will be on equal footing with Italian.

In sum, the Sulpice Sabon and Chappuys translations have rather different intentions (as described in their prefatory material), with the Sulpice Sabon translation inviting comparisons to the *Amadis* while Chappuys identifies intertextual references to Virgil and Ovid. But to what extent do the translations themselves bear out these intentions? In the previous chapter, I showed that Herberay des Essarts took an approach to prose translation that was strongly influenced by humanist rhetorical practice, which led him to intervene in significant ways in both the language and the thematic emphasis of his source text. In the case of the *Furioso*, however, despite an active approach to influencing the text's reception at the paratextual level—which is, as we have seen, clearly influenced by the *Amadis*—the Sulpice Sabon and Chappuys translations are considerably more passive in their relationship to their source texts (the Italian, in the case of the Sulpice Sabon translation, and the Sulpice Sabon translation itself in Chappuys' case).

This can be seen clearly in contrast to the verse translations of the *Furioso*, which necessarily, in their quest to observe certain poetic features of Ariosto's original, such as the octave or the rhyme scheme, departed from word-for-word translation. Jean Fornier, in the preface to his 1555 partial verse translation, refers to the difficulty of verse translation (compared to Sulpice Sabon's prose version) as justification for his use of uncommon or unfamiliar French

³³¹ Chappuys, *Roland furieux*, iii^f.

³³² Chappuys, *Roland furieux*, ii^v.

words: “Car si le traducteur d’Arioste en prose, demande excuse des vocables, desquelz il a usé ayant la bride large, & liberté entiere, de combien plus en doy-je obtenir, qui me sus essayé de traduire, d’une mesme façon de vers, les parolles & le sens de l’auteur ?”³³³ Jean Vignes has observed that Fornier calques the Italian rhyme words wherever possible, even at the expense of meter, “si bien qu’elles semblent souvent le point de départ de sa traduction.”³³⁴ Where lyric extracts of the *Furioso* by members of the Pléiade often straddled the border between translation and adaptation, verse translations seeking to render large portions of the *Furioso* as a verse narrative often seem to take on a much stricter sense of fidelity to the Italian language of the original. But while these longer verse adaptations are highly faithful, the Sulpice Sabon translation, and Chappuys’ rejuvenation of it, are more faithful still. This can be illustrated by comparing how each work renders the first several lines of the *Furioso*, which famously begins with an imitation of the *Aeneid*:

Le donne, i cavallier, l'arme, gli amori,
 le cortesie, l'audaci imprese io canto,
 che furo al tempo che passaro i Mori
 d'Africa il mare, e in Francia nocquer tanto...

The 1555 verse translation by Jean Fornier, though it does not contain any drastic departures from the Italian, does contain a number of smaller changes:

Les Chevaliers, Armes, Amours & Dames,
 Leur courtoysie, & haults faicts veulx chanter :
 Quand par la mer d’Aphrique, à voile & rames
 Maint More vint la France tourmenter...³³⁵

Here, the changes that Fornier makes include recasting the order of the elements in the list in the first line, and opting for non-cognate synonyms such as “haults faicts” for “audaci impresi” in lieu of the direct Italian cognates “audacieuses entreprises.” Fornier also intensifies “i Mori” to “maint More,” and modulates “in Francia nocquer tanto” to “vint la France tourmenter.” Where Fornier does use formulations other than literal word-for-word cognates, they can largely be explained by the exigencies of the alternating rhyme; for instance, perhaps the largest change—the substitution of the equivalent “à voile et rames” for “passaro... il mare”—can be explained by the need to rhyme “rames” with “Dames.” Similarly, the example above of rendering “nocquer tanto” as “tourmenter” handily provides a verb to rhyme with “chanter.”

These examples from the relatively faithful Fornier verse translation help to illustrate how very literal the Sulpice Sabon translation is. The changes that do exist in the Sulpice Sabon translation are primarily syntactical—concessions to prosification such as the reorganization of sentence elements into subject-verb-object order—or, to a lesser degree, consist of explicitations or light amplifications. In general, however, the translation hews quite closely to the method of providing one-for-one Italian cognates for each word. This can be seen in the Sulpice Sabon translation of the lines above:

³³³ Jean Fornier, transl., *Le premier volume de Roland Furieux ... mys en rime françoise par Ian Fornier de Montaulban, etc.* [Cantos 1-15.] (M. de Vascosan: Paris, 1555), b.i^r.

³³⁴ Vignes, “Traductions et imitations françaises,” 82.

³³⁵ Fornier, *Roland Furieux*, 2^r.

Je chante les Dames, les Chevaliers, les Armes, les Amours, les Courtoysies, les audacieuses entreprises, qui furent **faictes** au temps, que les Mores passerent la Mer d'Aphrique, & **feirent si grand nuysance a France**...³³⁶

The translation generally offers equivalents for each word, using direct cognates wherever possible and not adding any additional words. The two exceptions are the explicitation of “che furo” to “qui furent faictes” (which seems to serve mainly to clarify the antecedent of the verb) and the amplification of “in Francia nocquer tanto” to “feirent si grand nuysance a France.” Nowhere in these lines, though, do we see the more drastic kinds of departures—in the form of synonyms or modulations—that I described in Fornier’s translation above. (For instance, we saw Fornier transform the difficult “nocquer” to “tourmenter” at the expense of slightly rearranging the grammar of the relevant phrase, while the Sulpice Sabon translation maintains a kind of cognate by opting for “faire... nuisance.”) Thus, despite the fact that translating in prose is itself a significant departure from Ariosto’s text that has significant implications for the genre of the *Furioso*, the translation itself is able to rely almost exclusively on word-to-word cognate equivalents, to an extent that isn’t possible for even the most fidelity-inclined rhymed verse translation. Though this translation, in its paratext, directly states its intention to vie with Herberay’s *Amadis* for translational skill, its approach to the original work is entirely different from Herberay’s. Herberay’s concern for prose rhetoric is entirely replaced, here, by the search for direct equivalents for each individual Italian word.

Gabriel Chappuys’ approach to the Sulpice Sabon translation is very much in a similar vein, in the sense that he displays little concern for rhetorical effect, rarely modifying the original text beyond updating its spelling and punctuation. I find no evidence that Chappuys consulted the original Italian text at all in revising the Sulpice Sabon translation, though he was certainly proficient enough in Italian to have done so, as he did with Ariosto’s *Cinque Canti* and the Pescatore continuation in the other volumes of the series. In fact, the one clear instance of direct translation from Italian in Chappuys’ *Furioso* occurs in his address to the reader. As Rosanna Gorris Camos has observed, the part of Chappuys’ preface that provides a defense of the moral value of the *Furioso* consists of an unacknowledged translation of the dedicatory letter of Giolito’s 1542 Italian edition, which was in fact addressed “all’Invitiss. Prencipe il Delphino di Fr.”:

Qui la prudenza e la giustizia d’ottimo prencipe: qui la temerità et la trascuragine di non savio Re è accompagnata don la Tirannide: qui l’ardire et la timidità; qui la torreta e la villa; qui la castità e la impudicitia: qui l’ingegno, e la sciocchezza: qui i boni e i rei consigli sono in modo definiti et espressi ch’io ardisco dire, che non è libro veruno, dal quale e con più frutto et maggior diletto superar si possa quello, che per noi fuggire e seguitare si possa.³³⁷

[Cest autheur] a descrit la prudence & la justice d’un bon Prince : la temerité d’un Roy non sage, accompagnee de tyrannie : hardiesse & crainte, la force & pusilanimité : la chasteté & l’impudicité : l’esprit & la bestise : bref, les bons & mauvais conseils sont

³³⁶ Sulpice Sabon, *Roland furieux*, ai^r.

³³⁷ Ctd. Rosanna Gorris Camos, “Traduction et illustration de la langue française,” 246.

tellement exprimez en ce livre, & avec telle grace & industrie, que j'ose dire n'y avoir aucun livre qui donne plus de contentement, & lequel soit plus profitable & utile.³³⁸

One priority of Chappuys' translation, therefore, seems to be providing the French reader a reading experience that is as close to that of an Italian reader as possible, up to and including the arguments of the prefatory material.

The translational effort involved in this preface is all the more striking when considered in relation to Chappuys' translation of the text itself. When Chappuys refers in his preface to the "maintes fautes qui avoient esté faites, tant par le traducteur, que par les Imprimeurs," it seems he is thinking largely of faults in French language, rather than of the interpretive or stylistic choices made in the translation. In comparing his version of the lines above to the Sulpice Sabon translation, it is easy to see the kinds of minor changes Chappuys introduces:

SULPICE SABON	CHAPPUYS
Je chante les Dames, les Chevaliers, les Armes, les Amours, les Courtoysies, les audacieuses entreprises, qui furent faictes au temps, que les Mores passerent la Mer d'Aphrique, & feirent si grand nuyssance a France... ³³⁹	Je traicte des Dames, des Chevaliers, des Armes, des Amours, des Courtoisies, & des vaillantes entreprises, du temps que les Mores passerent la Mer d'Afrique, & firent si grand mal en France... ³⁴⁰

The majority of Chappuys' adjustments consist of spelling changes such as changing "Courtoysies" to "Courtoisies," or "Aphrique" to "Afrique." In other cases, his alterations modify or replace changes to the Italian introduced by the Sulpice Sabon translation; these changes seem to move in the direction of more idiomatic French rather than to support any particular thematic or intertextual interpretations. For instance, by changing "Je chante les Dames..." to "Je traicte des Dames..." Chappuys opts for a more natural-sounding phrase at the expense of making Ariosto's intertextual reference to the first line of the *Aeneid* even less obvious. Given that the preface to Chappuys' translation particularly emphasizes the work's Virgilian influences, this particular change demonstrates how separate the actual task of translation (as Chappuys approaches it) is from the direction laid out in the preface. Chappuys also chooses to replace certain Italian cognates in the Sulpice Sabon translation with more common French synonyms, such as "vaillantes" for "audacieuses" (from the original "audaci") and "mal" for "nuyssance" (which, as we saw above, the Sulpice Sabon translation takes some pains to provide as a cognate for "nocquer").

In making these changes, Chappuys brings the Sulpice Sabon translation closer to the "naturelle simplicité" of style that Des Gouttes claimed for it in his preface. By assisting in the domestication of the anonymous Sulpice Sabon translator's awkwardly calqued French prose, and contributing to the paratextual impression of it as one part of a larger multi-volume work, Chappuys is also aligning the prose *Furieux* more closely with the style and appearance of

³³⁸ Chappuys, *Roland Furieux*, ii^r.

³³⁹ Sulpice Sabon, *Roland furieux*, ai^r.

³⁴⁰ Chappuys, *Roland furieux*, 1.

Herberay des Essarts' *Amadis*. And the *Amadis* was a project with which, we must recall, he would become intimately familiar as one of its most prominent translators. Despite Chappuys' evident desire to put his edition of the *Furioso* in dialogue with its Italian editions, and his efforts to call attention to the intertextual and formal features that align the *Furioso* with classical epic, his translation also plays an important role in cementing the status of the *Furieux* as a French prose romance.

IV. Return to Roncesvalles: François de Rosset's Roland Furieux

The third and last translator of the *Furioso* that I discuss in this chapter was an aspiring historiographer who took a much more active approach in using his translation of Ariosto to burnish his historiographical credentials than does Chappuys. As I have mentioned, Gabriel Chappuys was a highly favored royal historiographer, though he does not directly bring this profession to bear on his translation of the *Furioso*, he is identified by title on the frontispiece. François de Rosset, whose translation was published in 1615, is writing at a considerably different moment in history—and historiography—from Chappuys. Chantal Grell explains that in the seventeenth century, as the chaos of internal and external warfare subsided, historiographers turned from the philologically-oriented, erudite “grandes histoires” of the sixteenth century to works more focused on the present, and the current king. Henri IV, born in Navarre, brought with him an influx of new historiographers from Gascony and other parts of Southwest France to write these new, contemporary histories.³⁴¹ François de Rosset, born in Provence, certainly fits this profile. Rosset was also a translator of other Italian, Latin, and Spanish works, including—as I will discuss in the next chapter—Cervantes' *Don Quixote*. He is precisely the kind of aspiring, upwardly mobile, highly educated functionary who, as I discussed in the previous chapter, would have avidly consumed the *Trésor des Amadis* to develop a courtly vernacular and thus overcome his provincial origins. Rosset is best known for his collection of stories, the *Histoires mémorables et tragiques de ce temps*, which were first published in 1615, the same year as his translation of the *Furioso*. Despite the great success of this work, he died in 1619 having always been, as one scholar puts it, “polygraphe misérable... toujours en quête de protecteurs.”³⁴²

In the prefaces to his translations of the *Furioso* and the *Innamorato*, Rosset's desire to distinguish himself as a historiographer—and the difficulties that he anticipates in this ambition—are discussed at length. The translations themselves, as he describes them in the prefaces, seem to largely serve the function of alleviating any question of his ability to speak and write in an appropriate, courtly French. In his preface to the *Furioso*, he anticipates criticism from people who will argue that his linguistic provincialism disqualifies him for a project of this nature (and, we might extrapolate, for historiographical assignments as well): “...il y a des personnes, qui veulent enfermer le langage des François dans les bornes de leurs Provinces, & qui tiennent pour general Maxime qu'un Provençal, & qu'un Gascon ne peuvent jamais bien

³⁴¹ Chantal Grell, “Les historiographes en France,” 141-143. Grell describes, under Henri IV, “l'appel aux protégés qui n'ont, pour nombre d'entre eux, jamais écrit... le moindre ouvrage d'histoire ou s'en sont, pour les plus consciencieux, tenus à quelques écrits de circonstance” (143).

³⁴² Anne de Vaucher Gravili, Introduction to *Les Histoires mémorables et tragiques de ce temps* by François de Rosset ([Paris]: Librairie Générale Française, 1994), 7.

escrire.”³⁴³ He goes on to defend his Provençal origins by saying that he has corrected the deficiencies of his native dialect through diligent study and exposure to courtly language:

Je sçay bien que ma Provence, & la Gascogne ont des termes & des façons d’escrire qui sont du tout contraires à la Grammaire, Mais je sçay bien aussi que ceux qui ont pris naissance en ces Provinces peuvent corriger les deffauts de leurs Meres, durant le long espace de temps qu’ils vivent à la Court, & qu’ils y frequentent les personnes, dont les Escrits servent de regle infaillible à ceux qui se meslent d’Ecrire.³⁴⁴

Here it is clear that Rosset’s Gascon background is viewed as a distinct social handicap. But later on in this preface, Rosset draws a parallel between his own personal work of linguistic purification, and the challenge of retranslating the *Furioso*. Just as he himself had to un-learn his Gascon dialect in order to participate in the courtly and literary culture of France, the French nation needs the labor of translators like him to rescue “un Arioste... tout perverty.” He argues the stakes of this resuscitation are a question of national pride, standing on its head the traditional translational claim to “fai[re] parler François l’Arioste” by demonstrating that this act of ventriloquism is no merely mechanical process, and requires adequate judgment on the part of the translator.

To make this argument, Rosset essentially frames the recent past in which the Chappuys translation took place as a kind of temporal Provence, on the margins of courtly society, with Rosset acting as a kind of literary Henry Higgins. In this, he resembles Chappuys’ comments on the Sulpice Sabon translation. For Rosset, however, the inappropriateness of the previous translations lies not in a lack of eloquence in their French, but in their inability to correctly communicate the meaning of the source text. In his critique of the prior prose translations, Rosset draws attention to both the Sulpice Sabon translation’s faulty understanding of the Italian, and the type of translator (like Chappuys) who profits from making only slight changes to another translator’s work. Anticipating calumniators who believe it is unnecessary to retranslate a work that has already been translated, Rosset attempts to demonstrate why the previous translations communicate a lack of judgment that reflects poorly on France as a whole:

A la verité je sçay bien qu’il se treuve des Corneilles qui se parent de la plume d’autruy, & qui mettent leur nom à des traductions, apres avoir changé quelque mot. Mais quand un Arioste se treuvera tout perverty, & qu’on le fera parler un langage tout contraire à son intention, ne sera t’il pas louïable de le restituer en son entier, & d’oster aux Italiens l’opinion qu’ils peuvent avoir conceuë, que nous manquons de jugement ? Ne sera ton pas obligé de traitter favorablement une traduction, qui monstre que ceux qui ont fait parler François l’Arioste, ont commis pour le moins deux mille fautes contre le sens de l’Auteur.³⁴⁵

What follows, in the preface, is a lengthy list of dozens of examples in which Rosset compares his translation, the Chappuys translation, and the original Italian, to demonstrate that the previous translation misinterprets the meaning of the Italian. For instance, in this example from Canto

³⁴³ Rosset, *Roland Furieux*, ~i.i^f.

³⁴⁴ Rosset, *Roland Furieux*, ~e.iii^v.

³⁴⁵ Rosset, *Roland Furieux*, ~i.i^f.

VIII, Rosset takes issue with the previous translator's rendering of "Cade à terra il cavallo, e il Cavaliero : / La preme l'un, la tocca l'altro à pena":

*Considerez le jugement de ce Traducteur : Ainsi (escrit il) cheut à la terre le Cheval & le Chevalier. Là l'un il presse, & la il touche l'autre à peine. Or je dis qu'il faut ainsi traduire : Le Cheval, & le Chevalier vont à terre : mais l'un la presse, & l'autre ne la touche qu'à peine.*³⁴⁶

Rosset calls these examples "fautes insupportables," and holds them up as proof that his retranslation is necessary to "purger la France de ceste ordure."³⁴⁷ But while Chappuys' edition of the *Furioso* limits its criticism of the Sulpice Sabon translation's "fautes" to the antiquated language in which it is written, Rosset here is targeting interpretive faults rather than linguistic ones. His understanding of the task of the translator thus has a kind of inherently prosifying quality, since he views it as the translator's job to clearly communicate the meaning of Ariosto's sometimes complex or opaque verse syntax, rather than specific poetic features of his language.

An analysis of Rosset's translation itself bears this out; by contrast with the strict word-for-word translation in the Sulpice Sabon translation, and Chappuys' somewhat looser approach, Rosset's translation features many more departures from direct equivalence, which often introduce hypotactic phrases rather than following the syntax of Ariosto's verse. For instance, we have noted above how the Sulpice Sabon and Chappuys translations took slightly different approaches to the ambiguous referent of "che" in Ariosto's phrase "che furo al tempo che..." in the first few lines of the poem, with Sulpice Sabon opting for "qui furent faictes au temps que..." (referring to "les audacieuses entreprises") and Chappuys omitting the referent entirely by using "du temps que..." Rosset, by contrast, rearranges the items in the list and combines two of them into "les genereuses entreprises des Chevaliers," which allows him to use "Chevaliers" as the referent to "qui vivoient au temps que..." thus avoiding the Sulpice Sabon translation's awkward passive construction "qui furent faictes."

SULPICE SABON	CHAPPUYS	ROSSET
Je chante les Dames, les Chevaliers, les Armes, les Amours, les Courtoysies, les audacieuses entreprises, qui furent faictes au temps, que les Mores passerent la Mer d'Aphrique, & feirent si grand nuyance a France... ³⁴⁸	Je traicte des Dames, des Chevaliers, des Armes, des Amours, des Courtoisies, & des vallantes entreprises, du temps que les Mores passerent la Mer d'Afrique, & firent si grand mal en France... ³⁴⁹	Je Chante la beauté des Dames : les armes, & les amours : les courtoisies, & les genereuses entreprises des Chevaliers, qui vivoient au temps que les Mores passerent la mer d'Affrique, & firent tant de mal en France... ³⁵⁰

Another way that Rosset seeks to introduce greater clarity in his translation is by providing explicating glosses within the poem where he perceives them to be necessary. For instance,

³⁴⁶ Rosset, *Roland Furieux*, i.ii^v.

³⁴⁷ Rosset, *Roland Furieux*, o.ii^v.

³⁴⁸ Sulpice Sabon, *Roland Furieux*, ai^f.

³⁴⁹ Chappuys, *Roland furieux*, 1.

³⁵⁰ Rosset, *Roland Furieux*, f. 1^f.

Rosset at several points translates poetic metaphors into more literal equivalents, as he does in his translation of Canto VII when Melissa (appearing as Atlante, Ruggiero’s mother), asks: “È questo dunque il frutto ch’io / lungamente atteso ho **del sudor mio**?” The Sulpice Sabon translation follows its usual procedure of offering word-for-word cognates as often as possible: “...est doncques cestuy le fruit, que j’ay longuement attendu **de ma sueur**?” The Rosset translation, by contrast, in lieu of “sueur” introduces a doublet that interprets the metaphorical meaning of “sudor”: “Est-ce doncques le fruit que j’ay si long temps attendu, **en recompense de tant de peine & de travail** ?” A similar move occurs in Canto IX when Rosset translates “levar del petto” as “bannir de l’ame.”

At other points, comparing the Rosset translation to its predecessors illustrates how loathe he is to introduce the kinds of allegorizing moral glosses that sometimes find their way into the Sulpice Sabon translation. These instances also clearly bear out Rosset’s claim in the preface to have referred directly to the source text and corrected errors and misinterpretations in the Sulpice Sabon translation. For example, in the *proemio* to Canto IX, Ariosto laments the power of Love to divert the path of a faithful knight who should be in service to his Prince. In the second stanza, there is a line whose internal logic both the Sulpice Sabon translation and Chappuys’ rejuvenation seem to omit in favor of more clearly elucidating the moral stakes of the characters’ situation; Rosset, on the other hand, strives to make the logic of the line extremely clear.

ARIOSTO	CHAPPUYS	ROSSET
Ma l'escuso io pur troppo, e mi rallegro / nel mio difetto aver compagno tale; / ch'anch'io sono al mio ben languido ed egro, / sano e gagliardo a seguitare il male.	Mais je l’excuse assez, & me resjoy d’avoir un tel compagnon en mon deffaut. Car à son exemple souvent en ma foiblesse & maladie, je suis sain & dispos à suivre le mal qu’apporte telle folie amoureuse. ³⁵¹	Je l’excuse pourtant, & suis bien ase d’avoir un tel compagnon en ma folie : car il faut que je confesse, que je suis extrêmement paresseux à suivre ce qui est de mon bien, au lieu que je me treuve tousjours sain & dispos, quand il faut courir apres mon dommage.

The Sulpice Sabon translation introduces an explicitation of the nature of the “mal” (“qu’apporte telle folie amoureuse”), as well as the reason for the narrator’s predisposition to pursue it (“en ma foiblesse & maladie”), both of which amount to a kind of allegorizing moral interpretation of the events of the poem that are absent in Rosset’s. In Rosset’s translation, the departures from the original mainly serve the purpose of making the syntactic logic of the poetic line more explicit. He provides transitional phrases (“au lieu que,” “quand”), provides clear subjects for each clause (“il faut,” “je me treuve”), and ensures that each phrase is in subject-verb-object order. As a result, Rosset makes clear the contrast between good and harm that is omitted altogether in the Sulpice Sabon and Chappuys translations.

In these examples, we can see that Rosset’s translation practice bears out the desire he expresses in the preface to use the translation to provide proof of his stylistic and interpretive

³⁵¹ Chappuys, *Roland Furieux*, 81-82.

qualifications. Throughout his translation, Rosset demonstrates his understanding of the source text, and his ability to communicate Ariosto's poetic language in straightforward French prose. In Rosset's work on the other volumes of his cycle—and in particular, in the original continuation that he writes and appends to his translation of the *Furioso*—his intention to use the Roland story as a kind of showpiece for his skills as a historiographer becomes even more explicit. Rosset's continuation also illustrates how the Sulpice Sabon and Chappuys translations, despite their extreme linguistic fidelity, ultimately help to shape the *Furioso* into a work that more closely resembles the medieval *Pseudo-Turpin* than an epic poem. Rosset reclaims the *Furioso* for France by reuniting it with the rest of the Roland material. Indeed, as we will see, there is evidence that Rosset draws on works derived from the *Pseudo-Turpin* itself, such as Bagnyon's *Fierabras*. But first, we must consider how the transformation of the *Furioso*, over the course of the sixteenth-century prose translations, into just one part of a multi-volume cycle contributes to this re-historicization and repatriation of the material.

One way that this operates in Rosset's cycle is through the recuperation of Boiardo's *Innamorato*, and an affirmation of the work's direct genealogical relationship to the *Furioso*. The "Au Lecteur" to Rosset's translation of Boiardo notes the strangeness of translating the *Innamorato* after the *Furioso*, reminding the reader that Ariosto's tale is actually a continuation of Boiardo's. He then goes on to say that his translation differs from Chappuys'³⁵² because he is translating from a different original: "Tu le trouveras bien different de celuy qui a tant couru par la France, puis que je l'ay traduit sur un vieil exemplaire que le fils du mesme Auteur fit imprimer un peu apres le decez de son pere."³⁵³ Rosset seems to be referring to a 1495 Italian edition of the *Innamorato*—the first edition to publish the first three books together—whereas previous translations like Chappuys' were based on earlier editions of the individual books. His reference to a "vieil exemplaire" echoes the philological labor described in romance "found manuscript" prefaces such as the ones that Herberay and Montalvo append to their respective versions of the *Amadis*. But it also resembles the Chappuys translation's efforts to philologically account for the "complete" Italian *Furioso* as Ariosto intended it (including the *Cinque canti* and the Pescatore continuation). Rosset similarly describes himself as rediscovering a more authentic version of the *Furioso* that even the Italians, in their rush to modernize Boiardo's language, have lost. In the preface, he criticizes Chappuys' translation alongside Francisco Berni's *Rifacimento*, which recast Boiardo's poem in a more modern style. Scholars have shown that Berni's changes, while focused on diction, go well beyond that.³⁵⁴ Both Berni's revision and Chappuys' translation, Rosset suggests, are betrayals of Boiardo's original intention:

... & je te dis en passant qu'il [Berni] luy a osté une partie de sa grace, de mesme que celuy qui nous l'a donné en nostre langue [Chappuys] a perverty presque par tout le sens de cest Autheur. Si tu as quelque intelligence en l'une & en l'autre langue tu verras incontinant que si le premier a esté temeraire, l'autre n'est moins ignorant. (av^v)

³⁵² Rosset does not specifically name the Chappuys translation; but given his reference to this previous translation's popularity, he seems very likely that he is referring to Chappuys rather than the Sulpice Sabon.

³⁵³ François de Rosset, transl., *Roland l'Amoureux, composé en Italien par Mre Matheo Maria Bayardo Comte de Scandian* (Paris: Robert Foüet, 1629), a.v^r.

³⁵⁴ Elissa Barbara Weaver, "The Spurious Text of Francesco Berni's 'Rifacimento' of Matteo Maria Boiardo's *Orlando Innamorato*," *Modern Philology* 75, no. 2 (1977): 122.

In this way, Rosset conflates the interlingual translation of Boiardo's previous translator (Gabriel Chappuys) with the Italian modernization, suggesting that both have erred in the same way: by overriding the perfection of the original with their own stylistic preferences (or failings). But in fact, Rosset is imitating Chappuys' prefatory and paratextual strategy. By presenting his own, superior understanding of Ariosto's intentions, Rosset claims the right to shape the genre and direction of the cycle as a whole.

Rosset's critique of Italian editors and exegetes is further elaborated in the preface to his continuation of the *Furioso*. This work does not have a dedication, but it does contain a lengthy "Au Lecteur" in which Rosset defends his decision not to translate Giambattista Pescatore's continuation³⁵⁵ (as Chappuys did) but to write his own, once again framing his decision in reference to the Italian's lack of fidelity to Ariosto's intentions:

...voyant que le Poëte qui l'a composée [Pescatore] s'est égaré en tout & par tout du sens de l'Arioste, & de celui du Comte Scandian, & commis de si grandes impertinences, qu'elles ne meritent point le travail que j'eusse pris à la traduire, je te donne maintenant une nouvelle Suite.³⁵⁶(a.ii^r)

As evidence that the author of the continuation was not following Ariosto's and Boiardo's intentions (which Rosset takes to be one and the same), Rosset gives multiple examples of textual discontinuities (Angelique is described in France pursuing Roland while, according to Ariosto's last mention of her, she should be in Cathay with Medor), temporal contradictions (Roger's wedding celebrations seem to last two years), and especially geographical impossibilities. Rosset catalogues at length the impossible itineraries Pescatore's text implies; for example, Ferragus appears to be in two places in one day that are more than a thousand leagues apart. These impossibilities, Rosset argues, violate obligations of *vraisemblance* that are required even of the fantastical romance genre: "Encores que le Romant soit bien souvent fabuleux, il est nécessaire neantmoins que le vraysemblable y paroisse ; que la Chronologie y soit observée, & principalement la Cosmographie."³⁵⁷ However, Rosset says nothing of similar improbabilities committed by Ariosto and Boiardo themselves. This suggests that Rosset's attack on Pescatore's lack of verisimilitude is more a means of justifying Rosset's new continuation, than an articulation of Rosset's theory of *vraisemblance*.

Indeed, Rosset's continuation shows that his primary concern is not the defense of verisimilitude, but rather the incorporation of the *Furioso* and the *Innamorato* into the other episodes in the traditional nationalist narrative of Charlemagne's Spanish campaign. At the beginning of his continuation, Rosset echoes the beginning of Ariosto's poem, while also addressing himself to a specifically French audience, and outlining his intention (which, evidently, he took to be Ariosto and Boiardo's as well) that the story should end with the Battle of Roncevaux:

³⁵⁵ Rosset seems to be under the impression that Lodovico Dolce, rather than Pescatore, was the author of the continuation Chappuys translated into French. While Dolce did indeed write a kind of 'prequel' to both the *Innamorato* and the *Furioso* about Orlando's youth (*Prime imprese del conte Orlando*), he did not (so far as I know) write a continuation.

³⁵⁶ Rosset, François de. *La suite de Roland le furieux. Nouvellement compose en François, par Fr. De Rosset* (Paris: Robert Foüet, 1615).

³⁵⁷ Rosset, *La suite de Roland le Furieux* a.ii^v.

Je poursuis l'histoire des Dames, & des Chevaliers, que le Divin Arioste n'a point achevée. Je veux raconter à la France la verité des proïesses & des courtoisies des Paladins, suivant que les Annales du bon Turpin me l'ont apprise. Je veux escrire par mesme moyen la mort du bon Roger, & celle du grand Comte d'Angers, qui moururent tous deux, l'un près de Poictiers, & l'autre à Roncevaux, par les embusches du traistre Ganelon.³⁵⁸

By invoking Turpin's authority in this new context, Rosset considerably changes the role that Turpin plays in both Boiardo's and Ariosto's works. As we have seen, in those works, Turpin functions as a satirical commentary on the veracity of the improbable events they describe, as well as (for Ariosto) a rejection of the use of literary material for nationalist historiographical purposes. Here, Rosset not only returns to Boiardo's "According to Turpin" framing device, but he uses it to state his intention of weaving the French Rolandian material—up to and including Roncevaux—together with the narratives of the *Furioso* and the *Innamorato*. Though Boiardo's and Ariosto's works use Turpin to modernize the intertextual conventions of the medieval *chanson de geste* tradition, Rosset in fact uses Turpin to bring many of those same conventions back to Boiardo and Ariosto.

The continuation maintains many of the same romance plot points that Boiardo and Ariosto use, such as the arrival of a mysterious magician ("Aventure II"). At the same time, it also incorporates episodes from the *Pseudo-Turpin*. But the way that Rosset re-introduces these Turpinian episodes demonstrates two things. First, that he is drawing not from the *Pseudo-Turpin* itself (or at least, not exclusively from it) but from medieval vernacular translations like the *Fierabras*. And secondly, despite invoking Turpin as an authority, Rosset feels no compunction to treat him as a source with the same deference that those vernacular rewritings and translations do. Despite seeking to re-incorporate much of the material from the medieval French Roland stories, and despite reclaiming Turpin as an authoritative model, Rosset is not following the methodologies used in those works. Instead, he employs a modern combination of adaptation, invention, and intertextuality that is, ironically, at least partly drawn from Boiardo and Ariosto.

One episode that illustrates this combination of strategies is the battle between Roland and Ferragus ("Aventure IX"). In the *Pseudo-Turpin*, this battle is also a religious confrontation, in which Ferragus poses intellectual challenges to Roland's Christian beliefs, such as the nature of the Trinity, and the virgin birth of Jesus. Ultimately, the combat between the two is framed as a test of the comparative powers of Islam and Christianity, with Ferragus saying:

"I will fight with you on the following condition: if this faith that you hold is true, I will be beaten; if it is false, you will be beaten. May the loser's people be disgraced and those of the winner be filled with honor and glory forever!"³⁵⁹

In the writing of the *Pseudo-Turpin* in Bagnyon's *Fierabras*, the dialogue exchange between the two, featuring Ferragus's challenges to Christianity and Roland's answers, are largely summarized, though Ferragus does issue his religious challenge as well:

³⁵⁸ Rosset, *La suite de Roland le Furieux*, 1^rv.

³⁵⁹ Kevin R. Poole (Ed. and Transl.), *The Chronicle of Pseudo-Turpin* (Italica Press: New York), 2014.

“Tu es crestien et veulx maintenir la foy de la quelle tu m’as parlé, et je suis payen et tiens pour mon dieu Mahon. Pour quoy celluy qui sera vaincuz, sa loy soit tenue pour nulle, et la foy du victorieux soit bonne et loyalle et qu’elle soit tenue entierement et gardee.”³⁶⁰

One innovation in Bagnyon’s version of the story is that he inserts an overnight truce into the middle of the fight between the two: “...tous deux furent lasses et prindrent treves ensemble d’ung accord jusques a l’endemain et qu’ilz deussent batailler sans cheval et sans lance.”³⁶¹

Rosset adopts this temporary truce, though he adds considerably more detail than Bagnyon, describing the two adversaries sharing a civilized meal. His attention to the quotidian niceties of the meal is a reflection of the modern courtly details found in the *Furioso*.

Another example from the same episode is in the way that Rosset treats the religious dimensions of the conflict between the two characters. Where in the *Pseudo-Turpin*, the religious dialogue between the two is initiated by Ferragus, in Rosset’s telling it comes from Roland’s chivalrous desire to bring such a worthy opponent to the true faith:

Après que Roland, & Ferragus eurent souppé, le Comte qui se sentoit obligé à Ferragus pour sa courtoisie, eut bien voulu treuver quelque expedient, qui peust les accorder, sans prejudice de son honneur: mais plustost il desiroit reduire à la vraye foy un si vaillant home, ne se souciant gueres de son casque, pourveu qu’il peust sauver l’ame de ce Guerrier.³⁶²

Accordingly, this change by Rosset changes the conclusion of the fight between the two as well. Roland triumphs over Ferragus in all three versions. But in the *Pseudo-Turpin*, Ferragus dies pleading, “ ‘Muhammad, Muhammad, my God, come to my help, for I am dying!’”³⁶³ Similarly, in *Fierabras* he cries out, “O Mahonmet, mon dieu a quy je me suis donné, viens moy seccourir, car tu voys bien que je me meurs, et ne tarde plus!”³⁶⁴ Rosset, on the other hand, has Ferragus achieve a serene deathbed conversion, saying, “ ‘Genereux Comte, je crois en ton Dieu.’”³⁶⁵ Though the episode as a whole comes from historiographical sources, and though Rosset’s own version of the episode shows a careful reading of these sources, he does not hesitate to adapt them in order to reflect a more courtly, modern version of Roland, in line with the tone and characterization established by Boiardo and Ariosto.

The way that Turpin is invoked in this episode illustrates how Rosset both relies upon, and undercuts, Turpin’s demotion from historiographer to character by Boiardo and Ariosto. When Rosset refers to Turpin’s trustworthiness, the reference is not undercut with any sense of irony, but is used in all seriousness. At the same time, the specific passages for which Turpin is cited as a source never come from the *Pseudo-Turpin*, or even, most likely, from a more distant source like the *Fierabras*. This is clear when Rosset, at the outset of the chapter, refers to Turpin’s authority in recounting the events he is about to describe:

³⁶⁰ Bagnyon, *Fierabras*, 196.

³⁶¹ Bagnyon, *Fierabras*, 195.

³⁶² Rosset, *La suite de Roland le Furieux*, 66^f.

³⁶³ Poole, *The Chronicle of Pseudo-Turpin*, 48.

³⁶⁴ Bagnyon, *Fierabras*, 197.

³⁶⁵ Rosset, *La suite de Roland le Furieux*, 69^f.

Le Paladin, & le Sarrasin se rencontrèrent d'Escu, de corps & de teste si furieusement, que ce choc rendit un son si espouvantable, qu'on doutera de ce que j'escris. Mais le bon Archevesque Turpin, qui n'a pas accoustumé de mentir, me servira tousjours de caution. Il nous raconte en ces Chroniques, que si la Mer, la Terre, le Ciel, & tous les Elemens tomboient dans le plus profond des Abismes, ils ne meneroient pas plus de bruit...³⁶⁶

The turn of phrase that Rosset attributes to Turpin (“que si la Mer, la Terre, le Ciel, & tous les Elemens [etc.]...”) is not, in fact, in the *Pseudo-Turpin*. It is possible that it may appear in one of the printed prose translations or adaptations of the *Pseudo-Turpin* circulating in France. However, Rosset's tendency to cite Turpin as his source for particularly eloquent turns of phrase seems more like a way of calling attention to Rosset's own eloquence, than of genuinely attributing it to another author.

At the same time, Turpin's historiographical authority is very much relied upon in other instances in the continuation. The most notable such reference occurs in the very last scene of the continuation, which depicts the humiliation of the character Bernard de Carpi, whom Rosset describes as Marsilio's fool. Of course, as we have seen above, in the Spanish tradition Bernardo del Carpio was no fool, but rather the hero of *Bernardo, o victoria de Roncesvalles* by Bernard de Balbuena, the sixteenth-century revival of the epic tradition in which Bernardo kills Roland during the Battle of Roncevaux.³⁶⁷ Cioranesco points to the significance of Rosset's first oblique mention of Balbuena (the author of the *Bernardo*), which occurs when he is narrating the suicide of Sacripant (as opposed to his death at the hands of Roger, as Pescatore's continuation would have it). Rosset uses the opportunity to reinforce Turpin's authority, criticize Pescatore, and obliquely mention his disagreement with Balbuena, all in one stroke:

C'est la fin pitoyable du valeureux, & fidele Sacripant. Le bon Turpin, qui vivoit en son siecle l'a ainsi escrite, à la honte d'un Escrivain menteur & ridicule, qui a voulu dire que Roger le tua. Mais cela est aussi veritable, comme le conte de ce sot & impudent Poëte des Espiciers & des Fruictieres d'Espagne, qui fait tuer Roland, par un bouffon du Roy Marsille, nommé Bernard de Carpi, ou de la Carpe.³⁶⁸

Rosset uses Turpin as a stand-in for the self-evident truth of the French version of the story, while authors like Pescatore and Balbuena—who depict a less flattering version of events—are derided as “menteur & ridicule” or “sot & impudent.” For Rosset, there is no question of weighing the veracity of these different texts according to the sources they used—indeed, there is no evidence whatsoever that Rosset himself referred to the *Pseudo-Turpin* in writing his continuation. The character Sacripant, after all, features in Boiardo's and Ariosto's poems rather than in the native French Roland tradition. Rather, Rosset consistently uses Turpin to represent the traditional, most nationalistic version of the story, in opposition to Pescatore but also, much more vehemently, in opposition to the Spanish historiographical tradition represented by Balbuena's Carpi.

³⁶⁶ Rosset, *La suite de Roland le Furieux*, 64^v-65^r.

³⁶⁷ Al[exandre] Cioranesco, “La première édition du Bernardo,” *Bulletin Hispanique* 37, no. 4 (1935): 484. Though the earliest surviving printed edition of the *Bernardo* dates to 1624, Cioranesco notes that Rosset's references to the *Bernardo* in this continuation must point to the existence of an earlier edition.

³⁶⁸ Rosset, *La suite de Roland le Furieux*, 39^v.

Of course, Rosset's continuation does not follow the *Bernardo* in describing Roland's death at Bernardo del Carpio's hands. But neither does he directly turn the tables and have Roland kill Bernardo. Instead, the Archbishop Turpin kills Carpi and parades his body before the Saracen camp in imitation of Achilles. He then derides the notion that a mere poet like Balbuena could be considered a more reliable source than the historiographer-archbishop: "C'est la verité de l'histoire que le fidele Turpin a inferée dans ses Annales. Il estoit Archevesque, & par mesme moyen plus croyable qu'un Poëte, parent de Carpi." Rosset then goes on to accuse Balbuena of the very charge that Spanish historiographers previously levelled against Turpin, namely that the resentment and humiliation of defeat caused him to write a biased and untrue account:

Il n'y a point de doute que la punition que fit de ce bouffon le saint Archevesque de Rheims n'ait induit ce Rimeur à escrire des choses qui sont du tout contraires aux bons & veritables Romans, qui se lisent par tout le Monde. Mais comme les Estrangers ont tousjours envié la gloire de la France, il ne leur falloit, après tant de maux qu'ils luy ont fait si souvent ressentir, qu'avoir un Chevalier qui mist à mort le Comte Roland.³⁶⁹

Rosset appeals to the authority of "le fidele Turpin," an Archbishop and therefore "plus croyable qu'un Poëte" in depicting this version of events, although of course, the *Pseudo-Turpin* does not mention Carpi at all, let alone Turpin's grisly treatment of him. At the same time, even as Rosset accuses Balbuena of being a poet and therefore inherently a liar, he also suggests that Balbuena is guilty of the dereliction of his literary duty to produce "bons & veritables Romans."

In a certain respect, this rhetoric is familiar not just from the Spanish accounts of Roncesvalles, but also from the preface to Herberay's *Amadis*, namely that the literary jealousy of foreigners results in false literary historiographies. But Rosset goes even further, providing a specific and personal motive for this jealousy: namely, that Balbuena must be a descendent of Carpi's, and thus inclined to write a version of the story that is more flattering to his ancestor. It is here that we see just how skilled and selective an Ariostan reader Rosset really is. He is resurrecting the character of Turpin, the French nationalist historiographer, whom Ariosto had so deftly repurposed to affirm his own freedom from his French literary predecessors. But at the same moment, Rosset accuses his Spanish competitor Balbuena of the kind of genealogical bias of which Ariosto accuses the French. Though Rosset had accused Ariosto's previous translators of offering him up to the public "tout perty," it is Rosset who truly contorts Ariosto's relationship to the literary past to suit Rosset's own present purposes. The end of his continuation makes it clear that he views his Roland cycle as a work starring, in the end, not Roland but Turpin. Rosset views the cycle as a kind of *Turpin Furieux* in which the historiographer-archbishop wanders Ariosto's romance seeking to be reunited with the site of his authorial vindication, Roncesvalles. Once he finds it, he is able to reveal—against all odds—that the *Furioso* was French all along.

V. Conclusion

Shortly before his translation of the *Furioso*, Rosset published an original *pièce-ballet* titled *Romant des Chevaliers de la Gloire*. The first volume of the *Romant* was published with a highly favourable royal privilege in 1612, its purpose to celebrate—as the title describes—

³⁶⁹ Rosset, *La suite de Roland le Furieux*, 101^v-102^r.

“plusieurs hautes & fameuses adventures des Princes, & des Chevaliers qui parurent aux Courses faictes à la Place Royale pour la feste des Alliances de France & d’Espagne.”³⁷⁰ The *Romant* describes the adventures of a group of wandering knights, who encounter giants, lions, dwarves, ladies, and strangers; it includes such Amadisian touches as a chapter-long description of an exotic palace, and reproductions of letters sent to the leaders of Europe. At the same time, in the *Romant*, Rosset also weaves in real contemporary events and personages. The beginning of the romance starts with the meeting of the *Génies* of France and Spain, who encounter one another on a mountaintop and discuss the need for union between their two nations, in the form of the marriage between Louis XIII and Anne of Austria. As the Spanish *Génie* puts it, “ ‘N’est-ce pas un grand mal-heur... qu’il faille que nos Couronnes soient si souvent des-unies: pendant que l’Infidèle se rit de nos pertes, & que nos dissensions donnent accroissement à son Empire?’ ”³⁷¹ In the dedicatory letter of the *Romant* to Marie de’ Medici, Rosset promises a continuation that will further celebrate the King’s wedding.³⁷² At the time when his translation of the *Furioso* was published, this continuation had, it seems, not yet been approved.³⁷³

The way the *Romant* combines romance fantasy with the commemoration of an important royal event shows us why the *Orlando* cycle was, in Rosset’s mind, such a fitting audition piece for his ambitions as a royal historiographer. Part of the task of the royal historiographer, as Rosset envisions it, is to help blur the boundaries between romance and historiography. Rosset’s translations of the *Orlando* cycle help bring romance closer to historiography. And, in a parallel fashion, the *Romant des chevaliers de la gloire* makes historiography itself into a kind of romance, framing the royal wedding as an episode set within a romance plotline. The preface to Rosset’s translation of the *Roland l’Amoureux* states explicitly that his translation of the chivalric romance is meant to show why he is the ideal historiographer of the king’s contemporary military triumphs:

Tandis que... j’exerce ma plume à descrire les exploits de ces renommez Guerriers qui vivoient sous le regne du grand Charles vostre Predecesseur, je me prepare par mesme moyen de me rendre digne de publier la gloire de vos faicts qui obscurcissent desja ceux du premier des Cesars...³⁷⁴

There is, therefore, a kind of irony inherent in Rosset’s literary career. His continuation of the *Orlando Furioso* is part of a century-long trajectory that I have traced, starting in Chapter One, in which medieval historiographical narratives such as the *Pseudo-Turpin* were discredited by humanist critical methods, and thus found refuge within the neighboring genre of romance. But, at the same time, the *Romant des chevaliers de la gloire* is one indication that Rosset’s own historical moment marks the beginning of a swing of the historiographical pendulum back in the opposite direction. Under Louis XIII and XIV, there was a return to the concept of history as a

³⁷⁰ François de Rosset, *Le romant des chevaliers de la gloire...* (Paris: Veuve de Pierre Bertaud, 1612).

³⁷¹ Rosset, *Le romant des chevaliers de la gloire*, Aii^r.

³⁷² Rosset, *Le romant des chevaliers de la gloire*, aii^v.

³⁷³ We know this because in the dedicatory letter to the *Furioso*—also addressed to Marie de’ Medici—Rosset describes his work on the *Orlando* cycle as a kind of audition for the continuation of the *Romant*: “Quand je descrivis l’action memorable de la place Royale, & ces Magnificences qui surpassent toute la pompe des triomphes des Romains, je n’eus d’autre but que de tesmoigner à la plus grande REYNE de l’Europe, l’intention que j’avois de celebrer ses loüanges au Romant des Chevaliers de la Gloire.” (Rosset, *Roland Furieux*, ai^v.)

³⁷⁴ Rosset, *Roland l’Amoureux*, a.ii^v-a.iii^r.

rhetorical art, rather than as the deployment of critical method. For the purposes of his own *gloire*, Rosset's approach to history was unfortunately both a little too late, and a bit too early.

There is another way in which Rosset proves singularly unfortunate in his reading of the cultural zeitgeist. At the very end of his continuation to the *Furioso*, Rosset compares the character Bernard de la Carpe to Don Quixote, saying that this character imagined himself destined to kill the Twelve Peers of France, "... de mesme que Don Quichot son parent s'imaginoit qu'il estoit venu au monde pour remettre en honneur la Chevalerie errante."³⁷⁵ Rosset means this reference as a criticism; indeed, we have seen in this chapter that Rosset had no great regard for Spanish literature, or Spain in general. However, the very marriage between Louis XIII and Anne of Austria that the *Romant des chevaliers de la gloire* commemorates would mark a turning point in French-Spanish literary relations. And no work exemplified the Hispanophilia that would grip seventeenth-century Spain more than Miguel de Cervantes' *Don Quixote*.

Indeed, Rosset would come to know this well, since—as we will see in the next chapter—he was the first translator of Book II of the *Quixote*. And Cervantes and Rosset have more in common than Rosset seems to believe, for they share a common preoccupation with the Matter of France and its position at the crux of romance and history. In Book I, Chapter 26 of *Don Quixote*, the Knight of the Sorrowful Countenance poses himself on a rock to contemplate two courses of action: "imitar a Roldán en las locuras desaforadas que hizo, o en Amadís en las malencónicas."³⁷⁶ Weighing the arguments against Roland, Quixote continues:

—Si Roldán fue tan buen caballero y tan valiente como todos dicen, ¿qué maravilla, pues, al fin era encantado, y no le podía matar nadie si no era metiéndole un alfiler de a blanca por la punta del pie, y él traía siempre los zapatos con siete suelas de hierro? Aunque no le valieron tretas contra Bernardo del Carpio, que se las entendió, y le ahogó entre los brazos, en Roncesvalles.³⁷⁷

In my next and final chapter, I will consider how *Don Quixote* weaves together the strands of Roland, Amadís, and Bernardo in a way that indicates Cervantes' concern not only with these original works, but with their reception and transformation by translators like Rosset himself. Then, I will consider how French translators follow the precedent that Rosset has set in his translation of the *Furioso*, overwriting Cervantes' criticism of nationalist mythology by claiming the *Quixote* for the modern French canon.

³⁷⁵ Rosset, *La suite de Roland le Furieux*, 101^r.

³⁷⁶ Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *El Ingenioso hidalgo Don Quijote de la Mancha*, Book I, ed. Luis Andrés Murillo (Madrid: Editorial Castalia, 1987), 318.

³⁷⁷ Cervantes, *El Ingenioso hidalgo Don Quijote de la Mancha*, 318.

CHAPTER FOUR

“Revestue à la Française”:

Romance Textuality and Literary Modernity, from *Don Quixote* to *Gil Blas*

In 1659, the French and Spanish were on the verge of finalizing the Treaty of the Pyrenees, which—when sealed by the marriage of Louis XIV to María Teresa, the Infanta of Spain—would see an end to French-Spanish hostilities that had lasted for decades.³⁷⁸ Two written testimonies from the time of the treaty illustrate the extent to which the cultural differences between the two cultures were, at this moment, a source of both repulsion and attraction. The first comes from a pamphlet produced to commemorate the treaty and the marriage, entitled *La Pompe et Magnificence faite au mariage du Roy et de L’Infante D’Espagne*. Among the events described in the pamphlet—the king’s introduction to the princess, her entrance into France, the French marriage mass—is Anne of Austria’s preparations for her son’s wedding:

Sa Majesté... dit qu’il pretendoit dès ce soir là consommer le Mariage, qu’il croyoit d’ailleurs bien achevé, & témoigna ardeur pour cela : Mais la Roynne mere qui vouloit auparavant, habiller la Reine à la Française, & la rendre encore plus aimable, dit au Roy qu’il restoit quelque ceremonie de l’Eglise, qui ne se pouvoit faire qu’aujourd’huy.³⁷⁹

At a moment when differences of clothing were capable of sinking a treaty months and years in the making,³⁸⁰ the Queen Mother’s decision to re-dress the new Queen “in the French style” is a savvy piece of courtly diplomacy. The pamphlet goes on to narrate, as Abby E. Zanger puts it, “the story of a princess’s transformation from *infanta* María Teresa, to *reine* Marie-Thérèse... her rite of passage as she moves from one culture or symbolic system (Spanish) to another (French).”³⁸¹ The image of the Spanish Infanta being re-dressed in the French style is echoed in allegorical terms in an almanac for the year 1659, which depicts “La Flandre Despouillée des habits d’Espagne et revestue à la Française” (Figure 1).³⁸² In the engraving, a disheveled, half-disrobed woman (Flanders) is held by a group of French soldiers before a female, allegorical image of France, who is wearing a cape with a *fleur-de-lys* pattern. In the background, a man holds up another, similar cape, which (as the title of the almanac makes clear) will replace Flanders’ original clothing. This image celebrates the exchange of Spanish garments for French ones as a gesture of Spanish military submission to France.

³⁷⁸ These hostilities continued despite Louis XIII’s marriage to Anne of Austria in 1615.

³⁷⁹ *La Pompe et magnificence faite au mariage du Roy et de l’infante d’Espagne* (Paris: Jean Promé, 1660), 6. Ctd. Abby E. Zanger, *Scenes from the Marriage of Louis XIV: Nuptial Fictions and the Making of Absolutist Power* (Stanford University Press, 1997), 46.

³⁸⁰ There is a letter written during the treaty negotiations by Mazarin to his war minister Le Tellier, in which Mazarin—knowing that national differences in clothing styles had been a source of mockery and thus conflict in the past—says to Le Tellier, “I do not expect, given the differences between these two nations, that whatever agreement we may come to, we shall be able to meet each other dressed in the same manner.” (Ctd. Abby E. Zanger, *Scenes from the Marriage of Louis XIV*, 39.)

³⁸¹ Abby E. Zanger, *Scenes from the Marriage of Louis XIV*, 46.

³⁸² The image is a violent one; there is a discussion of the way the engraving suggests ritualized rape in the vein of the Sabine women in Abby E. Zanger, *Scenes from the Marriage of Louis XIV*, 47-49.

The necessity of re-dressing the Spanish Infanta can also be seen in the second testimony, from the *Mémoires* of Françoise Bertaut de Motteville, a member of Anne of Austria's household, who describes with disgust the clothing of the new queen and her entourage:

...l'Habit & la Coiffure des Femmes d'Espagne me fit de la peine à voir. Leur corps n'étoit point vêtu de rien qui fût ferme, & leur gorge étoit ouverte par derriere... leur Gard-Infante étoit une machine, à demi ronde & monstrueuse ; car, il sembloit que c'étoient plusieurs cercles de tonneau cousus en dedans de leurs Juppes, hormis que les cercles sont ronds, & que leur Gard-Infante, étoit aplati un pu par devant & par derriere, & s'élargissoit par les côtez. Quand elles marchaient, cette machine se haussoit & baissoit, & faisoit enfin une fort laide figure.³⁸³

However, the apparently straightforward xenophobia expressed in this letter is complicated by the fact that, as Zanger points out, the *garde-infant* had in fact been popular in France and Italy, as well as in Spain, until a more streamlined silhouette became fashionable in France around 1660.³⁸⁴

Thus, de Motteville's distaste for the Infanta's dress, while clearly rooted in nationalism, also conveniently displaces the alterity of an outmoded and disavowed (but also quite recent) French fashion onto Spanish culture. The gesture of re-dressing is thus more than a simple ritual of conquest; it is also a means of affirming the modernity of French fashion at the expense of Spain, despite the two nations' shared sartorial history. Similarly, the almanac commemorates a sense of French military dominance and cultural superiority that centers on the exchange of Spanish garments for French.

The same dynamics that characterize the literal *translatio* of María Teresa also govern the translation of texts from Spanish to French in the seventeenth century. The metaphor of re-dressing a text from the "clothing" of one language into another is a common one in Renaissance translators' introductions.³⁸⁵ In seventeenth century France, the metaphor is commonly used to justify the necessity of changing a text's outer garments to meet the norms of a new culture—in other words, as a defense of unfaithful translation, in the case of both classical and modern languages. Nicolas Perrot d'Ablancourt, the seventeenth-century translator whose work famously garnered the label of *belle infidèle*,³⁸⁶ employs a metaphor of re-dressing in the dedicatory letter to his translation of Lucian:

³⁸³ Françoise de Motteville, *Mémoires, pour servir à l'histoire d'Anne d'Autriche*, Vol. 5 (Amsterdam: Francois Changuion, 1723), 87-88. Ctd. Abby E. Zanger, *Scenes from the Marriage of Louis XIV*, 51.

³⁸⁴ Abby E. Zanger, *Scenes from the Marriage of Louis XIV*, 51.

³⁸⁵ Though the clothing metaphor is prevalent in European Renaissance discourse on translation, I do not wish to contend that it is exclusive to this period or culture. For a discussion of the metaphor from antiquity to the twentieth century, Cf. Ben Van Wyke, "Imitating Bodies and Clothes: Refashioning the Western Conception of Translation," in *Thinking through Translation with Metaphors* (New York: Routledge, 2010), 17-46.

³⁸⁶ Roger Zuber, *Les "belles infidèles" et la formation du goût classique* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1995). Recent scholars have rejected the term as anachronistic, suggesting in its place "traduction libre." Cf. Yen-Mai Tran-Gervat, Frédéric Weinmann, et al., "Discours sur la traduction," in *Histoire des traductions en langue française: XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles (1610-1815)*, Edited by Yves Chevrel, Annie Cointre, and Yen-Mai Tran-Gervat (Paris: Éditions Verdier, 2014), 251-252. Tran-Gervat, Weinmann, et al. argue that this term as a historical or critical designation dates to the twentieth century, and that its earlier uses (e.g. by Voltaire) refer specifically to a single translator, Perrot d'Ablancourt.

Je ne m'attache donc pas toujours aux paroles ni aux pensées de cet Auteur ; & demeurant dans son but, j'agence les choses à nostre aire & à nostre façon. Les divers temps veulent non-seulement des paroles, mais des pensées différentes ; & les Ambassadeurs ont coutume de s'habiller à la mode du país où on les envoie, de peur d'estre ridicules à ceux à qui ils tâchent de plaire.³⁸⁷

Translation as re-dressing is applied, here, to Lucian's text in diplomatic terms that are reminiscent of the re-dressing of the Infanta Maria Teresa, but also highlight the difference between translating a classical text, and a Spanish one, at this particular historical moment. According to d'Ablancourt's letter, the translator is simply fulfilling a wish that Lucian would no doubt express, if he could, to appear at the French court in appropriate garb. D'Ablancourt frames Lucian as an ambassador, and thus a visitor; his re-dressing is imagined as voluntary, and thus in some sense temporary or consciously artificial.

In the case of Spain, on the other hand, we have seen that translation—in the form of the “carrying over” of the Spanish Infanta into France—is a gesture of conquest and dominion rather than courtly diplomacy, in the context of the political relationship between the two nations at this particular historical moment. The role that diplomacy plays in translation, and vice versa, bears a close relationship to what Timothy Hampton (2009) has recently identified as the influence of diplomatic culture on the invention of Early Modern literary forms and genres.³⁸⁸ But unlike the temporary diplomacy of d'Ablancourt's translation, the re-dressing of Maria Teresa is a way of annexing or repatriating the Spanish princess (and, through her, a claim to Spain³⁸⁹) for France. Her stay is intended to be permanent; her transformation, total. The literal re-dressing of the Infanta illustrates the political potency of Spanish-to-French translation as an illustration not of diachronic *translatio studii*, but of a synchronic transfer of power from one nation to another.

I have shown in previous chapters that sixteenth-century French translators of Spanish and Italian romances skillfully negotiated the conflicting requirements of royalist politics and changing literary norms. In the seventeenth century, shifting cultural and political trends brought about a more intentionally regulated relationship between royalism and intellectualism. In this chapter, I invert the usual perspective of translation history: I am interested less in how these new cultural conditions change the practice of translation (though that is necessarily part of the story), than in how practices of textual transmission that are usually associated with earlier periods actually become even more prominent and influential in classical French literary culture. I argue that literary practices associated with chivalric romance—such as the “found manuscript” narrative; translation and continuation as vehicles for vernacular authorship; and the staking of nationalist claims on foreign source texts—are embraced in France well into the eighteenth century, moving beyond romance into a growing number of literary genres, despite being more commonly associated with the pre-modern. The broader implication of this argument is that the translation of Spanish literature plays a central role in the articulation of “modernity” in seventeenth-century French literature and culture.

³⁸⁷ Nicolas Perrot d'Ablancourt, Transl., *Lucien, de la traduction de N. Perrot, Sr d'Ablancourt.... Tome I* (Paris: A. Courbé, 1654), e.iii^{r-v}.

³⁸⁸ Timothy Hampton, *Fictions of Embassy: Literature and Diplomacy in Early Modern Europe* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2009).

³⁸⁹ Though Maria Teresa renounced her claim on the Spanish throne upon marrying Louis, he nevertheless would use her right to inherit as a pretext for claiming the Spanish Netherlands less than a decade after their marriage.

We will see in this chapter that the concept of literary modernity is built upon Spanish texts in two distinct ways. I begin by examining the broad cultural phenomenon of ubiquitous French translations and adaptations of Spanish works throughout the century, at the same time as these works were widely reviled as ugly, antiquated, or absurd—often by the very people who were translating or adapting them. This paradox, at first inexplicable, becomes legible (I argue) by viewing these translations as rituals through which the disfigured specter of pre-classical French language and literature is repeatedly banished. We recall that the Spanish Infanta’s “monstrous” *garde-infant* also exerted a strange fascination for Mme de Motteville, allowing her to exorcise the French history of the garment by attributing it to Spain’s bad taste. Similarly, French translators throughout the century are perpetually drawn to replace the (in their view) barbaric and archaic Spanish language with elegant, contemporary French as a means of affirming France’s modernity. I use this lens to take a new perspective on familiar literary artifacts from classical France, such as Pierre Corneille’s *Le Cid*, and Charles Sorel’s *Bibliothèque Française*. These new readings illustrate the critical role that Spanish works played as a proxy for French aesthetic imperfections, in the bumpy transition from Renaissance imitation practices to the new norms of classicism.

The main focus of this chapter, however, is the one Spanish author who was regarded by the French public as indisputably modern: Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra. In the Quarrel of the Ancients and Moderns that shook the halls of the Académie Française, Cervantes was often invoked by the Moderns as one of their standard-bearers, primarily on the basis of his critique of chivalric romance in *Don Quixote*. My aim in this chapter is to show, firstly, how Cervantes’ critique of romance processes of textual transmission is based in large part on the way such processes pervert the historical record in favor of nationalist propaganda; and secondly, how this critique is entirely subverted in the novel’s French transmission, as the French translations of *Don Quixote* use these very romance techniques to transplant the novel onto French soil. I argue that this illustrates how romance literary practices, more commonly associated with medievalism, underpin seventeenth-century French concepts of modernity, proving to be flexible and durable tools for the annexation of desirable foreign texts into French literary culture. Finally, I conclude by looking at the eighteenth-century ramifications of this complex tradition of Spanish-French cultural exchange, by looking at Alain-René Lesage’s recuperative translation of Alonso Fernández de Avellaneda’s unauthorized continuation of *Don Quixote*, alongside the Spanish reception of Lesage’s picaresque novel *Gil Blas*.

I. “Extravagante, & Barbare”: Hispanomania and Hispanophobia in French Classicism

Translating Spanish works into French in the seventeenth century was different in many respects from such translations a century earlier. As I discussed in my second chapter, the French translations of the *Amadis de Gaule*—the highest-profile example of Spanish-to-French translation in the sixteenth century—often contested or simply ignored their source texts. This was possible both because such treatment of sources was a convention of chivalric romance dating back to the Middle Ages; and because Spanish source texts were not regarded as prestigious, and thus were not viewed as subject to the same deferential translational approaches that applied to classical and Italian literature. However, the new influx and popularity of Spanish literature in the seventeenth century brought with it a broader array of genres—pastoral,

picaresque, and particularly the novella³⁹⁰—as well as greater prestige and, thus, a more prominent place for Spanish translations in discourse about translation methodology.³⁹¹ The translation landscape more broadly underwent significant changes as well; though seventeenth-century translators have been famously labeled the “belles infidèles,”³⁹² this era also saw the first efforts to establish and institutionalize translation methodology.³⁹³ Members of the Academy became increasingly interested in establishing prescriptive translation norms; for example, in the treatise *De la Traduction, ou Regles pour apprendre à traduire la langue latine en la langue françoise* (1660), Gaspard de Tende, sieur de l’Estang decrees:

La premiere chose à quoi il faut prendre garde dans la traduction françoise [...] c’est d’être extrêmement fidèle et littéral, c’est à dire, d’exprimer en notre langue, tout ce qui est dans le latin, et de le rendre si bien, que si, par exemple, Ciceron avoit parlé notre langue, il eût parlé de meme que nous le faisons parler dans notre traduction.³⁹⁴

Similarly, Méziriac, in an early debate over translation at the Académie Française, argued that a “faithful translator” must observe things: “...qu’il n’ajoute rien à ce que dit son auteur, qu’il n’en retranche rien, et qu’il n’y rapporte aucun changement qui puisse altérer le sens.”³⁹⁵ Many of these changes have been discussed in the wealth of recent scholarship on seventeenth-century French translation.³⁹⁶

But one of the most distinctive aspects of French translation in this period, which has only recently begun to be examined by scholars, was the commercial demand for continual translation and re-translation of Spanish texts. Describing trends in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century French prose translation, one scholar identifies “la progression... d’une hispanophilie voire d’une hispanomanie.”³⁹⁷ The Spanish literature that was appreciated in France was specifically a wide-ranging spectrum of prose fiction; Annie Cointre et al. observe that “Presque

³⁹⁰ On the popularity of Cervantes’ *Novelas ejemplares*, see G. Hainsworth. *Les Nouvelles Exemplaires de Cervantes et leur popularité en France au 17e siècle*, (Paris, Champion, 1933) and Hainsworth, G. “Quelques opinions françaises (1614-1664) sur les Nouvelles exemplaires de Cervantes (1613).” *Bulletin Hispanique* 32, no. 1 (1930): 63–70.

³⁹¹ Giovanni Dotoli has shown that the perception that French translations of Italian works declined after the sixteenth century is, in fact, a misconception. However, his study does find that literary texts represent a decreasing percentage of Italian texts translated into French, as other genres (like scientific works) come to the fore. See Giovanni Dotoli, ed., *Les Traductions de l’italien en français au XVIIe siècle* (Fasano (Br-Italia) : Paris, France: Schena ; Presses de l’Université de Paris-Sorbonne, 2001).

³⁹² Roger Zuber, *Les “belles infidèles” et la formation du goût classique*.

³⁹³ The one notable example of a sixteenth-century effort to develop such a methodology is Étienne Dolet’s short treatise *La manière de bien traduire d’une langue en aultre* (1540). For more on the exceptional nature of Dolet’s treatise in the context of sixteenth-century translation theory, see Glynn P. Norton, *The Ideology and Language of Translation in Renaissance France and Their Humanist Antecedents* (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1984).

³⁹⁴ Ctd. Roger Zuber, *Les “belles infidèles” et la formation du goût classique*, 151.

³⁹⁵ Ctd. Yen-Mai Tran-Gervat, Frédéric Weinmann, et al., “Discours sur la traduction,” 259.

³⁹⁶ Yves Chevrel, Annie Cointre, and Yen-Mai Tran-Gervat, eds., *Histoire des traductions en langue française: XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles (1610-1815)* (Paris: Éditions Verdier, 2014). This series is an essential contribution to the study of French translation history. At the same time, as it is organized largely by source text genres, my dissertation adds a new perspective by considering the evolution of a particular genre, and a particular source language, in translation. (For instance, translations of the *Orlando Furioso* and *Orlando Innamorato* are included in the chapter on “Poésie,” despite the fact that, as I have shown, they had a significant reception as prose works in France in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.)

³⁹⁷ Annie Cointre et al., “Prose narrative,” in *Histoire des traductions en langue française: XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles (1610-1815)*, eds. Yves Chevrel, Annie Cointre, and Yen-Mai Tran-Gervat (Paris: Éditions Verdier, 2014), 1124.

la totalité de la prose narrative espagnole est traduite dans la première moitié du XVIIe siècle.”³⁹⁸ Popular Spanish prose works were retranslated numerous times over the course of the seventeenth century. For instance, there were six different translations of *Lazarillo de Tormes*, and four translations of *Guzman de Alfarache*, in fewer than one hundred years.³⁹⁹ Much of this popularity continued into the eighteenth century; Filleau de Saint-Martin’s translation of *Don Quixote*, for example, was reprinted over 30 times through 1825; and the late eighteenth century saw two new translations of the *Amadis de Gaule*.⁴⁰⁰ This voracious appetite was, however, exclusively for works of Spanish prose; Spanish poetry is, for the most part, overlooked in classical France. To the extent that contemporaries attempted to explain this, the general consensus seemed to be that Spanish verse was not to French tastes, and not worth translating.⁴⁰¹ Florence Lautel-Ribstein et al. attribute this to a combination of factors, including a preference for Italian poetic models, and the antagonistic political relationship between France and Spain; they also suggest that the relatively widespread knowledge of Spanish might have meant that readers were accessing these texts in their original language.⁴⁰² However, none of these explanations really accounts for French distaste for Spanish poetry, when there was so much lively interest in Spanish prose. There is a pervasive tendency, in seventeenth-century French translations of Spanish prose fictions, to profess strong attraction to the narrative “body” of the text, and a deep distaste for the stylistic and cultural “garments” in which that narrative came clothed. One further way to account for the exclusive interest in prose, therefore, is the pervasive opinion that Spain’s literary genius lay in producing narrative bodies, upon which French stylistic garments hung particularly well.

As was the case with Spanish garments in the testimonies I discussed at the beginning of the chapter, the insatiable desire to watch Spanish literature dressed and re-dressed in French garb was equaled only by a visceral disgust for Spanish literature in its original language. Ambrosio de Salazar, a seventeenth-century teacher of the Spanish language in France, claimed that a third of French courtiers spoke Castilian without ever having been to Spain,⁴⁰³ but this interest in Spanish language learning did not result in any diminished demand for French translations. Alicia Yllera Fernández, in a study of translators like Vital d’Audiguier and Jean Chapelain, finds that they systematically criticize Spanish taste, often focusing on tendencies toward digression and mixture of high and low society, or the sacred and profane; these tendencies were considered to be “vicios de la nación.”⁴⁰⁴ Yllera Fernández notes, but does not

³⁹⁸ Annie Cointre et al., “Prose narrative,” 1204.

³⁹⁹ Annie Cointre et al., “Prose narrative,” 1129-1132.

⁴⁰⁰ See Annie Cointre et al., “Prose narrative,” 1146-1147.

⁴⁰¹ For instance, as I discuss below, the otherwise scrupulously faithful Spanish grammarian César Oudin changes or omits much of the poetry in his translation of *Don Quixote*.

⁴⁰² Florence Lautel-Ribstein et al., “Poésie,” in *Histoire des traductions en langue française: XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles (1610-1815)*, eds. Yves Chevrel, Annie Cointre, and Yen-Mai Tran-Gervat (Paris: Éditions Verdier, 2014), 1034-1035.

⁴⁰³ Sylvie Le Moël et al., “L’enjeu des langues,” in *Histoire des traductions en langue française: XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles (1610-1815)*, eds. Yves Chevrel, Annie Cointre, and Yen-Mai Tran-Gervat (Paris: Éditions Verdier, 2014), 79.

⁴⁰⁴ Alicia Yllera Fernández, “Cuando los traductores desean ser traidores,” In *Traducción y Adaptación Cultural: España-Francia*, Edited by Francisco Lafarga and María Luisa Donaire Fernández (Oviedo: Universidad de Oviedo, Servicio de Publicaciones, 1991), 648. For more on French translations of Spanish during this period, see Zinguer, Ilana. “De la théorie à la pratique dans les traductions des nouvelles d’espagnol en Français au début du XVIIIe siècle.” *Bulletin de l’Association d’étude sur l’humanisme, la réforme et la renaissance* 15, no. 1 (1982): 86–95. doi:10.3406/rhren.1982.1298.

account for, the irony that “La época de mayor número de traducciones literarias españolas en Francia es, al mismo tiempo, la época de mayor hispanofobia.”⁴⁰⁵ Even Cervantes is sometimes called “extravagante, & barbare”; and Lope de Vega’s translator says that the world would have been better off if he had never written.⁴⁰⁶ Other translators, less critical of the original works themselves, simply refer to changing “[des] choses qui sont vraiment louables en son païs, mais ridicules au nostre.”⁴⁰⁷

There are numerous examples of how these supposed failings of Spanish literary taste are used to justify translational infidelities that are, at the same time, important new articulations of French literary norms. This is true across a range of different prose genres. And while, as I have mentioned, translators from classical languages have also been called *belles infidèles* in this era, it is worth noting the specific kinds of infidelities that particularly characterize translations from Spanish.⁴⁰⁸ While translators from Greek and Latin often state in their prefaces that their infidelities are stylistic interventions—abridging long passages, removing repetitions, or replacing obscure terminology⁴⁰⁹—Spanish translators often cite *bienséance* to change plot details, alter endings, or otherwise intercede directly in the narrative. For instance, in Madame Gillot de Saintonge’s 1699 translation of Jorge de Montemayor’s pastoral romance *La Diana* (whose title page describes it as “mise en nouveau langage”), Saintonge justifies the omission of Montemayor’s final book by arguing that *bienséance* would not permit Diana to remarry so soon after her previous husband’s death.⁴¹⁰ Echoing Nicolas Perrot d’Ablancourt, Gillot de Saintonge declares, “Je n’ai point eu en vüe d’en faire une traduction fidelle, mais seulement de la rendre agreable par un tour nouveau & réjouissant...”⁴¹¹ The last book is replaced with a session of interpolated storytelling, including a fairy tale (“La Princesse des Iles Inconues”), a novella (“L’amant Ingenieux”), and a treatise on fiction (“L’Origine des Contes, ou le Triomphe de la Folie sur le Bon-goût”). The gap between French and Spanish tastes, therefore, becomes the occasion for explicit reflection on, and imitation of, various models of prose fiction.

Whereas these translators discuss their infidelity as a kind of obligation, Pierre Corneille’s tragicomedy *Le Cid* is perhaps the most famous example of how a more faithful French adaptation of a Spanish text spurred an influential cultural conversation about contemporary French literary norms. *Le Cid* was first performed at the Marais in January 1637. Corneille had been searching, since 1636, for a tragi-comic subject in either Spanish romance or *comedia*, and settled on Guillén de Castro’s play *Las Mocedades del Cid* (1605-1615).⁴¹² Guillén de Castro himself drew on sources ranging from medieval chronicles, to the Spanish romance

⁴⁰⁵ Alicia Yllera Fernández, “Cuando los traductores desean ser traidores,” 650.

⁴⁰⁶ Alicia Yllera Fernández, “Cuando los traductores desean ser traidores,” 645-646.

⁴⁰⁷ Jean Baudoin, ctd. Ilana Zinguer, “De la théorie à la pratique...” 88.

⁴⁰⁸ I use terms such as “infidelity” in this chapter in accordance with my view, laid out in my introduction, that this term is always relative; in this case, I am juxtaposing the kinds of departures from source texts that are common among Spanish prose translators with the kinds of infidelities practiced by “belles infidèles” translators such as d’Ablancourt.

⁴⁰⁹ Cf. Nicolas Perrot d’Ablancourt, *Les Commentaires de César* (1650). Ctd. Alicia Yllera Fernández, “Cuando los traductores desean ser traidores,” 644.

⁴¹⁰ Mme Gillot de Saintonge, Transl., “Au Lecteur,” *La Diane de Montemayor, mise en nouveau langage. Avec une idille sur le mariage de Mme la duchesse de Lorraine, et des lettres en vers burlesques* (Paris: Vve D. Hortemels, 1699), Bibliothèque nationale de France, département Réserve des livres rares, Y2-75929.

⁴¹¹ Mme Gillot de Saintonge, Transl., “Au Lecteur.”

⁴¹² Pierre Corneille, *Le Cid (1637-1660)*, Edited by Georges Forestier (Paris: Société des Textes Français Modernes, 2001), xiv.

tradition, to Renaissance editions and rewritings of these older materials.⁴¹³ According to Juan Luis Suárez, Guillén's work is characterized by his skillful "fusión de géneros," a process through which he places the disordered, unspecific chronology of the romance versions of the Cid story into a more coherent temporal framework, thus historicizing the romance material.⁴¹⁴ Of course, Corneille's version of *Le Cid* famously sparked a massive literary *querelle* in which the tragicomedy was critiqued for its lack of adherence to the classical unities, as well as its violations of *bienséance*.⁴¹⁵

In Corneille's efforts to defend himself against these allegations, he takes two different approaches. The first is to appeal to the historicity of the romance materials upon which Guillén's work is based. For instance, in responding to a letter by Georges de Scudéry in which Scudéry criticizes the speed with which the character Chimène recovers from the death of her father, Corneille replies by providing the texts of two Spanish romances that support the interpretation:

Deux Romances Espagnols que je vous donneray en suite de cet advertisement, parlent encor plus en sa [Chimène] faveur. Ces sortes de petits Poëmes sont comme des originaux descousus de leurs anciennes Histoires, & je serois ingrat envers la memoire de cette Heroïne, si apres l'avoir fait cognoistre en France, & m'y estre fait cognoistre par elle, je ne taschois de la tirer de la honte qu'on luy a voulu faire. Je vous donne donc ces pieces justificatives de la reputation où elle a vescu, sans dessein de justifier la façon dont je l'ay fait parler François...⁴¹⁶

Citing these romances on his behalf, and appealing to the esteem in which the Spanish romance tradition holds Chimène, Corneille refers to them as "des originaux descousus de leurs anciennes Histoires." He paints the romances as historical documents, but of a lesser, more primitive nature. Corneille also, at various points, argues that he could not dispense with other plot points because they are part of the historical record. At the end of the play, Guillén's version has Chimène agreeing to marry her father's killer, Rodrigo; Corneille says of this shocking development:

Il est Historique, et il a plû en son temps ; mais bien seurement il déplaiseroit au nostre... Pour ne pas contredire l'Histoire, j'ay crû ne me pouvoir dispenser d'en jeter quelque idée, mais avec incertitude de l'effect, et ce n'estoit que par là que je pouvois accorder la bien-seance du Theatre avec la verité de l'évenement.⁴¹⁷

These ideas are often repeated: what is in the play that does not concur with contemporary French tastes, is taken from history (or simply from his source text) and thus cannot be changed. He sometimes appeals to Guillén's superior knowledge of Spanish history, as when he refers to

⁴¹³ On Guillén de Castro's sources, cf. John G. Weiger, "Sobre la originalidad e independencia de Guillén de Castro." *Hispanófila*, no. 31 (1967): 1–15; and Juan Luis Suárez, "La historización de un mito: el tiempo como problema y como solución en Las mocedades del Cid." *Revista Canadiense De Estudios Hispánicos* 26, no. 3 (2002): 493-509. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27763784>.

⁴¹⁴ Juan Luis Suárez, "La historización de un mito," 495.

⁴¹⁵ A collection of the main documents in this *Querelle* can be found in Jean-Marc Civardi, Ed., *La Querelle du Cid (1637-1638): Édition critique intégrale* (Paris: Champion, 2004).

⁴¹⁶ Pierre Corneille, *Le Cid*, ed. Georges Forestier, 110-111.

⁴¹⁷ Pierre Corneille, *Le Cid*, ed. Georges Forestier, 124.

“D. Guillen de Castro qui a traité ce Sujet avant moy, & qui devoit mieux connoistre que moy quelle estoit l’authorité de ce premier Monarque de son país...”⁴¹⁸ His deference to the author of his source text in this matter is considerably different from the way that French translators generally approached Spanish texts at this time with an attitude of corrective disgust, as we have seen above.

Similarly, another part of the criticism lodged against Corneille was that *Le Cid* was a mere translation of Guillén, and thus not worthy of Corneille’s excessive boasting about his own originality in the prefatory materials to the first edition.⁴¹⁹ In response to these criticisms, in a 1648 “Avertissement,” Corneille promises to provide direct references to all the parts of the original text that he uses in his own:

...quantité de mes amis ayant jugé à propos que je rendisse conte au public de ce que j’avois emprunté de l’Auteur Espagnol dans cet Ouvrage, & m’ayant tesmoigné le souhaiter, j’ay bien voulu leur donner cette satisfaction. Vous trouverez donc tout ce que j’en ay traduit imprimé d’une autre lettre, avec un chiffre au commencement, qui servira de marque de renvoy pour trouver les Vers Espagnols au bas de la mesme page.⁴²⁰

It is interesting that Corneille first refers to these sections of the original text first as “emprunté,” and then as “traduit,” a reflection of the vacillating status of his work. His ultimate aim seems to be to show that even if certain sections of the text are translated, these make up a minority of the work (and are some of the least inventive parts of the play). As a further effort to defend himself against charges of unoriginality, Corneille showed Guillén de Castro’s Spanish text to Cardinal Richelieu, later advertising this fact as evidence that his own play was sufficiently original.⁴²¹ However, I would argue that the criticisms that the play is translated are less critiques of translation *per se*, than of the particular kind of translation Corneille is practicing—namely, an overly faithful kind, that fails to replace Spanish garments with French ones.

In these debates over *Le Cid*, we can see how Corneille’s approach to his Spanish source text comes into conflict with the expectations of the literati and members of the Académie. It is no accident that these debates occurred in relation to a play based on Spanish material, or that Corneille’s subsequent plays—the first of which, *Horace*, is dedicated to Richelieu—were based on classical and religious historical material. While the prevailing trends of the era require the ritualized re-dressing of Spanish works in the garments of French literary culture, Corneille’s *Le Cid* goes against the grain. Paradoxically, Corneille’s refusal to identify his work as a translation, or to embrace the methods of the era’s *belle infidèle* translators, makes him *more* faithful to his source text than a translator like Saintonge, above. Rather than rewriting the parts of Guillén de Castro’s text that highlight the cultural and literary differences between medieval Spanish culture and modern French *bienséance*, Corneille reproduces these differences, insisting that he has an obligation to do so. In doing so, he calls into question the normative literary values exemplified by the Académie. Of course, Corneille ultimately rewrote the play to bring it in line with the classical unities, and to remove some of the more offensive violations of *bienséance*. But the

⁴¹⁸ Pierre Corneille, *Le Cid*, ed. Georges Forestier, 126.

⁴¹⁹ Jean-Marc, Civardi, Ed. *La Querelle du Cid*.

⁴²⁰ Pierre Corneille, *Le Cid*, ed. Georges Forestier, 115-116.

⁴²¹ Timothy Murray, “Theatrical Legitimation: Forms of French Patronage and Portraiture,” *PMLA* 98, no. 2 (1983): 173.

quarrel over the play is an important illustration of the almost mandatory nature of translational infidelity when it comes to Spanish source texts at this moment in time.

Of course, as I have mentioned, there was one important exception to the generally negative assessment of Spanish authors: Miguel de Cervantes. Whereas Corneille's Spanish source text is deeply rooted in the romance tradition (and he defends it as such), Cervantes' critique of romance in *Don Quixote* strongly associated him with modernity in the eyes of the French literati. In the Academician François de Callières' 1688 treatise *Histoire poétique de la guerre nouvellement déclarée entre les Anciens et les Modernes*, an allegorical battle takes place between the ancient and modern authors, in order to settle the Quarrel of the Ancients and Moderns⁴²² once and for all. Cervantes plays an important role in Callière's treatise as a whole; he is elected head of the Italian and Spanish Modern authors in the treatise, with the Italian Orators vowing to follow him, hoping "que celui qui avoit si heureusement défait tous les Amadis & les autres Romans de l'ancienne Chevalerie, par son Roman inimitable de *Dom Quixotte de la Manche*, pourroit encore vaincre Ciceron & Démosthènes..."⁴²³ According to the Orators, Cervantes' experience as the novelistic conqueror of the medieval romance qualifies him to be the conqueror of rhetorical antiquity as well; he is the Modern Orator *par excellence*.

At the end of Callières' treatise, the god Apollo delivers judgment on a wide variety of poets and orators both ancient and modern, in a scene worthy of *Don Quixote*'s book-burning episode. Apollo banishes "tous Magiciens, Sorciers, Enchanteurs, Fées, & autres idées extravagantes des Romans de Chevalerie";⁴²⁴ and as for Cervantes:

Il met Miquel de Cervantes non seulement à la tête de tous les Auteurs de Romans Comiques, d'Histoires amoureuses, & de nouvelles galantes ; mais il le declare encore le premier, le plus spirituel & le plus judicieux de tous les Auteurs de sa Nation...⁴²⁵

The elevation of Cervantes in these superlative terms reflects a general sense in the treatise that Cervantes is not simply the best of the foreign Moderns, but so excellent that he becomes a kind of honorary Frenchman as well. His influence over the French can be seen in a scene in which the French Moderns sit in judgment of La Calprenède, a contemporary author of long heroic romances. Cervantes speaks strongly in La Calprenède's defense, to great effect:

Cette declaration de Cervantes... imposa silence à Balsac & à tous les Avocats François, qui craignirent que Cervantes ne fit contr'eux & contre leurs ouvrages, une Critique aussi ingenieuse que celle qu'il a faite contre les Romans de Chevalerie, dans son beau Roman de *Dom Quixote*...⁴²⁶

⁴²² Major works on the Ancients and Moderns include: Joan DeJean, *Ancients Against Moderns: Culture Wars and the Making of a Fin de Siecle* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997); and Hans Baron's seminal article, "The Querelle of the Ancients and the Moderns as a Problem for Renaissance Scholarship," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 20, no. 1 (1959): 3-22.

⁴²³ François de Callières, *Histoire poétique de la guerre : nouvellement déclarée entre les Anciens et les Modernes* (Paris: Pierre Aubotin, Pierre Embry, and Charles Clousier, 1688), 66-67.

⁴²⁴ François de Callières, *Histoire poétique de la guerre...*, 244.

⁴²⁵ François de Callières, *Histoire poétique de la guerre...*, 255.

⁴²⁶ François de Callières, *Histoire poétique de la guerre...*, 151.

After Cervantes' speech, the Avocats François decide in La Calprenède's favour. Thus, not only is Cervantes the best author of his nation, but his word is law in matters of French national literature as well.

The gradual adoption of Cervantes as an honorary French author can be traced through a variety of seventeenth-century literary treatises. He appears, for instance, in *La Bibliothèque Française* (1667), an attempt by Charles Sorel (the author of *Francion* turned Historiographe de France) to definitively establish a schema of French literary genres, and French literary history. While Sorel mentions Latin, Greek, and Italian authors as eminent exempla in a variety of genres, mentions of Spain are generally more rare.⁴²⁷ An exception is the section on “des romans de chevalerie et de bergerie,” which contains a narrative about the origin of the *roman* in Spanish and French that connects the literary genre to the language(s) in which such works were written—that is, “la langue corrompue du langage Latin ou Romain.”⁴²⁸ Among the chivalric works he lists as most highly regarded in France (Perceforest, Lancelot du Lac), he also includes the *Amadis de Gaule*.⁴²⁹ *Don Quixote*, by contrast, is listed in a separate section titled “Des romans comiques,” among various picaresque works: “Les Espagnols sont les premiers qui ont fait des Romans vraisemblables et divertissants: L'ingénieur Dom Quichotte de la Manche ouvrage de Michel de Cervantès est un agréable Satire contre les Romans de Chevalerie...”⁴³⁰ By way of justifying his inclusion of *Don Quixote* in a catalog titled *La Bibliothèque Française*, Sorel says: “Je nomme des Livres qui sont Espagnols d'origine, mais qui ayant été faits Français par la Traduction peuvent tenir leur rang en ce lieu.”⁴³¹ This is an unusual explanation; though there are works in Italian, Latin, and Greek included throughout the work, Sorel does not include any such comment about them. Evidently, certain Spanish works—like Cervantes' “Satire contre les Romans de Chevalerie”—are such valuable literary contributions, and their translations so worthy, that these works can become part of the “Bibliothèque Française.”

At the same time, despite the widely lauded modernity of Cervantes' critique of chivalric romance in *Don Quixote*, elsewhere in Sorel's work we can see a certain ambivalence about the demodé status of romance, given its French origins. In Sorel's *Remarques* accompanying the “Premier livre” of the 1633 revised satire *Le Berger extravagant*, he expands on his views about the history of the *roman* beyond the comments about *Don Quixote* in the *Bibliothèque française*. Sorel's explanation of the *roman*⁴³² emphasizes that the genre was a French, rather than a Spanish, invention, in terms that are strongly reminiscent of Herberay's preface to the *Amadis de Gaule*, and the prefaces to the French *Orlando Furioso* translations:

⁴²⁷ Charles Sorel, *La Bibliothèque Française: 1667*, Edited by Filippo D'Angelo, Mathilde Bombart, Laurence Giavarini, et al. (Paris: Honoré Champion Éditeur, 2015). Sorel also regards Italian authors critically; in another of Sorel's works *De la connaissance des bons livres* (1671), he says of Ariosto: “On y trouve beaucoup d'impudicité et d'autres vices. [...] Pour les discours ils ne sont propres qu'à entretenir des paysans et des valets.” Ctd. Florence Lautel-Ribstein et al., “Poésie,” 1020.

⁴²⁸ Charles Sorel, *La Bibliothèque Française*, 232.

⁴²⁹ Charles Sorel, *La Bibliothèque Française*, 233.

⁴³⁰ Charles Sorel, *La Bibliothèque Française*, 249.

⁴³¹ Charles Sorel, *La Bibliothèque Française*, 250.

⁴³² Sorel's understanding of the word “roman” is more complex than it is possible to elucidate here. For instance, the *Remarques* accompanying the “Premier livre” of the 1633 revised *Berger extravagant* describe the story of “le berger Lysis” as a *histoire* rather than a *roman*; Daniel Syrový helpfully clarifies that the distinction, which rests on the greater *vraisemblance* of the *histoire*, is related to the work's metafictionality and intertextuality—what is imitated is, in Sorel's view, *véritable* in the sense that it is based on “real” books. For a further discussion of the terms “histoire,” “roman,” and “anti-roman” in Sorel's work, see Syrový 2013: 46-57.

Ce ne seroit pas estre assez subtil de dire que le mot Roman vient du mot Espagnol, *Romanzo*,⁴³³ qui signifie un conte fabuleux, veu qu'il y en a assez qui soustiennent que la langue Françoise est plus ancienne que l'Espagnole. Il faut plustost croire que les Espagnols ont pris de nous cette façon de parler...⁴³⁴

Sorel goes on to recount the narrative of the Roman settlement of Gaul and the emergence of a new language called *Roman*, after which “les Livres de Cour” were named. He adds disparagingly that it is logical that romances are named after a language, since in them one finds only “des compliments et des amourettes,” empty words without instructional value.⁴³⁵ However, despite Sorel’s belittling remarks, it is notable that he takes the time to recount the evidence that such works were a French invention, rather than a Spanish one. Sorel goes on to give a brief account of the romance’s relationship to the Gaulish origins of France, citing Fauchet’s account of the Carolingian etymology of the word *roman*:

L’origine que je donne du mot de Roman est prise de Fauchet, qui n’en peut trouver de meilleure. Il dit que Baptiste Giraldi pense que les Romains ont pris leur nom de Rheims, parce que le Livre que Turpin Archevesque de cette ville a composé de la vie de Charlemagne, a donné plus de sujet que pas un aux Trouverres pour exercer leur esprit, comme si le mot de Roman venoit de *Rhemensis* ; mais il faut croire que cet Italien s’est trompé, et que son ethymologie est trop esloignée.⁴³⁶

By attributing Fauchet’s mistaken account of the Turpinian origins of the word “Roman” to Baptiste Giraldi, Sorel is able to repeat this conveniently nationalist etymology, while also displacing its dubious scholarly foundation onto an Italian rather than a Frenchman.

In sum, Sorel wishes to distance himself from the empty “compliments” and “amourettes” that characterize romance as an (in his view) antiquated literary form; he also wants to celebrate the modernity of Cervantes’ *Don Quixote*, and to build Cervantes into the pantheon of writers in the *Bibliothèque Française*. But at the same time, antiquated though romance may be, it also forms an important part of the French literary historiography that Sorel is attempting to establish. And, as I have discussed in Chapters 2 and 3, affirming the French origins of the romance genre was an important part of the vernacular French literary project throughout the sixteenth century. These conflicting motivations characterize the seventeenth-century translations of *Don Quixote*; but before examining these translations, I will turn to consider the internal aspects of Cervantes’ novel that further overdetermine its French reception as both a romance, and as the modern antithesis of romance.

⁴³³ Sic.

⁴³⁴ Though, for clarity, I use here the work’s best-known title *Le Berger Extravagant*, my comments and citations refer to a recent critical edition of Sorel’s “revised and augmented” second edition, which bore the pointed title *L’anti-Roman, Ou, L’histoire du berger Lysis*. See Charles Sorel, *L’anti-Roman, Ou, L’histoire du berger Lysis, Accompagnée de ses remarques: Seconde édition du Berger Extravagant revue et augmentée par l’auteur*, Edited by Anne-Elisabeth Spica (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2014), 75.

⁴³⁵ “...ce qui fut tres-judicieusement fait, de les appeler seulement du nom d’une langue : car de tels Livres ne contiennent que langage ; Je veux dire que l’on n’y apprend que des compliments et des amourettes, sans rien y voir qui nous puisse instruire.” Charles Sorel, *L’anti-roman*, 75.

⁴³⁶ Charles Sorel, *L’anti-roman*, 75-76.

II. Tilting at Turpin: Romance Textual Transmission in Cervantes' Don Quixote

The French embrace of Cervantes' *Don Quixote* as part of the "Bibliothèque Française" might seem, at first, perverse, since the novel is so rooted in the particularities and problems of nascent Spanish nationhood. Anthony Cascardi has described *Don Quixote* as a novel in which "Cervantes' critical engagement with romance... acts in the service of a critique of the national political imaginary."⁴³⁷ Specifically, discussions of romance in the novel call attention to the fantastical stories buttressing the "imagined community" (or more accurately, the imagined community-in-progress) of Spain. Cascardi argues that what is at stake in discussions of romance in Part I—aesthetic questions about the ideal composition of fictions—differs significantly from the way Part II interrogates the "imaginary force of the national romance."⁴³⁸ In *Don Quixote*, Cascardi shows, romance episodes evolve into opportunities for reflection on the promise, and the impossibility, of a community in which the many internal divisions of the Spanish state are reconciled into coherence and stability. With this reading in mind, it is unsurprising that France and the French have a minimal role in the novel. Warren Boutcher has called attention to the fact that in the world of *Don Quixote*, successful scenes of textual transmission are invariably Hispano-Moorish or Hispano-Italian in nature; French books make up a very minor part of the novel's many intertextual references, except when mediated through other languages.⁴³⁹

But while French works are little remarked in the text of *Don Quixote*, the French appreciation for Cervantes and *Don Quixote* is prominently featured; one of the *aprobaciones* for Part II of the novel, by the licenciado Márquez Torres, describes a visit between the Cardinal Archbishop of Toledo and the French ambassador to Spain, accompanied by "muchos caballeros franceses":

... apenas oyeron el nombre de Miguel de Cervantes, cuando se comenzaron a hacer lenguas, encareciendo la estimación en que así en Francia como en los reinos sus confinantes se tenían sus obras: *La Galatea*, que alguno dellos tiene casi de memoria, la primera parte desta [Don Quixote] y las *Novelas*.⁴⁴⁰

(Márquez Torres goes on to say that this strong appreciation for Cervantes by a foreign audience highlights just how underappreciated (financially and otherwise) the author is in his own country.) This French enthusiasm for Cervantes continues today, and as a result, the French reception of *Don Quixote* from the seventeenth century up to the present has received a considerable amount of critical attention in recent years.⁴⁴¹ This is usually taken to be more

⁴³⁷ Anthony J. Cascardi, *Cervantes, Literature, and the Discourse of Politics* (University of Toronto Press, 2012), 180.

⁴³⁸ Anthony Cascardi, *Cervantes, Literature, and the Discourse of Politics*, 181.

⁴³⁹ Warren Boutcher, "Transnational Cervantes: Text, Performance, and Transmission in the world of *Don Quixote*," In *Seventeenth-Century Fiction: Text and Transmission*, edited by Jacqueline Glomski and Isabelle Moreau (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 103.

⁴⁴⁰ Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quijote de La Mancha*, Book II, Edited by Luis Andrés Murillo (Madrid: Editorial Castalia, 1984), 30.

⁴⁴¹ Cf. Clara Foz and María Sierra Córdoba Serrano. "Dynamique historique des (re)traductions du Quijote en français: questions méthodologiques et premiers résultats," *Meta: Journal des Traducteurs* 50.3 (August 2005): 1042-1050. The novel is also mentioned throughout in *Histoire des traductions en langue française: XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles (1610-1815)*, Edited by Yves Chevrel, Annie Cointre, and Yen-Mai Tran-Gervat. Paris: Éditions Verdier, 2014.

evidence of the novel's universally recognized greatness, than proof of any particular French understanding of, or affinity for, *Don Quixote* itself.

But Cervantes' engagement with the continental romance tradition in *Don Quixote* has more to do with France than is usually acknowledged, and it colors the French reception of the novel in ways that have not previously been studied. Cervantes alludes at numerous points to the ways in which French and Spanish nationalist takes on the Matter of France, and the Battle of Roncesvalles in particular (which I discussed in Chapter 3), are a principal cause for the confusion of fantasy and reality that is at the root of Don Quixote's madness. For Cervantes, literary works based on the Matter of France are prime examples of the irresponsible (in his view) textual transmission that characterizes the romance tradition. Translations and continuations are the tools of this kind of transmission, and are capable of transforming their source material beyond all recognition and erasing its original literary value. At the same time, the *Orlando innamorato* and *Orlando furioso* are proof that such practices can also lead to highly worthy results. Thus, while the "sane" characters in *Don Quixote* often critique literary practices associated with romance textual transmission, Part I of the novel also frequently imitates, references, and even invites these practices. Part II, however, takes a much less tolerant position to such practices, reacting to Alónso Fernandez Avellaneda's continuation, published in 1614.

Perhaps the most famous scene in Part I where *Don Quixote* reckons with the continental romance tradition is Chapter 6, in which the priest and the barber review the tomes in Quixote's library to determine which deserve to be kept, and which deserve to be burned. Quixote himself exhibits a preference for all kinds of romances, from a variety of languages and spanning both recent works and older medieval ones. Boutcher has argued that one of the criteria observed by this impromptu committee is whether the books are "Spanish 'originals'" as opposed to translations or continuations; moreover, they favor works that "emulate prestigious Italian models and eschew or heavily mediate French 'matters.'"⁴⁴² However, things are not quite so simple. The priest and the barber set out a complex, sometimes contradictory set of opinions on the acceptability of translation and continuation. It is true that the first four books of the *Amadís* are pardoned as "el mejor de todos los libros que de este género se han compuesto,"⁴⁴³ while continuations like *Esplandián* and *Amadís of Greece* are not, since, as the priest says, "no le ha de valer al hijo la bondad del padre."⁴⁴⁴ The priest's approach to derivative works, however, is more complex when it comes to Ariosto and Boiardo. The priest pardons the *Espejo de caballerías*, a very free prose translation of the *Orlando Innamorato* (which he identifies as the story of "el señor Reinaldos de Montalbán con sus amigos y compañeros, más ladrones que Caco, y los doce pares, con el verdadero historiador Turpin"⁴⁴⁵). The priest condemns this book to mere exile, rather than to the flames,

...porque tienen parte de la invención del famoso Mateo Boyardo, de donde también tejíó su tela el cristiano poeta Ludovico Ariosto; al cual, si aquí le hallo, y que habla en otra

⁴⁴² Warren Boutcher, "Transnational Cervantes: Text, Performance, and Transmission in the world of *Don Quixote*," In *Seventeenth-Century Fiction: Text and Transmission*, edited by Jacqueline Glomski and Isabelle Moreau (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 102-103.

⁴⁴³ Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quijote de La Mancha*, Book I, Edited by Luis Andrés Murillo (Madrid: Editorial Castalia, 1984), 111.

⁴⁴⁴ Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quijote de La Mancha*, Book I, 112.

⁴⁴⁵ Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quijote de La Mancha*, Book I, 113-114.

lengua que la suya, no le guardaré respeto alguno; pero si habla en su idioma, le pondré sobre mi cabeza.⁴⁴⁶

The priest, here, seems to be suggesting a division between two types of works: those like Boiardo's *Orlando innamorato*, whose "invention" can be successfully transmitted through free translations such as the *Espejo de caballerías*; and those like the *Orlando furioso*, whose language forms an inextricable part of its literary value. The acceptability of a translation is not really determined by the extent to which it imitates Italian models or mediates French matters; rather, it depends on whether the source text's worth lies in its language or its "invention."

By treating Ariosto and Boiardo separately, the priest makes it clear that he does not consider the *Orlando innamorato* and *Orlando furioso* to be part of the works related to the "Matter of France," which he condemns as a whole, with particular distaste for depictions of the Roncesvalles episode. The terms of his condemnation slide from a critique of translation as a whole, to a critique of the Matter of France as a genre, in a way that shows how he regards the Matter of France as particularly implicated in negative translation practices:

...le perdonáramos al señor capitán que no le hubiera traído a España y hecho castellano; que le quitó mucho de su natural valor, y lo mesmo harán todos aquellos que los libros de verso quisieren volver en otra lengua: que, por mucho cuidado que pongan y habilidad que muestren, jamás llegarán al punto que ellos tienen en su primer nacimiento. Digo, en efecto, que este libro, y todos los que se hallaren que tratan destas cosas de Francia, se echen y depositen en un pozo seco, hasta que con más acuerdo se vea lo que se ha de hacer dellos, ecutando a un *Bernardo del Carpio* que anda por ahí, y a otro llamado *Roncesvalles*; que éstos, en llegando a mis manos, han de estar en las del ama, y dellas en las del fuego, sin remisión alguna.⁴⁴⁷

The barber provides a further gloss on the priest's reasoning here, saying, "...era el cura tan buen cristiano y tan amigo de la verdad, que no diría otra cosa por todas las del mundo."⁴⁴⁸ By specifically condemning *Bernardo del Carpio* to the flames, the priest shows that he is not merely opposed to French versions of the Matter of France (which, as I showed in Chapter 3, were viewed in Spain as French propaganda); indeed, he reacts to Spanish versions of the story even more violently. The prosaic translation of poetry, according to this passage, goes hand in hand with the tendency to mingle historical fact with romance nonsense indiscriminately; and these faults are found in both Spanish and French versions of the Matter of France.

Indeed, Don Quixote's belief in the patently unbelievable aspects of the Roncesvalles stories often creates problems for his sane listeners, who are forced to admit that supposedly historical accounts of these events seem unlikely to be true. This can be seen, for instance, in Chapter 49, in which the canon of Toledo and Don Quixote debate the veracity of books of chivalry. When the canon gives Don Quixote a speech about the dangers of chivalry, and encourages him to read Scripture or classical history instead, Don Quixote replies with a long discourse that mingles factual dimensions of chivalric literature with patently fantastical elements. He argues that the stories contained in the *Amadís* or *Fierabras* must be true, saying, "Y si es mentira, también lo debe de ser que no hubo Héctor, ni Aquiles, ni la guerra de Troya, ni

⁴⁴⁶ Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quijote de La Mancha*, Book I, 114.

⁴⁴⁷ Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quijote de La Mancha*, Book I, 114-115.

⁴⁴⁸ Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quijote de La Mancha*, Book I, 115.

los doce Pares de Francia, ni el rey Artús de Inglaterra, que anda hasta ahora convertido en cuervo...⁴⁴⁹ He goes on to argue that there is physical evidence of these characters and their adventures: "...en Roncesvalles está el cuerno de Roldán, tamaño como una grande viga; de donde se infiere que hubo Pierres, que hubo Cides, y otros caballeros semejantes..."⁴⁵⁰ The canon, impressed by Don Quixote's deep knowledge of these texts, concedes that the Twelve Peers of France are real ("pero no quiero creer que hicieron todas aquellas cosas que el arzobispo Turpin dellos escribe"⁴⁵¹) as are El Cid, and Bernardo del Carpio; however, the canon says, "...pero de que hicieron las hazañas que dicen, creo que la hay muy grande."⁴⁵² This conversation bears a strong resemblance to Ariosto's references to Turpin's authority in *Orlando furioso*, which (as I discuss in Chapter 3) serve to draw attention to the dubious nature of the medieval historical tradition, with its local relics and its unreliable traditions. Quixote's mad mingling of the chivalric and the historical serves to point out the unbelievable aspects of the historiographical tradition, and the way that that tradition clearly draws upon the fabulous concoctions of chivalric romances like the *Amadís*.

Don Quixote's love of Roland and the characters of the Matter of France, insane though it might be, is apolitical. Though Cascardi (and others) suggest that *Don Quixote* is fundamentally about problems of Spanish nationhood, Quixote the character chooses his heroes on the basis of their supposed prowess in battle and love, rather than for nationalist reasons. We know that Don Quixote is an admirer of Bernardo del Carpio because in the first chapter of the novel, the narrator tells us both that Quixote prefers Amadís to El Cid, and that "Mejor estaba con Bernardo del Carpio, porque en Roncesvalles había muerto a Roldán el encantado..."⁴⁵³ I have also recounted in the previous chapter the episode in Chapter 26 where Quixote weighs whether to imitate Roland or Amadís and ultimately chooses Amadís, both because he disdains the cause of Roland's madness, and because Bernardo del Carpio defeated Roland at Roncesvalles. At other points, though, Quixote's admiration and emulation of Roland directly clash with the folk Spanish perception of Roland as French, and an enemy. For instance, in Chapter 9, Book II of *Don Quixote*, Sancho and Quixote encounter a peasant singing lines from a ballad ("*romance*"): "'Mala la hubistes, franceses/ en esa de Roncesvalles.'" ⁴⁵⁴ Don Quixote takes the words to be an ominous portent, identifying himself with the defeated Frenchmen. Sancho responds by mocking the knight in terms that both critique romance, and allude to the nationalist nature of such stories: "pero ¿qué hace a nuestro propósito la caza de Roncesvalles? Así pudiera cantar el romance de Calainos, que todo fuera uno para sucedernos bien o mal en nuestro negocio."⁴⁵⁵ Sancho's comment that the song could just as easily have been the ballad of Calainos is suggestive; in the *Romance del moro Calainos*, the Moorish lover of the infanta of Seville tries to bring her the head of three of the Twelve Peers of France, but is instead beheaded by Roland. Sancho's comment thus substitutes Roncesvalles (a story of Roland's defeat at Spanish hands) with a ballad in which Roland triumphs over Spain. This juxtaposition foregrounds the strangeness of

⁴⁴⁹ Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quijote de La Mancha*, Book I.49, 580.

⁴⁵⁰ Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quijote de La Mancha*, Book I.49, 580.

⁴⁵¹ Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quijote de La Mancha*, Book I, 582.

⁴⁵² Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quijote de La Mancha*, Book I, 583.

⁴⁵³ Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quijote de La Mancha*, Book I, 74.

⁴⁵⁴ Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quijote de La Mancha*, Book II, 102.

⁴⁵⁵ Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quijote de La Mancha*, Book II, 102.

the Spaniard Quixote's identification with the French knight Roland, while also suggesting that both ballads are equally irrelevant to Quixote and Sancho's present circumstances.⁴⁵⁶

In the episodes above, I have shown how Cervantes' critique of the modes of textual transmission associated with romance, particularly romances based on the Matter of France, becomes clear in the contrast between Don Quixote himself and other characters. But this critique is accompanied by metafictional imitations of, and intertextual references to, these very kinds of textual transmission, a fact that causes the *Quixote* itself to be received in France as one of the very romances it critiques. This is true despite the fact that Part II of *Don Quixote* goes to a great deal of effort to clarify that Part I is not intended to participate in the romance textual transmission that it references. Cervantes goes to such lengths to clarify this in Part II because of the continuation written by Alónso Fernandez Avellaneda⁴⁵⁷ and published in 1614, between Cervantes' Part I and Part II. Cervantes' criticisms of Avellaneda often take the form of decrying Avellaneda's characters as imposters, and Avellaneda's book itself as a pseudo-history. Cervantes' dedicatory letter to the Count of Lemos in Part II, for instance, begins by explaining that the author's friends urged him to publish the second book "para quitar el hámago y la náusea que ha causado otro don Quijote, que con nombre de segunda parte se ha disfrazado y corrido por el orbe..."⁴⁵⁸ Similarly, in Chapter 59 of Part II, Don Quixote overhears two men at an inn discussing Avellaneda's continuation, and in the course of Quixote's conversation with these men, in which he establishes his true identity, one of the men refers to Avellaneda as "[el] que ha querido usurpar vuestro nombre y aniquilar vuestras hazañas."⁴⁵⁹ The concern that Avellaneda's continuation poses an existential threat to the "real" Quixote and Sancho leads to clarifications or alterations, in Part II, to the metafictional references to textual transmission in Part I.

One example of such a reference is found in the conclusion to Book I of *Don Quixote*; the book ends with a return to the "found manuscript" narrative established earlier in the book, proclaiming that the narrative Quixote's third sally was presented by "un antiguo médico que tenía en su poder una caja de plomo, que, según él dijo, se había hallado en los cimientos derribados de una antigua ermita que se renovaba"⁴⁶⁰ in which there were Castilian verses in

⁴⁵⁶ Quixote, in these examples, ultimately proclaims the superiority of the Spanish knight Bernardo, but we have already seen that the saner characters cast doubt on the notion that Bernardo really killed Roland at Roncesvalles, acknowledging that this is likely a nationalist invention. We know that Cervantes took a particular interest in Bernardo; in the dedication to his posthumous Heliodoran romance *Los trabajos de Persiles y Sigismunda* (1617), Cervantes refers to his upcoming works as including a piece that he refers to as the "famoso Bernardo." Daniel Eisenberg has argued persuasively that this work would have been a prose romance, a chivalric companion piece to the amorous adventures of the *Persiles*. (Daniel Eisenberg, "El 'Bernardo' de Cervantes fue su libro de caballerías," *Anales Cervantinos* 21 (1983): 103. See also Daniel Eisenberg, *A Study of Don Quixote* (Newark, Del: Juan de la Cuesta, 1987).) Eisenberg further observes that Cervantes' characterization of Bernardo in his play *La casa de los zelos* depicts him as a historical Christian warrior and a military hero. (Eisenberg, "El 'Bernardo' de Cervantes..." 112-114.) As such, there is reason to believe that Cervantes' "famoso Bernardo" would have presented the character of Bernardo as a more historically grounded protagonist, rather than as the Roland-slayer of romances like the *Bernardo del Carpio* by Balbuena. Eisenberg's suggestion remains in the realm of speculation. But a Cervantine take on Bernardo that eschews the "madness" in nationalist pseudo-historical romances of the Matter of France, in favor of something closer to Boiardo and Ariosto, seems consistent with what we saw in the book-burning scene.

⁴⁵⁷ For scholarship on Cervantes and Avellaneda, see Joseph R. Jones, "Notes on the Diffusion and Influence of Avellaneda's 'Quixote,'" *Hispania* 56 (April 1, 1973): 229-37; and James Iffland, "Do We Really Need to Read Avellaneda?," *Cervantes* 21, no. 1 (2001): 67.

⁴⁵⁸ Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quijote de La Mancha*, Book II, 38.

⁴⁵⁹ Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quijote de La Mancha*, Book II, 487.

⁴⁶⁰ Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quijote de La Mancha*, Book I, 604.

Gothic script on parchment. The narrator emphasizes the immense philological labor required to decipher and describe the writing on this parchment, but promises that they will likely be published soon. The last line of the book is a quotation from *Orlando Furioso*: “Forsi altro canterà con miglior plectio.”⁴⁶¹ This seemingly refers to the tradition of leaving room for future versions of the “matter” being used at the present moment, very common in the romance tradition, as I discuss in Chapter 2. He returns to this citation from the *Furioso* in Chapter 1 of Book II,⁴⁶² where he describes Roland in such ungentlemanly terms that his interlocutor, the priest, expresses the opinion that Roland’s beloved, Angelica, was better off with the Moor Medoro after all. Quixote replies by saying that Angelica herself was “una doncella destraída, andariega y algo antojadiza,”⁴⁶³ continuing,

El gran cantor de su belleza, el famoso Ariosto, por no atreverse, o por no querer cantar lo que a esta señora le sucedió después de su ruin entrego, que no debieron ser cosas demasadamente honestas, la dejó donde dijo: “Y cómo del Catay recibió el cetro. / quizá otro cantará con mejor plectro.”⁴⁶⁴

Here, Cervantes places the line with which he concluded his first book into a specific narrative context, also translating it himself. This context makes it clear that Ariosto’s invitation to a continuator does not constitute any sense of authorship as a collaborative venture, but rather reflects Ariosto’s reluctance to treat the indelicate topic of Angelica and Medoro’s “not... overly virtuous” relationship. By re-contextualizing the quote from the *Furioso*, Cervantes makes it clear that to interpret it as literal incitement to subsequent derivative authorship is a mistake.

Of course, the framing device that Cervantes inserts at the beginning of Book I, Chapter 9, which establishes a fictional textual history, was interpreted as just such an incitement. According to this device, the first eight chapters of *Don Quixote* were not written by Cervantes but rather edited by him, from another text of unknown origin.⁴⁶⁵ The narrator (often identified

⁴⁶¹ Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quijote de La Mancha*, Book I, 608.

⁴⁶² There is another quote from the *Orlando Furioso* which appears in both Part I and Part II. In Chapter 13 of Part I, Don Quixote—in one of his first descriptions of his beloved Dulcinea—argues that her family is as illustrious as any other, saying, “Y no se me replique en esto, si no fuere con las condiciones que puso Cervino al pie del trofeo de las armas de Orlando, que decia: *Nadie las mueva/ que estar no pueda con Roldán a prueba*” (Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quijote de La Mancha*, Book I.13, 177). The same quotation appears in Chapter 66 of Part II, where Don Quixote is returning home after having been defeated by the Knight of the White Moon. Sancho suggests that they leave Quixote’s armor hanging from a tree in order to lighten their load, to which Quixote replies, “...cuélguense mis armas por trofeo, y al pie dellas, o alrededor dellas, grabaremos en los árboles lo que en el trofeo de las armas de Roldán estaba escrito: *Nadie las mueva que estar no pueda con Roldán a prueba*” (Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quijote de La Mancha*, Book II.66, 542).

⁴⁶³ Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quijote de La Mancha*, Book II, 51.

⁴⁶⁴ Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quijote de La Mancha*, Book II, 51-52.

⁴⁶⁵ For scholarship on the metafictional dimensions of *Don Quixote*, cf. Mancing, Howard. “Cide Hamete Benengeli vs. Miguel de Cervantes: The Metafictional Dialectic of *Don Quixote*.” *Cervantes: Bulletin of the Cervantes Society of America* 1.1-2 (1981): 63-81; Raymond S. Willis, Jr., *The Phantom Chapters of the “Quijote”* (New York: Hispanic Institute, 1953); E. C. Riley, “Three Versions of *Don Quixote*,” *Modern Language Review*, 68 (1973); “Narrators, Readers, and Other Characters in Don Quijote, by Elias L. Rivers.” *Cervantes* 2.1 (1982), 96-98; Johnson, Carroll B. “Phantom Pre-Texts and Fictional Authors: Sidi Hamid Benengeli, Don Quijote and the Metafictional Conventions of Chivalric Romances.” *Cervantes: Bulletin of the Cervantes Society of America* 27, no. 1 (2007): 179–200; Anderson, Ellen. “His Pen’s Christian Profession: Cide Hamete Writes the End of Don Quixote,” *Romance Languages Annual*(RLA)6 (1994): 406-412; López Navia, Santiago. *La ficción autorial en el “Quijote” y en sus continuaciones e imitaciones*. Madrid: Universidad Europea de Madrid-CEES, 1996.

as Cervantes) is worried by the difficult task of finding the remainder of the narrative, and believes that “...la malignidad del tiempo, devorador y consumidor de todas las cosas... o la tenía oculta o consumida.”⁴⁶⁶ However, the narrator suddenly realizes that the modernity of the books in Don Quixote’s library mean that the story must have taken place relatively recently—indeed, recently enough to be tracked down in living memory. The new Arabic manuscript by Cide Hamete Benengeli falls into the narrator’s hands through chance rather than any active pursuit on his part, and he delegates the translation to an unnamed Moor he finds in a cathedral cloister. Cervantes makes use of this device to explain his story’s lack of verisimilitude, saying that the only possible objection to the history’s truthfulness is the fact that its author is an Arab, and he likely downplayed the outrageous truth out of enmity toward Christians. Cervantes uses these layers of fictionalized textual mediation—a Moorish historian and his unnamed translator—to parody history’s relationship to verisimilitude, just as Ariosto did through different means in the *Furioso*. But while, as I have shown, Ariosto declined to use the kind of pseudo-historiographical framing device that Boiardo offers at the beginning of the *Innamorato*, Cervantes does participate in the tradition of offering up a “found manuscript” genealogy for his text.

For this reason, despite Cervantes’ disinterest in having *Don Quixote* itself treated as a romance source text, the framing device allows it to be treated in precisely this way. Indeed, the way that Avellaneda’s continuation builds upon Cervantes’ framing device bears a strong resemblance to Nicolas Herberay des Essarts’s use of Montalvo’s “found manuscript” narrative in the *Amadé*, which I discuss in Chapter 2. Like Herberay, Avellaneda simply describes another “found manuscript” from which the present book is taken, a manuscript of similar origin and treating the same characters:

El Sabio Alisolan historiador, no menos moderno que verdadero dize, que siendo expelidos los Moros Agarenos de Aragon, de cuya nación el decendia, entre ciertos Annales de historias hallò escrita en Arabigo la tercera salida que hizo del lugar del Argamesilla, el invicto hidalgo don Quixote de la Mancha, para yr a unas justas que se hazian en la insigne Ciudad de Çaragoça, y dize desta manera.⁴⁶⁷

The fact that Cervantes addresses Avellaneda’s continuation at length in his prologue and his conclusion (and of course throughout Book II) indicates he is aware of the problem his narrational strategy poses to his authorial claim, and greatly interested in finding a way to assert himself as the one true author of *Don Quixote* within the constraints he created.

Cervantes warns us in the prologue to Book II that Don Quixote himself will be “dilatado, y, finalmente, muerto y sepultado,” by the end of the book, “porque ninguno se atreva a levantarle nuevos testimonios, pues bastan los pastados...”⁴⁶⁸ He has decided that the best way to prevent future continuations is to kill off his protagonist, closing off Don Quixote’s fictional world by burying him deep in the ground. In the last chapter of the second book, Don Quixote dies having renounced his madness and the books of chivalry that caused it. The very last lines of the book go to Cide Hamete Benengeli and his pen, who emphasize that Don Quixote’s death should mean the end of his narrative potential:

⁴⁶⁶ Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quijote de La Mancha*, Book I.9, 141.

⁴⁶⁷ Alonso Fernandez de Avellaneda, *Segundo Tomo del Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quixote de La Mancha...* (Tarragona: Felibe Roberto, 1614), fol. 1^r.

⁴⁶⁸ Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quijote de La Mancha*, Book II, 37.

Viendo lo cual el cura, pidió al escribano le diese por testimonio como Alonso Quijano el Bueno, llamado comúnmente don Quijote de la Mancha, había pasado desta presente vida, y muerto naturalmente; y que el tal testimonio pedía para quitar la ocasión de algún otro autor que Cide Hamete Benengeli le resucitase falsamente, y hiciese inacabables historias de sus hazañas.⁴⁶⁹

Here the purpose of Cervantes, the narrator-editor, as defined in Book I (“to make men hate those false, absurd histories in books of chivalry”), has become the purpose of Cide Hamete Benengeli, the Moorish historian. Likewise, the promise made by Cervantes in the prologue of Book II to present Don Quixote “muerto y sepultado” has been fulfilled by Cide Hamete. This collapsing of voices seems designed to dismantle the layers of mediated authorship that allowed Avellaneda to challenge Cervantes’ status as the primary author.

However, this collapsing of voices also leads Cervantes to affirm Cide Hamete’s authority and reliability, changing him from the figure of the unreliable Moorish historian to the picture of historical authenticity. Cervantes’ eagerness to enforce his status as primary author leads him to reaffirm concepts of historical verisimilitude that he parodied in the first part of the novel. In Part II, by contrast, it is Avellaneda’s narrator who becomes the “lying historian,” and Cide Hamete Benengeli the reliable narrator. For instance, in Chapter 59 when Quixote and Sancho encounter the two readers of Avellaneda’s continuation at the inn, Sancho, upon hearing that Avellaneda has referred to Sancho’s wife by the wrong name, exclaims, “Donosa cosa de historiador!”⁴⁷⁰ One of the readers, Don Juan, exclaims in outrage that “...si fuera posible, se había de mandar que ninguno fuera osado a tratar de las cosas del gran don Quijote, si no fuese Cide Hamete su primer autor, bien así como mandó Alejandro que ninguno fuese osado a retratarle sino Apeles.”⁴⁷¹ Don Juan’s longing for exclusive rights over the characters that Cervantes created reflects the various internal means by which, in Part II, Cervantes attempts to enforce this exclusivity. In the remaining chapters in Part II, other characters often distinguish between the “true” and “false” Don Quixotes; in one such incident, a character describes Avellaneda’s version of Quixote as “el apócrifo”; the adventures written by Avellaneda as “falsas historias”; and Cide Hamete Benengeli as “flor de los historiadores.”⁴⁷²

Quixote himself, interestingly, takes a more moderate stance when contemplating his own portrayal by authors other than Cide Hamete Benengeli. While other characters seemingly mirror Cervantes’ desire to exclude the possibility of other continuations, Quixote himself merely asks that those portrayals do him justice: “Retrátame el que quisiere... pero no me maltrate; que muchas veces suele caerse la paciencia cuando la cargan de injurias.”⁴⁷³ In considering *Don Quixote*’s seventeenth-century French translations, we will see that though the translators are flagrantly unfaithful to Cervantes’ intentions in many respects, they do, in other cases, attempt to treat Don Quixote well, re-dressing him as an ambassador rather than as a helpless Spanish princess.

⁴⁶⁹ Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quijote de La Mancha*, Book II.74, 591.

⁴⁷⁰ Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quijote de La Mancha*, Book II.59, 486.

⁴⁷¹ Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quijote de La Mancha*, Book II.59, 489.

⁴⁷² Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quijote de La Mancha*, Book II.61, 507.

⁴⁷³ Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quijote de La Mancha*, Book II.59, 489.

III. *Cide Hamete in France: Romancing Don Quixote*

By looking at *Don Quixote*'s translations into French, we can see the long-term impact of romance literary practices had on the novel's French reception well into the nineteenth century. Critical opinion has long held (as it did with *Orlando Furioso*, I showed in the previous chapter) that the early translations misunderstood the novel; in this case, critics contend that the early translators transmitted a bowdlerized, overly lighthearted version of the story.⁴⁷⁴ Looking more carefully, however, we find something quite different: a scrupulous fidelity in the first translation; and in the second, the transformation of Cervantes' *Don Quixote* into a multi-volume literary cycle, including both translations and continuations, strongly reminiscent of the French receptions of the *Amadis* and the *Orlando Furioso*. Quite contrary to what typical periodizations of both French literature and translation practices might lead us to expect, it is actually the late seventeenth- and eighteenth-century translations that adopt a "found manuscript" device to extend and expand the narrative, relocating it to France.

In 1614, nine years after it was published in Spanish—and the same year as the publication in Spanish of Avellaneda's continuation—Part I of *Don Quixote* was translated into French for the first time. The translator of the first part was the work of César Oudin, who held the title of *Secrétaire-Interprete de sa Majesté ès langues Germanique, Italienne et Espagnolle*,⁴⁷⁵ and was the author of a grammar of the Spanish language (1597) and a *Thresor des deux langues française et espagnole* (1607).⁴⁷⁶ Cervantes' Book II was published in Spanish the following year, and its French translation was published three years later, in 1618, by a different French publishing house than the one that had printed Oudin's Part I. The translator of this second part was François de Rosset, the aspiring historiographer whose translations of *Orlando Innamorato* and *Orlando Furioso* I discussed in Chapter 3. Oudin's translation was already in its second edition when Rosset's translation was published; but most editions after Rosset's translation combined the two translations in one book.⁴⁷⁷

Oudin's work, heavily annotated and explicated, clearly bears the influence of his work as a philologist; the early twentieth-century scholar Maurice Bardon describes Oudin's translation as "une sorte de décalque, d'une littéralité fatigante."⁴⁷⁸ Oudin's involvement in the translation of the *Quixote* marks an interesting development in French translations of Spanish

⁴⁷⁴ A long tradition dating from nineteenth-century romanticism holds that early Quixote translations in France failed to understand the novel's inherent sadness, focusing too much instead on its comic aspects; cf. Maurice Bardon, "Avant-Propos," *"Don Quichotte" en France au XVIIe et au XVIIIe Siècle*, Tome I (Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, 1931), and 326. J. A. G. Ardila says, "...most critics agree that the French and English reception during the seventeenth century remained largely superficial, treating the novel only in its most farcical sense, giving rise to parodies and light theatrical adaptations of various episodes." (*The Cervantean Heritage: Reception and Influence of Cervantes in Britain* (London: Legenda, 2009), 66.) Some analysis of this particular problem can be found in Marc Charron, "De la question de la lisibilité des traductions françaises de Don Quijote," In *Doubts and Directions in Translation Studies: Selected Contributions from the EST Congress, Lisbon 2004*, Edited by Yves Gambier, Miriam Shlesinger, and Rade Gundis Stolze, 311-322 (Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2007).

⁴⁷⁵ Clara Foz, "(Re)traduction(s) et (Re)présentation(s): première et dernière sortie du Quijote en français," *Cadernos de Tradução* (2003) 11.1: 51.

⁴⁷⁶ For more on Oudin, see Marc Zuili, "César Oudin y la difusión del español en Francia en el siglo XVII," In *La Cultura del otro: español en Francia, francés en España*, Edited by Manuel Bruña Cuevas et al., 278-289 (Seville: Universidad de Sevilla, 2006).

⁴⁷⁷ For more on the Oudin-Rosset translation, see Liliane Picciola, "Traduire 'Don Quichotte' au début du XVIIIe siècle," *Revue Des Deux Mondes* (2001): 137-147.

⁴⁷⁸ Foz, "(Re)traduction(s)," 49.

works. Another translator whose work I have discussed, Gabriel Chappuys, (who translated both the *Amadis* and the *Orlando Furioso*) also held the title of *Secrétaire-interprète*; however, at the peak of his translational activity, he was a historiographer. The type of linguistic expertise that Oudin brought to the task of translating Cervantes is quite different from the expertise in reading and interpreting rhymed octavos that François de Rosset claimed for himself in the preface to his translation of the *Orlando Furioso*. Oudin's involvement thus marks a moment in which Spanish literature begins to receive the same kind of philological attention that had previously been turned on classical literature in the previous century. His translation of Part I was dedicated to Louis XIII.

This approach to translation was not, however, appreciated by all of Oudin's contemporaries. For example, the translator Vital d'Audiguier (who, like Rosset, translated Cervantes' *Novelas Ejemplares* in 1618) promotes his translation by proclaiming its infidelity in terms that implicitly critique translators like Oudin:

[II] faut confesser que les Espagnols ont quelque chose par-dessus nous en l'ordre, et en l'invention d'une histoire: mais en contréchange, ils sont bien éloignés aussi de la pureté de nos écrits... Ç'a été la cause que je n'ai point traduit cestui-ci motà mot, comme ceux qui pour acquérir la reputation d'entendre bien l'espagnol, font voir qu'ils n'entendent rien en leur propre langue.⁴⁷⁹

There are many examples of Oudin's literalism at the expense of comprehensibility in French, but this tendency is especially prominent in his treatment of instances of Spanish wordplay. In the interpolated pastoral story of Marcela and Grisóstomo, for instance, an uneducated shepherd named Pedro interrupts a conversation between Don Quixote and Sancho and group of shepherds. Pedro breathlessly relates that another shepherd (Grisóstomo) has killed himself out of unrequited love for the beautiful Marcela. During Pedro's narration, Don Quixote at several points interrupts to correct his errors; two such interjections hinge on the difference between "el cris" and "eclipse," and the other between "estil" and "esténil." In both cases, Pedro does not substitute a wrong word, but rather mispronounces the word he means to say (although his mispronunciations do resemble other words, namely *el crisis* and *estilo*). Oudin follows the same procedure for both words: he simply adds an "e" to the end of the Spanish mistake, even though that results in one word that makes some sense as an error ("la crise"), and one that is a noun rather than an adjective and thus nonsensical in context ("stile"):

CERVANTES	OUDIN
-----------	-------

⁴⁷⁹ Ctd. Yen-Mai Tran-Gervat, Frédéric Weinmann, et al., "Discours sur la traduction," 256.

<p>— Principalmente, decían que sabía la ciencia de las estrellas y de lo que pasan, allá en el cielo, el sol y la luna, porque puntualmente nos decía el cris del sol y de la luna.</p> <p>— <i>Eclipse se llama</i>, amigo, que no cris, el escurecerse esos dos luminares mayores —dijo don Quijote.</p> <p>Mas Pedro, no reparando en niñerías, prosiguió su cuento, diciendo:</p> <p>— Asimesmo adivinaba cuándo había de ser el año abundante o estil.</p> <p>— <i>Estéril queréis decir</i>, amigo —dijo don Quijote.</p> <p>— <i>Estéril o estil</i> —respondió Pedro—, todo se sale allá.⁴⁸⁰</p>	<p>« ...principalement on disait, qu'il sçavait la science des étoiles, & de ce que font au ciel le Soleil & la Lune, car il nous disait fort exactement la crise du Soleil et de la Lune. »</p> <p>« On appelle Éclipse, mon ami, & non pas crise, quand ces deux grands luminaires s'obscurcissent, » dit don Quichotte.</p> <p>Mais Pierre, ne s'arrêtant pas à ces petites niñeries,⁴⁸¹ poursuivit son conte, disant, « Aussi mesmement il devinait, quand l'année devait estre abondante ou stile. »⁴⁸²</p> <p>« Vous voulez dire stérile, mon ami, » dit don Quixote.</p> <p>« Stérile ou stile, » répondit Pierre, « ce m'est tout un. »⁴⁸³</p>
---	--

In this example, Oudin is not just translating word-for-word, but nonsense-word-for-nonsense-word, whereas other French translators search for wordplay equivalents in French or simply delete such exchanges.⁴⁸⁴ This is consistent with Oudin's approach in his *Refranes o proverbios espanoles traducidos en lengua francesa* (1605). In this work, Oudin translates a variety of Spanish proverbs word-for-word without attempting to duplicate the rhymes, though he does provide an equivalent French proverb where possible, and briefly glosses the meaning of more obscure proverbs in Spanish but not in French (see Figure 2). Oudin's approach is entirely focused on elucidating the source language, rather than on producing an eloquent or pleasurable French version of the source text.

Oudin does occasionally exhibit some unfaithful tendencies in his treatment of Cervantes' verse. He omits entirely several of the poems that begin Book I. But as for the others, he renders some almost word for word⁴⁸⁵ but treats others more freely. In at least one case he replaces an entire sonnet of Cervantes' with one of his own.⁴⁸⁶ He also omits some of the paratextual materials in Cervantes' original work, such as the dedication to the duke of Béjar and the introductory poems for Book I.⁴⁸⁷ In general, though, a strict fidelity to the letter of the Spanish text serves Oudin's purposes, however infelicitous the results might be in French. For as Oudin explains in the dedicatory epistle to Louis XIII, his real goal in producing the translation is to whet the royal appetite for Spanish lessons in the future:

...j'eusse bien désiré que vostre Majesté eust peu lire & entendre ce Chevalier errant en sa propre langue... & si vostre Majesté ne desdaigne de luy jeter une favorable & douce œillade, peut estre luy esmouvera il quelque envie de gouster sa langue originelle, en

⁴⁸⁰ Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quijote de La Mancha*, Book I.12, 162-163.

⁴⁸¹ The modern editor of Oudin's translation replaces "petites niñeries" with "puérlitiés."

⁴⁸² The modern editor of Oudin's translation replaces "stile" with "estile."

⁴⁸³ Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *L'ingénieux hidalgo Don Quichotte de La Manche*, Edited by Jean Cassou.

Transl. César Oudin and François de Rosset (Mayenne: J. Floch, 1940), 81.

⁴⁸⁴ The next French translator of Part I of *Don Quixote*, Filleau de Saint-Martin, probably objecting to the repetitive nature of the two almost identical exchanges, simply cuts the second entirely, replacing the contrast "abondante/stérile" with "bonne ou mauvaise." For the first, he uses "les éclisses" where Oudin uses "la crise."

⁴⁸⁵ Maurice Bardon, *"Don Quichotte" en France*, Tome I, 28.

⁴⁸⁶ Maurice Bardon, *"Don Quichotte" en France*, Tome I, 34.

⁴⁸⁷ Interestingly, Jean Cassou, the modern editor of the Pléaide edition of *Don Quixote*, who uses the Oudin-Rosset translations, restores these paratexts. See his explanation in Cassou 1940: 9-10.

laquelle il a bien meilleure grace qu'en la nostre. [...] Que si d'aventure, Vostre Majesté desire un jour d'en venir a ce point, je m'asseure qu'elle en recevra du contentement : ce luy sera une chose fort facile, & comme en jouant...⁴⁸⁸

One can certainly imagine Oudin using his translation of *Don Quixote* in the same way that he presumably used his other works of side-by-side translation, as a means of teaching Spanish to the French courtiers who desired to learn some, now that the language was fashionable.

But although Oudin had evidently envisioned himself translating the second part of the book, ultimately he did not do so.⁴⁸⁹ Rosset had already translated Cervantes' *Novelas ejemplares* in 1614 and his *Persiles y Sigismunda* in 1618. His translation of Part II was commissioned by a different bookseller than Jean Foüet, who had published Oudin's Part I, but three editions (in 1639, 1646, and 1665) placed the two parts together to form a single complete translation.⁴⁹⁰ In this way, the Oudin-Rosset "cycle" resembles the first generation of *Orlando* translations that I discussed in the previous chapter (though, in that case, Rosset's own translation, and the subsequent continuation that he authored, belonged to a subsequent generation). Though the two translations were completed by different translators, they were ultimately received and published as a single work.

Compared to Oudin, Rosset's translation is often described by scholars as unfaithful. Interestingly, one of the grounds for this criticism is the numerous errors that Rosset commits in his interpretation of the Spanish (for example, translating "tres noches" as "trois mois").⁴⁹¹ Mainly, though, Rosset's reputation for unfaithfulness largely comes by way of comparisons with Oudin's scrupulous word-for-word approach. For example, an editor of the two translations for the 1940 Pléiade Edition ascribes to the two translators mirror-image vices: "à Oudin une trop docile complaisance aux tournures espagnoles, d'où de nombreuses bizarreries; et à Rosset une tendance trop lâche à la paraphrase et au délayage."⁴⁹² An example of his tendency toward dilation can be seen in the passage from Part I that I previously cited, where Cervantes returns to clarify his citation from *Orlando Furioso* at the end of the first book:

CERVANTES	ROSSET
El gran cantor de su belleza, el famoso Ariosto, por no atreverse, o por no querer cantar lo que a esta señora le sucedió después de su ruin entrego, que no debieron ser cosas demasiadamente honestas, la dejó donde dijo: <i>Y</i>	Aussi le grand chantre de sa beauté, le fameux Arioste, pour n'oser, ou plutôt pour ne vouloir chanter ce qui succéda à cette dame Angélique , après qu'elle se fut si indignement abandonnée (& sans doute le succes de

⁴⁸⁸ Miguel de Cervantes, *L'Ingenieux Don Quixote de la Manche, compose par Michel de Cervantes, Traduit fidèlement d'Espagnol en François, et Dedié au Roy...*, Transl. Cesar Oudin (Paris: Jean Foüet, 1615), a.ii^{r-v}.

⁴⁸⁹ « ...si tu luy continue cette affection, le désir m'augmentera de contribuer à ton contentement tout ce qui me sera possible, je t'en prie, attendant un second Tome que je te donneray en bref. » Ctd. Maurice Bardon, "*Don Quichotte*" en France, 38, n.1.

⁴⁹⁰ This version of the translation, uniting the Oudin and Rosset translations, was also reprinted by Emile Gebhard in 1885, and by the Bibliothèque de la Pléiade in 1940.

⁴⁹¹ Cf. Bardon, 30-32; Alexandre Cioranescu, *Le Masque et le Visage* (Paris: Librairie Droz, 1983), 533-534. This is ironic since, as we have seen, Rosset provided a lengthy list of precisely such errors in the preface to his translation of the *Orlando Furioso*, which he used to chastise the previous translator, Gabriel Chappuys.

⁴⁹² Cervantes, *Don Quichotte de La Manche*, Ed. Cassou, 9. See also Bardon, on Rosset: "Il et moins scrupuleux, pourtant, que l'érudit César Oudin. Il ne vise pas toujours à rendre, mot pour mot, la phrase et les expressions du texte" (1931: 43); and on Oudin: "...à force de vouloir ajuster strictement sa prose à la prose castillane, il ne nous fournit par endroits qu'une sorte de décalque, d'une littéralité fatigante" ("*Don Quichotte*" en France, 28).

<i>cómo del Catay recibió el cetro / quizá otro cantará con mejor plectro.</i> ⁴⁹³	ses aventures dernières ne furent guères honnêtes) la laissa, sans parler plus d'elle, ainsi que ces vers le témoignent : <i>Quelque autre chantera sur sa plus douce lire / Qu'elle luy fait donner le sceptre de l'empire.</i> ⁴⁹⁴
---	---

Certainly, compared to Oudin, Rosset's translation is freer. But he is hardly practicing the kind of wholesale rewriting that is commonly associated with the *belle infidèle*.⁴⁹⁵

Indeed, given the fact that Oudin himself sometimes rewrites whole poems, the two translators' methods are not as far apart as they might seem; they are surprisingly similar, considering the differences in the two men's backgrounds and training. Alexandre Cioranescu remarks that given the disparity between the two translators, and the negative qualities of both translations, "On ne peut sentir qu'une admiration mêlée de compassion pour les lecteurs qui eurent l'entêtement et l'intelligence nécessaire pour deviner Cervantes à l'intérieur de ce paysage en ruines."⁴⁹⁶ However, Rosset showed such remarkable interest in the recuperation of the Matter of France, and vilification of Bernardo del Carpio, in his continuation of *Orlando Furioso* (which I discussed in Chapter 3), that it is rather more striking that Rosset hews so closely to his source text in this case, even when translating passages that directly and disparagingly reference the French at Roncesvalles. For instance, in the passage that I discussed above where Quixote and Sancho encounter a peasant singing a ballad about the French defeat at Roncesvalles, Rosset's translation is quite faithful:

CERVANTES	ROSSET
<p>Venía el labrador cantando aquel romance que dicen: <i>Mala la hubistes, franceses, en esa de Roncesvalles.</i></p> <p>“Que me maten, Sancho,” dijo en oyéndole don Quijote, “si nos ha de suceder cosa buena esta noche. ¿No oyes lo que viene cantando ese vilano?”</p> <p>“Si oigo,” respondió Sancho; “pero ¿qué hace a nuestro propósito la caza de Roncesvalles? Así pudiera cantar el romance de Calainos, que todo fuera uno para sucedernos bien o mal en nuestro negocio.”⁴⁹⁷</p>	<p>Ce labreur venoit chantant ce vau-de-vieille qui dit : <i>Vous eustes la male journée, François, au lieu de Roncevaux.</i></p> <p>« Je puisse mourir Sancho, » (dit alors Dom-Quichot) « si rien de bien nous succede cette nuit. N'entens-tu pas ce que chante ce Croquan ? »</p> <p>« Je l'entens fort bien », (respond Sancho) « mais que fait à nostre propos la déroutte de Roncevaux ? Il pourroit aussi bien chanter le Romance de Calainos. Ce seroit une mesme chose, & autant de mal ou de bien en recevrions nous de l'un que de l'autre. »⁴⁹⁸</p>

While Rosset shows a tendency toward explicitation or intensification here at several points (for instance, translating “Mala la hubistes” as “Vous eustes la male **journée**,” and “Si oigo” as “Je l'entens **fort bien**”), he makes no effort to modify or comment on the intertextual references to the ballad or the *Romance de Calainos*.

After the Oudin-Rosset translation, the next French translation of *Don Quixote* was credited to a translator named Filleau de Saint-Martin (perhaps a pseudonym), and published by the Maison Barbin beginning in 1677. This edition, finally completed in 1713 and then reprinted

⁴⁹³ Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quijote de La Mancha*, Book II, 51-52.

⁴⁹⁴ Miguel de Cervantes, *Seconde partie de l'histoire de l'ingenieux et redoubtable chevalier, Dom-Quichot de la Manche*, Translated by François de Rosset (Paris: Jacques du Clou and Denis Moreau, 1618), 17-18.

⁴⁹⁵ We also saw Nicolas Herberay des Essarts practicing this kind of drastic rewriting in Chapter 2.

⁴⁹⁶ Alexandre Cioranescu, *Le Masque et le visage*, 535.

⁴⁹⁷ Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quijote de La Mancha*, Book II, 102.

⁴⁹⁸ Cervantes, *Dom-Quichot de la Manche*, Transl. François de Rosset, 96.

more than 30 times in the next 75 years,⁴⁹⁹ was devoured by an eager French public, and was the edition known and referenced by authors like Voltaire, Rousseau, and Diderot. The Oudin-Rosset translation, as I have mentioned, was a success in France; but sixty years later, the language and style had become relatively archaic and (due to the two different translators) more fragmented than seventeenth-century readers had grown to expect.⁵⁰⁰ Filleau de Saint-Martin has been called a “belle infidèle,”⁵⁰¹ and his comments certainly lend themselves to this assessment. For instance, in the first volume published in 1677, Filleau criticized the previous translators’ unnecessary (in his view) fidelity to the original text: “...les manières de parler espagnoles, leurs Proverbes, et leurs Poësies demandent une autre expression en nostre Langue pour avoir le mesme sens et la mesme naïveté...”⁵⁰² Whereas Oudin authored a book whose sole purpose is to explicate Spanish proverbs, Filleau’s approach is generally to replace or omit them. Filleau’s more liberal approach to translation can be seen in comparison to Oudin’s translation of the passage from the Marcela and Grisóstomo episode, which I discussed above:

CERVANTES	UDIN	FILLEAU
<p>— Principalmente, decían que sabía la ciencia de las estrellas y de lo que pasan, allá en el cielo, el sol y la luna, porque puntualmente nos decía el cris del sol y de la luna.</p> <p>— Eclipse se llama, amigo, que no cris, el escurecerse esos dos luminares mayores —dijo don Quijote.</p> <p>Mas Pedro, no reparando en niñerías, prosiguió su cuento, diciendo:</p> <p>— Asimesmo adivinaba cuándo había de ser el año abundante o estil.</p> <p>— Estéril queréis decir, amigo —dijo don Quijote.</p> <p>— Estéril o estil —respondió Pedro—, todo se sale allá.⁵⁰³</p>	<p>« ...principalement on disait, qu’il sçavait la science des étoiles, & de ce que font au ciel le Soleil & la Lune, car il nous disait fort exactement la crise du Soleil et de la Lune. »</p> <p>« On appelle Éclipse, mon ami, & non pas crise, quand ces deux grands luminaires s’obscurcissent, » dit don Quichotte.</p> <p>Mais Pierre, ne s’arrêtant pas à ces petites ningeries,⁵⁰⁴ poursuivit son conte, disant, « Aussi mesmement il devinait, quand l’année devait estre abondante ou stile. »⁵⁰⁵</p> <p>« Vous voulez dire stérile, mon ami, » dit don Quixote.</p> <p>« Stérile ou stile, » répondit Pierre, « ce m’est tout un. »⁵⁰⁶</p>	<p>—Mais sur-tout, continua Pierre, il savoit, à ce qu’on dit, la science des étoiles, & tout ce qui se passe là-haut entre le soleil & la lune. Aussi ne manquoit-il point d’annoncer jour pour jour les éclisses de la lune & du soleil.</p> <p>—C’est éclipse, notre ami, interrompit Don Quichotte, & non pas éclisse, que s’apele l’obscurcissement qui arive à ces deux Astres.</p> <p>—Il devoit encore, poursuivit Pierre qui n’y prenoit pas garde de si près, quand l’année devoit être bonne ou mauvaise.⁵⁰⁷</p>

Filleau de Saint-Martin, rather than using “crise” as Oudin does (modeled on the word “cris” in the original Spanish), instead chooses a French word (éclisse) that sounds more like “éclipse,”

⁴⁹⁹ See Annie Cointre, “Prose narrative,” 1146-1147.

⁵⁰⁰ Jacques and Michèle Weil, “Introduction,” *Continuation de l’histoire de l’admirable Don Quichotte de la Manche*, by Robert Challe (Geneva: Droz, 1994), 12

⁵⁰¹ Alexandre Cioranescu, *Le Masque et le visage*, 536.

⁵⁰² Ctd. Maurice Bardou, “*Don Quichotte*” en France, 330.

⁵⁰³ Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quijote de La Mancha*, Book I.12, 162-163.

⁵⁰⁴ The modern editor of Oudin’s translation replaces “petites ningeries” with “puérlitiés.”

⁵⁰⁵ The modern editor of Oudin’s translation replaces “stile” with “estile.”

⁵⁰⁶ Cervantes, *Don Quichotte de La Manche*, Ed. Jean Cassou, 81.

⁵⁰⁷ Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *Histoire de L’admirable Don Quichotte de La Manche, Traduite de L’espagnol. Nouv. éd., rev., corr. et augm. avec figures*, Transl. Filleau de Saint-Martin (Paris: F. Dufart, 1798), 129-130.

just as in Spanish, “el cris” and “eclipse” are fairly close (as opposed to Oudin’s “la crise”). And as for the second juxtaposition of “esteril” and “estil,” probably objecting to the repetitive nature of the two almost identical exchanges, Filleau simply cuts the second entirely, even replacing the contrast “abondante/stérile” with “bonne ou mauvaise.”

A similar contrast between Rosset and Filleau can be seen in the passage where the laborer sings the ballad about Roncesvalles:

CERVANTES	ROSSET	FILLEAU
<p>Venía el labrador cantando aquel romance que dicen: <i>Mala la hubistes, franceses, en esa de Roncesvalles.</i> “Que me maten, Sancho,” dijo en oyéndole don Quijote, “si nos ha de suceder cosa buena esta noche. ¿No oyes lo que viene cantando ese vilano?” “Si oigo,” respondió Sancho; “pero ¿qué hace a nuestro propósito la caza de Roncesvalles? Así pudiera cantar el romance de Calainos, que todo fuera uno para sucedernos bien o mal en nuestro negocio.”⁵⁰⁸</p>	<p>Ce laboureur venoit chantant ce vauveville qui dit : <i>Vous eustes la male journee, François, au lieu de Roncevaux.</i> « Je puisse mourir Sancho, » (dit alors Dom-Quichot) « si rien de bien nous succede cette nuit. N’entens-tu pas ce que chante ce Croquan ? » « Je l’entens fort bien, » (respond Sancho) « mais que fait à nostre propos la déroutte de Roncevaux ? Il pourroit aussi bien chanter le Romancez de Calainos. Ce seroit une mesme chose, & autant de mal ou de bien en recevriens nous de l’un que de l’autre. »⁵⁰⁹</p>	<p>Le laboureur s’en alloit chantant cette romance : <i>Vous y faites mal vos orges, Français, à Roncevaux.</i> « Sancho, » dit don Quichotte, « je meure, s’il nous arrive rien de bon de toute cette nuit : entends-tu ce que chante ce drôle ! » « Oui, j’entends fort bien, » répondit Sancho ; « mais qu’est-ce que cela fait, c’est tout comme s’il avoit chanté, appelle Robinette. »⁵¹⁰</p>

Filleau, here, takes a number of approaches to domesticate the poetic and proverbial references in the original Spanish. He replaces the more general phrase “Mala la hubistes,” in the Spanish ballad, with the folksy French expression “Vous y faites mal vos orges.”⁵¹¹ The reference to the *Romance del moro Calainos* is omitted entirely, and replaced with a reference to a French popular song that had appeared prominently in a seventeenth-century French novella.⁵¹² Thus, whereas Cervantes’ intertextual references in the scene serve to comment on the nationalist, pseudo-historiographical nature of Spanish accounts of French military success and defeat, Filleau’s translation re-contextualizes these references within contemporary French literary culture. This has the effect of reinforcing, rather than refuting, Don Quixote’s identification with the French side at Roncesvalles (which for Cervantes, as I have discussed, is an indication of Quixote’s madness).

However, Filleau does not limit himself to changes to the “Proverbes” and “Poësies.” One of his most prominently unfaithful contributions is to condense the last two chapters into one and cause Don Quixote to recover from his illness, leaving him on the verge of fresh sallies. Whereas Cervantes’ novel ends with the historian Cide Hamete Benengeli eulogizing the dead

⁵⁰⁸ Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quijote de La Mancha*, Book II, 102.

⁵⁰⁹ Cervantes, *Dom-Quichot de la Manche*, Transl. François de Rosset, 96.

⁵¹⁰ Cervantes, *Don Quichotte de La Manche*, Transl. Filleau de Saint-Martin. 244.

⁵¹¹ The 1777 *Dictionnaire de l’Académie Française* says, “On dit proverbialement, *Faire ses orges, faire bien ses orges*, pour dire, Faire son profit, faire bien ses affaires. Il est familier.” Académie française, *Dictionnaire de l’Académie française*. Tome II (Avignon: Jacques Garrigan, 1777), 173. The expression is also listed in a 1660 French-English dictionary by Randle Cotgrave (London: William Hunt, 1660).

⁵¹² This song is cited in the 1629 *Les Amours folastres et recreatives du Filou et de Robinette*, where it appears “Appelez Robinette, Qu’elle viene un peu ça bas, etc.” (*Les Amours folastres et recreatives du Filou et de Robinette*, Paris: Jules Gay, 1862, xxi).

Quixote, Filleau's translation omits most of the last chapter entirely. His translation ends: "Ils eurent beau dire tous, Don Quichotte n'en fut ni moins rêveur, ni moins malade; mais il guérit enfin et retourna dans son bon sens..."⁵¹³ This change is particularly provocative given that, as I discussed above, Cervantes made great efforts to ensure the internal narrative of *Don Quixote* against any further continuations after Avellaneda's. We might expect that such a blatant infidelity would be criticized (particularly since, thanks to the Oudin-Rosset translation, the French reading public would have been well aware of Cervantes' original ending). But this was not at all the case; Filleau's translation was very well received, with 37 reprints between 1677 and 1798.⁵¹⁴

Of course, the main effect of this translational change from a commercial perspective is to leave the door open to further continuations, and this is exactly what happened. In 1695, when the Filleau translation was being reprinted, Claude Barbin added a fifth anonymous volume (usually thought to be written by Filleau or the person behind his pseudonym), which picks up where the translation left off. Sancho Panza is knighted and embarks on further adventures with Don Quixote, and the volume ends on a suspenseful cliffhanger in the midst of an adventurous love story between a French couple, Sainville and Sylvie. For some reason, the anonymous writer of this fifth volume was unable to continue the story, and readers were left in suspense until a sixth and final volume finally emerged in 1713. The translated edition, now complete, was extremely popular and widely read, reprinted more than thirty times before 1789.⁵¹⁵ The way that this cycle took shape bears a strong resemblance to the trends I discussed in Chapter 3 in relation to the *Orlando Furioso*, with the *Furioso* eventually being connected to the *Orlando Innamorato* and to some kind of continuation, in order to produce a complete three-volume cycle. But whereas, in Boiardo's and Ariosto's cases, the unfinished narrative created a natural opening for continuations, *Don Quixote*'s narrative was definitively closed by Cervantes and thus had to be re-opened by the translator to make continuations possible.

From a modern vantage point, this translational decision might look indefensibly unfaithful to Cervantes' intentions; but the Filleau translation's constant republication for several centuries makes it clear that this kind of unfaithfulness was not a barrier to popularity. It is true that nineteenth century editions of the Filleau translation evince a certain embarrassment about the last two volumes (which contain the two continuations). Though reprints of the edition continued in the nineteenth century, the two last volumes were simply truncated—a solution that nevertheless left Filleau's modified ending in place, with Don Quixote alive and his exploits unfinished. The strongest criticism of Filleau's change to the ending comes from the Abbé Saint-Martin de Chassonville, who discusses it in the preface to his 1744 translation of the *Novelas ejemplares*:

Lui peut-on pardonner d'avoir frustré le Public François du dernier Chapitre de cette Histoire, pour avoir lieu d'en faire une continuation à sa guise, malgré la précaution que Cervantes avoit eüe de faire mourir, et enterrer son Héros dans toutes les règles, et de prévenir par cette mort bien concertée, les continuations sans fin de ses aventures.⁵¹⁶

⁵¹³ Ctd. Maurice Bardon, "*Don Quichotte*" en France, 348.

⁵¹⁴ Maurice Bardon, "*Don Quichotte*" en France, 342.

⁵¹⁵ A full account of the publication history can be found in Maurice Bardon, "*Don Quichotte*" en France, Tome I, Ch. 7 (347-365).

⁵¹⁶ Abbé Saint-Martin de Chassonville, *Nouvelles Exemplaires de Michel Cervantes Saavedra, Auteur de Don Quichotte...*, Lausanne & Geneva, 1744. Ctd. Maurice Bardon, "*Don Quichotte*" en France, 343.

However, this criticism is both late and exceptional. Most critical evaluations of Filleau's translation, from its publication well through the nineteenth century, focus on stylistic qualities rather than on his treatment of the ending (which is often not mentioned at all).⁵¹⁷ In any case, it is very clear that for a century and a half, translators, publishers, and readers were extremely willing to ignore the clear internal indications that Cervantes was deeply perturbed by Avellaneda's apocryphal "part two," and wished to prevent any further continuations to the *Quixote* story.

One explanation for this can be found in the way that the continuations to the Filleau translation pick up on Cervantes' own use of the tropes of romance textual transmission, in ways that make continuation seem in line with Cervantes' intentions for the novel. The narrative structure of the two continuations to Filleau's translation harken back to the structure established by Cervantes in a way that makes it easier to understand why these two impersonator volumes were accepted, and even welcomed, as part of the French translation for so long. Filleau, in his fifth volume, supplies a new Moorish historian, Zulema (who is renamed Henriquez de la Torre after baptism⁵¹⁸). Robert Challe, today regarded as the author of the anonymous sixth volume,⁵¹⁹ begins his continuation with a complicated story about the way in which the supposed text that Challe is "translating" came to be in his hands. He describes another Hispano-Moorish historiographer named Cid Ruy Gomez, who had been following and spying upon Don Quixote at the behest of his friend Zulema. Ruy Gomez dies without telling anyone that he has further adventures of Quixote and Sancho in his possession; they fall into the hands of a valet whose master is in the court of Philip V, king of Spain. In the course of a conversation with a visiting Frenchman about the heroes of the two nations, the Frenchman expresses his enthusiasm for Don Quixote and, upon learning about the valet's papers, buys them for a handsome sum. Finally, the narrator (presumably Challe) says that some part of this continuation, written in Spanish, has fallen into his hands, and he has decided to translate it:

Comme l'idiome espagnol est devenu à la mode en France, et que tout le monde en veut savoir un peu, un de mes amis, qui l'apprend, m'a fait voir quelques endroits qu'il a traduits de la suite de Don Quichotte; ce que j'en ai lu m'est resté dans la tête, et ne m'a pas déplu; et, sans doute aussi fou que le Français qui l'a achetée, j'ai fait en sorte de l'avoir de ses mains, et comme je le lui ai promis, je l'ai traduite.⁵²⁰

Challe's means of introducing his continuation bears a strong resemblance to the way that Nicolas Herberay des Essarts began his translation of Montalvo's *Amadis de Gaula*, albeit updated for a new, post-humanist era. Herberay des Essarts' account describes the discovery of dusty, fragmentary, ancient Picard manuscripts pre-dating the Spanish manuscripts upon which his original is supposedly based. Challe's introduction, on the other hand, describes fresh eyewitness documents—originally written in Spanish—obtained through the mutual machinations of French and Spanish courtiers. The philological labor typically implied by the

⁵¹⁷ Maurice Bardon, "*Don Quichotte*" en France, 342-345.

⁵¹⁸ Maurice Bardon, "*Don Quichotte*" en France, 351.

⁵¹⁹ Challe was also the author of two other relatively popular texts, *Les Illustres Françaises* and *Journal de voyage aux Indes orientales*. Cf. English Showalter, "Robert Challe and Don Quixote," *The French Review* 45, no. 6 (1972): 1136-144.

⁵²⁰ Robert Challe, *Continuation de l'histoire de l'admirable Don Quichotte de la Manche*, Edited by Jacques Cormier et Michèle Weil (Geneva: Droz, 1994), 84-85.

“found manuscript” introduction to a chivalric romance is, here, replaced by a description of translation as an eccentric, offhand leisure pursuit. Rather than claiming Quixote as a French hero, Challe’s introduction implies that the French appreciate and understand him better than the Spanish, who part with their precious literary patrimony for purely venal reasons.⁵²¹

At the same time, one major change in the two continuations is that they focus increasingly on French characters, and many of the episodes in the two books actually take place in France. Cultural differences between the Spanish and the French, often centering on their different attitudes toward romantic fidelity, are treated explicitly at multiple points during Challe’s continuation. For instance, Chapter 50 is titled, “Dissertation sur les différentes manières d’aimer des Espagnols et des Français.” The Frenchmen in the conversation contend that, though love was born in Spain and practiced more faithfully there, the French loved more passionately. The chapter leads to an exchange of stories that are meant to exhibit the relative faithfulness of French and Spanish lovers. In particular, the French defend the fidelity of their wives and mistresses:

[Les Français] prétendirent que... ces derniers [les Espagnols] étaient si peu prévenus d’estime pour leurs maîtresses et leurs épouses, qu’ils ne se reposaient de leur fidélité que sur des grilles et des serrures, et que cette manière d’aimer avait quelque chose d’outrageant pour la personne aimée, au lieu que la confiance des Français avait quelque chose de plus noble et de plus généreux, en ce qu’ils s’assuraient entièrement de la fidélité de leurs maîtresses et de leurs épouses sur leur propre vertu et leur sagesse seule, dénuée de tout secours étranger.⁵²²

In regard to the paradox that a married man should not show any of his suspicions to his wife, “ils citèrent bien les vers de l’Arioste que je ne rapporterai pas, mais bien la traduction ou la paraphrase faite par Monsieur de La Fontaine...”⁵²³ Where Cervantes’ citations of Ariosto were used prominently to invite—and then disinvite—continuations such as the one that Challe is currently writing, Challe himself does not cite *Orlando Furioso* directly, but rather a French adaptation. The French characters argue that an attitude of trust, with regard to questions of fidelity, is superior, more “noble and generous,” than continual policing.

It is hard not to see, in this conversation about the origin of “amour,” an appeal to the character of Don Quixote as conceived by Cervantes. Unlike Cervantes himself, who took care to exclude the possibility of future conclusions, Quixote himself only asked, “Retráteme el que quisiere... pero no me maltrate.”⁵²⁴ The fidelity of Challe’s intentions as a continuator can be seen in the way he ends his continuation: both Sancho and Don Quixote are stricken with pleurisy and send for a barber, who puts them under a rigorous regimen of bleeding and herbal teas. While Sancho recovers after supplementing his remedies with a great deal of wine, Don Quixote dies in the arms of his priest with all the feelings of a good Christian. While the Filleau translation did resurrect Don Quixote from the dead in a way that Cervantes might have found objectionable, Challe also sends Quixote back to his grave.

⁵²¹ For more on the continuation, see Jacques Cormier, “La Continuation de l’histoire de l’admirable Don Quichotte de la Manche de Robert Challe : Cervantès trahi ou compris ?” *Cahiers de l’Association internationale des études françaises* 48, no. 1 (1996): 263–82.

⁵²² Robert Challe, *Continuation de l’histoire de l’admirable Don Quichotte de la Manche*, 221.

⁵²³ Robert Challe, *Continuation de l’histoire de l’admirable Don Quichotte de la Manche*, 223. From La Fontaine’s “La Coupe enchantée,” which in turn is adapted from *Orlando Furioso* cantos 42–43.

⁵²⁴ Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quijote de La Mancha*, Book II.59, 489.

IV. “Robadas a España y adoptadas en Francia”: Repatriating the Picaresque in the Works of Alain-René Lesage

Despite Challe’s efforts to conclude *Don Quixote* once again, the eighteenth century saw yet another French *Don Quixote* cycle. Alain-René Lesage (1668-1747) was the author of numerous highly successful plays (most prominently *Turcaret*) for the Comédie-Française and the Théâtre de la foire, as well as a number of translations and adaptations of Spanish prose and theater. While it is safe to say that Lesage made significant changes to all of the works he translated or adapted into French, three (*Nouvelles Aventures de l’admirable Don Quichotte de la Manche*, a translation of Avellaneda’s continuation; *Roland l’amoureux*; and *Histoire de Guzman d’Alfarache*) hew relatively close to the plot of the source text, while four others (including *Le Diable boiteux* and *Gil Blas*) seem to translate the first few chapters, title, and characters of their Spanish source texts, but pursue the story in an entirely different direction.⁵²⁵ Lesage’s translation of Avellaneda in 1704 was the first time Avellaneda’s continuation was translated into French. Lesage’s translation was followed by a six-book continuation titled the *Suite nouvelle et véritable de l’histoire et des aventures de l’incomparable Don Quichotte de la Manche* (1722-1726), which is also sometimes attributed to Lesage, though this attribution is doubtful.⁵²⁶ In any case, this multi-volume continuation is illustrative of how translated romances like the *Amadis de Gaule* and *Roland Furieux* remained an important model for the textual transmission, and commercial distribution, of *Don Quixote* well into the eighteenth century. Indeed, the inclusion of *Roland l’amoureux* among all the Spanish prose picaresque works in Lesage’s oeuvre is an important indication of how the chivalric romance and the picaresque⁵²⁷ were perceived in the eighteenth century as neighboring genres, perhaps with *Don Quixote* sitting at the juncture between the two.⁵²⁸

The prologue to Lesage’s *Don Quichotte* is notable for its promotion of Avellaneda at Cervantes’ expense. As we have seen, French Moderns in the seventeenth century viewed Cervantes as an exceptional Spanish author, standing out from his “barbaric” compatriots. Lesage’s project, on the other hand, entails the recuperation of the vilified Avellaneda, and the practices of textual transmission that Avellaneda represents. Lesage argues that Avellaneda was

⁵²⁵ This is the logic of the editors of Lesage’s recent *Oeuvres complètes*, who divide the series into “oeuvres romanesques” and “oeuvres ‘adaptées’” accordingly. In the introduction, they note that *Le Diable boiteux* uses only the first three chapters of its original, while *Don Quichotte* adapts 34 of its 36 chapters from Avellaneda. See “Introduction aux ‘oeuvres adaptées,’” 11-19 in Alain René Le Sage, *Nouvelles aventures de l’admirable Don Quichotte de la Manche. Œuvres Complètes*, Tome 9, Edited by Christine Bahier-Porte and Pierre Brunelle (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2009). Also Bibliothèque nationale de France, département Littérature et art, Y2-10969.

⁵²⁶ Alexandre Cioranescu, *Le Masque et le visage*, 539.

⁵²⁷ Hendrik van Gorp’s 1981 study of the role of translation in the transmission of the picaresque characterizes the genre according to two primary features (a highly episodic narrative, and tension between the marginalized protagonist-narrator and the world through which he travels), then proceeds to assess sixteenth- and seventeenth-century French translations according to their adherence to or deviation from these features. This approach to the classification of the picaresque is influenced by Claudio Guillen’s *Literature as System* (1971), which describes the picaresque as a transitional step between the romance and the modern novel. Peter Dunn’s 1993 book, *Spanish Picaresque Fiction: A New Literary History* is a provocative reconsideration of the status of the picaresque as an independent and coherent genre. Dunn argues that “picaresque” became a tautological definition, conditioning scholars to pay attention to certain features in the novels of the “picaresque canon” while ignoring others that would call the category itself into question.

⁵²⁸ Cervantes’ own relationship to the picaresque is hotly debated within contemporary scholarship on the definition of the genre. Dunn addresses this problem in “Beyond the Canon,” *Spanish Picaresque Fiction*, 203-231, and Klaus Meyer-Minnemann includes a chapter on the subject in his volume, 223-262.

obligated to write the continuation because Cervantes “négligeait [de] donner la continuation” to his first part. He also remarks that if there are resemblances between Avellaneda’s continuation and Cervantes’ Part II, “Cervantès n’ayant composé la sienne que longtemps après celle d’Avellaneda, il est aisé de juger lequel a été le Copiste.”⁵²⁹ Lesage dismisses Cervantes’ own critiques of Avellaneda in his Part II, judging them unconvincing, too overwrought in their tone, and based on a dislike for Avellaneda’s Aragonese Spanish. Lesage concludes that this last problem is no problem at all for French readers: “Que *l’Aragonais* ne parle si bon Espagnol que le *Castillan*, que nous importe? pourvu qu’il ait le génie aussi plaisant, et qu’il nous divertisse en notre langue autant que lui.”⁵³⁰ Unlike Cervantes, who in *Don Quixote* frequently asserts that translations are pale shadows of their original texts, Lesage claims that language itself is ultimately irrelevant, as long as “génie” can be freely transferred across linguistic borders.

Of course, while Lesage’s preface defends Avellaneda’s right to write a continuation, Lesage himself feels no compunction to adhere closely to Avellaneda’s text. Though there is no mention at all in the preface of Lesage’s translational approach, he does allude to it in the preface to his translation of *Le diable boiteux* (1707). In this preface, Lesage addresses the author of *El Diablo cojuelo*, Luis Velez de Guevara, and says of his translation, “Il n’est pas moins de vous que de moy. Votre *Diablo Cojuelo* m’en a fourni le titre & l’idée. J’en fais un aveu public. Je vous cede la gloire de l’invention...”⁵³¹ He echoes the claim (familiar to us from the earlier analysis of translators’ prefaces) that he translated the text as closely as possible given the two nations’ differing tastes, and goes on to say, “C’est ainsi que j’ay traitée le Seigneur Alonso Fernandez de Avellaneda. Je n’ay pas traduit plus fidèlement son Dom Quichotte que votre Cojuelo.”⁵³² Having thus granted himself a great deal of latitude in translating Avellaneda’s continuation, Lesage often departs from his source text in order to engage with Cervantes, rather than Avellaneda. Most notably, Lesage adds a long episode in Avellaneda’s Chapter 7, in which Don Quichotte and Sancho discover that a character has read Cervantes’ Part One. This episode has a dizzying hall-of-mirrors effect, given that it bears a strong resemblance to the moment in Cervantes’ Part Two when Don Quixote and Sancho meet characters at an inn who have read Avellaneda’s continuation.

In sum, then, Lesage’s recuperation of Avellaneda—successful, by any commercial measure, given that the translation spurred six continuations—is also an affirmation of the validity of methods of textual transmission that originated with French translations of romance. Through such methods, Lesage affirms the notion that the Spanish works he translates provide him only “le titre & l’idée”: he implies that all authorship is derivative, all characters collectively owned; and viewed from the right perspective, Cervantes himself is a mere “Copiste” of his own continuator. This perspective is both a logical endpoint of the French-Spanish literary exchange that I have traced up to this point, and an almost intolerable provocation to Spanish authors and readers who regarded the picaresque as national property, much as France had fought a century earlier for ownership over romance.

This can be seen most clearly in the reception history of Lesage’s *Histoire de Gil Blas de Santillane*. This prose work, published in three installments over a period of more than twenty years (1724, 1736, and 1747), is often invoked as proof of the popularity and influence of the

⁵²⁹ Lesage, *Nouvelles aventures*, 118.

⁵³⁰ Lesage, *Nouvelles aventures*, 119.

⁵³¹ Alain-René Lesage, “Au tres-illustre auteur Luis Velez de Guevara,” *Le Diable boiteux*. [Par A.-R. Lesage.] (Paris: Chez la Veuve Barbin, 1707).

⁵³² Lesage, *Le Diable Boiteux*.

picaresque in France.⁵³³ Lesage does not discuss the question of methodology in the preface to *Gil Blas*. The title page does not announce the work as a translation, as his translation of *Guzman de Alfarache* does; instead, it clearly states that the work is simply “Par Monsieur Lesage.” In this case, Lesage’s preface is also completely absent of references to any prior source, despite the fact that the book is set in Spain with Spanish characters. In fact, there are episodes and sections of *Gil Blas* that are translated from Vicente Espinel’s picaresque novel *Marcos de Obregón*, published in 1618. There was a French translation of *Marcos de Obregón* published in 1618, the same year Espinel’s original, so the work was not unknown in France. And Lesage is not hiding the connection to *Marcos de Obregón*, since *Gil Blas* contains a character with this name. But neither does Lesage explicitly credit Espinel or any other Spanish author.

While certain aspects of the plot are clearly taken from *Marcos de Obregón*, *Gil Blas* is several times longer and contains much that is entirely of Lesage’s invention. Perhaps for this reason, Lesage’s “Déclaration de l’auteur” reprises several lines from his other first prefaces that he uses elsewhere to credit his source text; but in this case, he credits only his own social and cultural observations. Lesage echoes the preface of *Le diable boiteux* when he says, “J’en fais un aveu public:” but this time the admission is not that his novel is an adaptation of another work, but that he has written a work attempting the mimetic depiction of reality: “...je ne me suis proposé que de représenter la vie des hommes telle qu’elle est...”⁵³⁴ Lesage goes on to emphasize the similarities of French and Spanish cultures, rather than their differences (which, as we have seen, was the norm in translators’ prefaces): “On voit en Castille, comme en France, des médecins dont la méthode est de faire un peu trop saigner leurs malades. On voit par-tout les memes vices et les memes originaux.”⁵³⁵ This declaration of national similarity is striking in its rarity, an almost unique instance of a preface affirming that the two nations are not so different after all. Nevertheless, Lesage does go on to say that he has not always followed “mœurs espagnols” but has found it necessary to soften them for French expectations:

J’avoue que je n’ai pas toujours exactement suivi les mœurs Espagnoles ; & ceux qui savent dans quel désordre vivent les Comédiennes de Madrid, pourroient me reprocher de n’avoir pas fait une peinture assez forte de leur dérèglements, mais j’ai cru devoir les adoucir, pour les conformer à nos manières.⁵³⁶

This comment about the morals of Spanish actresses echoes other prefaces that we have seen, where translators justified their unfaithful translations by giving similar examples of ways in which Spanish manners might violate French notions of *bienséance*. But since Lesage is admitting only to unfaithfully representing Spanish culture itself, rather than any particular source text, the admission amounts to a winking satire of a translator’s preface.

Lesage’s second prefatory text is, in fact, one of the most straightforward instances of translation (as opposed to free imitation) from *Marcos de Obregón* in *Gil Blas* as a whole. The preface contains a parable about two schoolboys on a journey from Penafiel to Salamanca, which comes from the author’s prologue to *Marcos de Obregón*, rather than the text itself. The schoolboys come across a spring, stop to drink, and encounter a stone, on which is engraved in Latin the phrase “*Conditur unio, conditur unio.*” While one of the schoolboys shrugs off the

⁵³³ Hendrik van Gorp, “Traductions et évolution d’un genre littéraire, » 210.

⁵³⁴ Alain René Le Sage, *Histoire de Gil Blas de Santillane* (Paris: Lefèvre, 1836), 2.

⁵³⁵ Le Sage, *Histoire de Gil Blas de Santillane*, 2.

⁵³⁶ Le Sage, *Histoire de Gil Blas de Santillane*, 2.

mystery and departs, the other schoolboy cracks the code—based on the double meaning of “unio” (both “unión” and “perla preciosísima”)—and lifts the stone, finding underneath both a pair of buried lovers and a necklace containing a giant pearl. Espinel concludes the story by connecting it to his own life story:

Algo prolijo, pero importante es el cuento, para que sepan cómo se han de leer los autores, porque ni los tiempos son unos, ni las edades están firmes. Yo querría en lo que he escrito que nadie se contentase con leer la corteza, porque no hay en todo mi *Escudero* hoja que no lleve objeto particular, fuera de lo que suena. Y no solamente ahora lo hago; sino por inclinación natural en los derramamientos de la juventud lo hice en burlas y veras; edad que me pesa en el alma que haya pasado por mí, y plegue a Dios, que lleguen los arrepentimientos a las culpas.⁵³⁷

This narration of the author’s youthful errors is a way of emphasizing the continuity between author and character, as well as prologue and fictional text. In *Marcos de Obregón*, therefore, the autobiographical aspect of the picaresque (which Meyer-Minnemann singled out as its defining generic feature) exists most strongly in this one paratextual moment.

The version of the parable in *Gil Blas*, however, is different from Espinel’s version in several important respects. First, it is entitled “Gil Blas au Lecteur”; separated from the body of the fictional text, this particular paratext in the voice of Gil Blas represents an intrusion of the fictional protagonist into the textual space of the author. Lesage also makes several significant changes to the tale itself. As in Espinel’s version, the schoolboys stop to drink and encounter a stone, but in Lesage’s account the engraving is in Spanish, and says, “Aquí esta encerrada el alma del licenciado Pedro Garcias.” One schoolboy simply laughs off the absurdity of an “*âme enfermée*” and departs, while the other stops to ponder the mystery and decides to dig up the stone. Underneath, he finds a leather pouch containing a hundred ducats and a letter in Latin congratulating him for his ingenuity. The letter concludes with an admonition to the reader: “Si tu lis mes aventures sans prendre garde aux instructions morales qu’elles renferment, tu ne tireras aucun fruit de cet ouvrage; mais, si tu le lis avec attention, tu y trouveras, suivant le précepte d’Horace, l’utile mêlé avec l’agréable.”⁵³⁸ Lesage’s version of the preface is thus, in a sense, precisely contrary to Espinel’s; rather than reinforcing an autobiographical connection between the true author and the story’s protagonist, it turns the entire text into a metafiction, with the character Gil Blas taking on the narratorial role as his own Cide Hamete Benegeli.

These kinds of games are, as I have mentioned, common to the picaresque as a genre. But it is probably the fact that the nature of Lesage’s work, its relationship to a Spanish original, is not mentioned either in the preface or the title page, that gave rise to the suspicion that Lesage was hiding something about his source. *Gil Blas* was the subject of controversy over the book’s true authorship in Spain over the course of the following centuries. The Spanish Jesuit writer José Francisco de Isla translated the work into Spanish in 1787, bearing the accusatory title *Aventuras de Gil Blas de Santillana, robadas a España y adoptadas en Francia por Mr. Le Sage; restituidas a su patria y a su lengua nativa por un español zeloso que no sufre se burlen de su nación*. In her introduction to this text, Nancy Vogeley makes the argument, which we earlier saw echoed by other scholars of French translators’ prefaces, that Isla’s claims are symptomatic

⁵³⁷ Vicente Espinel, *Vida Del Escudero Marcos de Obregón* (Alicante: Biblioteca Virtual Miguel de Cervantes, 1999). Digital edition based on the edition Barcelona: Domenech, 1881, Biblioteca Artes y Letras.

⁵³⁸ Le Sage, *Histoire de Gil Blas de Santillane*, 18.

of the ongoing rivalry (both political and literary) between France and Spain in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, as well as “a growing sense of a national language’s uniqueness” and the two nations’ increasingly distinct literary cultures and reading publics.⁵³⁹

However, a closer look at the terms of Isla’s objection shows that he is not identifying *Gil Blas* as picaresque (and therefore natively Spanish) in the sense that it uses certain tropes or characters. Rather, Isla makes his claim by casting Lesage as a participant in a fictional “found and translated manuscript” narrative. Though Isla admits that he is not sure who the real (Spanish) author of *Gil Blas* is, his narration of how Lesage came to claim it as his own is striking in its adherence to this literary trope:

Solo he podido averiguar que el tal Mr. Le Sage estuvo muchos años en España, según unos como Secretario, y según otros como amigo ó comensal de un Embaxador de Francia. Que su inclinación á nuestra lengua, y lo mucho que le gustaban los graciosos escritos satíricos y morales, que poco antes se habían publicado en ella, algunos anónimos, y otros con el nombre de sus verdaderos autores, le incite á solicitar el conocimiento y trato con los unos y con los otros. Tuvo estrecha amistad con cierto Abogado andaluz... que este mismo Abogado le confió á Mr. Le Sage el manuscrito de la Novela de Gil Blas... para que traducido en Francés le hiciese estampar en Paris, y publicar como nacido en aquél Reyno, supuesto que durante el actual Gobierno de España no se podía imprimir en ella sin que peligrase la vida del Impresor, y de todos los que tuviesen parte en su publicación.⁵⁴⁰

Certainly, this narrative must bring to mind the relationship between Cervantes and Cide Hamete Benengeli; and, indeed, Lesage’s own preface written in the voice of Gil Blas; but it is also related to a long-standing romance tradition with deep roots in both France and Spain. In the late eighteenth century, Isla claims *Gil Blas*, not by considering its textual genealogy from *Marcos de Obregón* in scholarly, philological terms, but by writing his own account of how a different, fictitious original Spanish text came to Lesage. Whether Isla truly believed that there was another Spanish source text is almost beside the point. Two centuries of French precedents in romance translations like the *Amadis de Gaule* and the *Roland Furieux*—and, indeed, *Don Quixote* itself—established a set French response to this kind of perceived literary misappropriation, of which Isla is obviously well aware. Namely, to repatriate the stolen text, using a prefatory account of a lost and rediscovered manuscript.

Despite Isla’s proclaimed mistrust of Lesage, he includes both of Lesage’s paratexts in his Spanish translation: Lesage’s authorial preface, which is described as a “Declaration by the author,” and the “note by Gil Blas to the reader.” He thus includes both prefaces as part of the text that he sets out to translate. We might conclude that Isla is assuming that Lesage himself is translating the Gil Blas preface from the original Spanish author (which, in fact, he is). On the other hand, the “Declaracion del Autor” is clearly in Lesage’s voice. Isla modifies Lesage’s disparaging comment about Spanish actresses in his translation, making it instead an insult about

⁵³⁹ Nancy Vogeley, “Introduction: Translation and National Politics: *Gil Blas* and the Picaresque,” From “Two Arguments for the Spanish Authorship of *Gil Blas*: Francisco De Isla and Juan Antonio Llorente.” *PMLA* 125, no. 2 (2010): 455.

⁵⁴⁰ Francisco de Isla, “Conversación preliminar, que comunmente llaman prologo y dedicatoria al mismo tiempo, a los que me quisieren leer” (Prologue), *Aventuras de Gil Blas de Santillana Robadas Á España*, Tome 1 (London: F. Wingrave et al., 1815), xii.

the hypocrisy of the French. (This is an example of Isla's general tendency to modify Lesage's anti-Spanish commentary, or amend places where he views Lesage's depiction of Spanish life to be inaccurate.) But despite the fact that Isla has little respect for Lesage, he has great respect for the source text that he imagines Lesage to be working from. For this reason, Isla treats Lesage's paratexts, for the most part, as part of his source text. Isla reproduces both of Lesage's prefaces as they appear in the original. He treats Lesage's paratexts as texts, approaching them with the same translational fidelity (a selective and nationalist form of fidelity, very familiar indeed in France) that he applies to the text as a whole.

The enduring impact of Isla's translation continues into the twentieth century: it spurred subsequent scholarly efforts in Spain to prove that Lesage did, in fact, have another source text; Isla's translation was reprinted in Spain numerous times in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, most recently in 1991; and, to my knowledge, there is no other full Spanish translation of *Gil Blas*. There is much more that could be said about how nationalist stories about manuscripts lost and found continue to shape our scholarly conclusions; the belief that such pseudo-historiographies belong to the pre-modern is itself, in the end, a comfortable fiction. But let us end, here, with Isla's preface, which illustrates the fact that the mania for dressing and re-dressing foreign texts in our own clothes, in the belief that we are in fact bringing them home where they belong, is not an exclusively French preoccupation. The power of romance literary practices—practices like translation, continuation, and nationalist repatriation—is still with us; indeed, it never left.

CONCLUSION

The Cobwebs in the Wine: Toward a Revolutionary Romance

Throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the repatriation of the romance genre was a central preoccupation of French authors, translators, and literary theorists. While the rediscovery of classical texts and the development of new humanist scholarly methods played important roles in the establishment of French literary culture during the Renaissance, a dialogic engagement with Spanish and Italian literatures was just as critical. Through translation, contemporary French literary norms were articulated in opposition to those of other modern nations, even as foreign works like the *Amadis de Gaula*, the *Orlando Furioso*, and *Don Quijote* were annexed into the French literary canon. The translations of these works were influential in themselves, as new models for the application of humanist rhetorical practices to vernacular works. But romance translations were also important to the broader landscape of international Renaissance culture. Authors and historiographers were able to use translation to negotiate between the intellectual and political spheres, which often placed distinct and seemingly incompatible demands on writers of vernacular literature.

In the Renaissance, the emergence of humanist philological tools for the analysis and criticism of historical source texts called some of the most cherished historical narratives of the European monarchy into question. Medieval chronicles like the *Pseudo-Turpin*—though bearing obvious markers of forgery and fictionality—served as authoritative source texts with very real political implications for hundreds of years, only to be suddenly re-categorized as pseudo-history in the sixteenth century. However, the unmasking of such forgeries was undertaken selectively and often politically; humanist scholarship was often wielded in a partisan fashion, as a weapon for the destabilization of other nations' historical claims. In this climate, a variety of different orientations to historicity emerged among French literary humanists. Some, like Joachim Du Bellay, embraced pseudo-historical (or even a-historical) approaches to vernacular canon formation, prioritizing the revitalization of native French literary material over the rigorous definition of genres according to their relationship to historical truth. Others, like Pierre de Ronsard, were torn between the nationalist nature of the epic genre and the pseudo-historicity of the medieval sources on which French epic was necessarily based. And still others, like Jacques Amyot, rejected native literary history altogether as irreparably tainted, turning exclusively to the translation of classical sources instead.

In mid-sixteenth century France, romance translation emerged as a critical tool of mediation between humanist critical methods and vernacular canon formation. Nicolas Herberay des Essarts was the first to show, in his translation of the *Amadis de Gaule*, that prose romance was capable of taking on many of the rhetorical and pedagogical characteristics of humanist history. Unabashedly unfaithful, Herberay's translation displays none of the usual theoretical concerns of Renaissance humanist translation (such as the choice between "word for word" and "sense for sense" approaches). Instead, Herberay posits infidelity itself as a kind of service to the monarchy, a literary annexation of Spanish territory that echoes France's political aspirations. This approach proved influential for historiographers as well, as we saw in the translations of the *Orlando Furioso* and *Orlando Innamorato*. By replacing one set of humanist theoretical concerns (historiography and philology) with another (translation and rhetoric), translator-

historiographers like Gabriel Chappuys and François de Rosset were able to frame their departures from humanist critical method as justifiable infidelities in the service of national textual repatriation. And in the seventeenth century, the use of translation as a means of literary repatriation broadened beyond romance source texts, coming to characterize the “romancing” of Spanish literary prose in general, as we saw in the notable example of *Don Quixote*.

In all of the examples that I have discussed, both romance and translation are employed as tools in the service of literary patrons, often including the monarchy. The project of building the literary canon, as I have traced it through the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, is largely inextricable from the glorification of the French crown, as literary production is increasingly influenced by the centralization and regulation of the absolutist monarchy. To conclude, though, I would like to consider a somewhat different political legacy of romance translation. In my second chapter, I detailed how the *Trésor des Amadis*—a collection of speeches from Nicolas Herberay des Essarts’ translations of the *Amadis de Gaule*—came to function as a vernacular rhetorical handbook for an emerging class of upwardly mobile readers. This development was, in some ways, a *détournement* of the translation project’s intended ends; while Herberay addressed himself directly to the education of the monarchy, he indirectly provided pedagogical resources to a much broader public. What other, perhaps unintended, political functions might these romance translations have served for audiences beyond the monarchy and their circle of patronage? And, in particular, what kind of afterlife might the romance texts and practices I have documented here had in the post-Revolutionary period, in the absence of the monarchy itself? How might a *révolutionnaire* understand the politics of these stories of knights errant, in whom the kings of France so literally saw themselves?

We might assume, given the strong association between the monarchy and romance, that the genre would fall out of favor altogether in the post-Revolutionary period; or that romance would become the exclusive province of those nostalgic for the *ancien régime*. However, this is not quite true. It is true that chivalric romance during Romanticism is more commonly associated with the use of images and tropes that defended or elegized monarchical values; but revolutionaries made use of romance as well. David Duff has mapped the emergence, in the early nineteenth century, of a “self-conscious, politically radical cult of chivalry,” which associated chivalry not with feudalism, but with the origins of civil society.⁵⁴¹ While there might seem to be an obvious cognitive dissonance between revolution and chivalry, Duff argues that certain aspects of the chivalric value system, such as its emphasis on generosity and justice, resonated with republican ideals of public and private virtue.⁵⁴²

We can see the legacy of some of these debates over romance, along with some of the romance tropes that I have traced in the preceding chapters, in a collection of chivalric romances edited in 1859 by the French writer, scholar, and Second Republic *révolutionnaire* Alfred Delvau.⁵⁴³ Titled *Bibliothèque bleue : romans de chevalerie des XIIIe, XIIIe, XIVe, XVe et XVIe siècles*, the collection was described as a corrective to the versions of the romances that appeared in the much more ephemeral *Bibliothèque bleue* pamphlet series published in the seventeenth

⁵⁴¹ David Duff, *Romance and Revolution: Shelley and the Politics of a Genre* (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 117-118. See also “The French Revolution and the politics of romance,” 8-53.

⁵⁴² David Duff, *Romance and Revolution*, 31. Interestingly, Duff’s book also points to the frequency with which polemicists on both sides invoked *Don Quixote* in post-Revolutionary debates over romance ideology.

⁵⁴³ Delvau was the private secretary to Alexandre Auguste Ledru-Rollin, one of the leaders of the February Revolution; Delvau also wrote a history of the experience, *Histoire de la Révolution de février* (Paris: Garnier frères, 1850).

and eighteenth centuries.⁵⁴⁴ Delvau declares, in the “Etude sur les romans de chevalerie et sur les origines de la langue française” that precedes the collection, that what differentiates his collection from the old *Bibliothèque bleue* is his aspiration to represent the original medieval versions of the story:

Je regrette de n’avoir pu traduire sur l’œuvre première, sur les poèmes romans ou sur les poèmes latins, composés longtemps avant l’invention de l’imprimerie. Je le regrette, parce que ces poèmes-là sont plus beaux encore, plus grandioses, plus éloquents, que les romans en prose. Je parlais tout à l’heure de l’épisode de la bataille de Roncevaux qui se trouve dans *Guérin de Montglave* : c’est un épisode émouvant, certes, et peu d’écrivains sauraient atteindre à ce pathétique. Ce n’est rien auprès du poème de Thurol, la *Chanson de Roland*! Mais je ne pouvais traduire des vers picards ou de la prose latine en prose française...⁵⁴⁵

Delvau goes on to explain that his inability to refer to the original medieval texts is due to his editor’s desire to put forth the sixteenth-century prose versions of the romances instead. But while the barrier in Delvau’s case is a thoughtless editor rather than the ravages of time, his overall translational posture should be familiar to us, since it mimics that of the romance translators that he disparages here. Herberay, Chappuys, and Rosset all lamented the fact that they had access only to the Spanish and Italian versions of romances that were originally written in French manuscripts; for Delvau, it is the Renaissance French versions of these romances that stand between him and his idealized medieval French source texts.

For the Renaissance translators that I studied in earlier chapters, the inaccessibility of French medieval source texts became the occasion for an unfaithful translation that brought romance closer to the forms and functions of history. In Delvau’s case, the idealized version of chivalric romance that he seeks to restore synthesizes, in unexpected ways, Montaigne’s criticism of romance as “tel fatras de livres à quoi l’enfance s’amuse”⁵⁴⁶ with the opposing concept of romance as a commonplace book of vernacular rhetoric. For Delvau, the childlike appeal of romances is a positive, rather than a negative. He argues that, in combining widespread accessibility with behavioral instruction, romances constitute a kind of revolutionary education *avant la lettre*, speaking to the “enfance de l’âme”⁵⁴⁷ not only of the individual but of society at large:

Qu’est-ce, en effet, que les romans de chevalerie, s’ils ne sont pas une école de grandeur d’âme ? Que font, je vous prie, tous ces chevaliers errants, sinon une guerre à outrance aux félons, aux méchants et aux lâches ? Le monde ne rêvait pas, alors, il était en marche

⁵⁴⁴ “... nous n’avons rien emprunté—que le titre—aux déplorables éditions de la veuve Oudot, de Troyes... Il y a *Bibliothèque bleue et Bibliothèque bleue!*” Alfred Delvau, ed., *Bibliothèque bleue : romans de chevalerie des XIIIe, XIIIe, XIVe, XVe et XVIe siècles ; précédés d’une Etude sur les romans de chevalerie et sur les origines de la langue française*, Vol. 1 (Paris: J. Bry ainé, 1859), 16.

⁵⁴⁵ Delvau, “Etude sur les romans de chevalerie,” *Bibliothèque bleue*, 13.

⁵⁴⁶ Michel de Montaigne, *Essais de Michel de Montaigne*, ed. André Tournon (Paris: Impr. nationale éditions, 1998), 299.

⁵⁴⁷ Delvau attributes this phrase to George Sand: “O noble enfance de l’âme... source d’illusions sublimes et de dévouements héroïques!” Delvau, “Etude sur les romans de chevalerie,” *Bibliothèque bleue*, 6.

vers une émancipation qui se rapprochait d'heure en heure... L'humanité commençait à émerger de ses ténèbres ! L'âme commençait à émerger de la matière !⁵⁴⁸

We can hear, in this passage, a clear echo of Duff's argument that many revolutionaries viewed romance as a genre that documented the origins of civil society. There is also a concept of romance as a "school of moral development" that echoes the pedagogical functions of romance as articulated in Herberay's translation of the *Amadis*. Indeed, the *Amadis* is at the forefront of Delvau's mind; in the beginning of his *Étude*, he lists the romances that he believes could amuse even "ce maussade vieillard qui s'appelait Louis XIV," and out of the 35 titles he mentions, the *Amadis* is second: "Faisons-nous donc conter *Peau d'âne*, ô mes amis! *Peau d'âne*—et surtout *Amadis de Gaule*, *Artus de Bretagne*, *Lancelot du Lac*, *les Quatre fils Aymon*, *Huon de Bordeaux*..."⁵⁴⁹ In addition to the *Amadis*, Delvau's list also includes *Roland amoureux* and *l'Archevêque Turpin*. His concept of romance, which incorporates both the *chanson de geste* and the Arthurian, and claims the *Orlando* alongside the *Lancelot*, thus clearly arises out of the phenomena that I have documented in this dissertation.

Delvau's concept of romance does differ from that of the earlier translators I have discussed in one major way. His introduction shows that the concerns about historicity and *vraisemblance* that were at the forefront of debates over romance during the Early Modern period have, by the nineteenth century, subsided in favour of a more historicist approach to the literary canon. In a discussion of *Huon de Bordeaux*, Delvau does mention the many errors of history and geography that appear in the romance, such as a mistaken account of the death of Charlemagne's son Charlot, as well as the misdating of the founding of Cluny Abbey. However, Delvau argues that this is part of the romance's charm: "Tous les romans de chevalerie fourmillent de ces erreurs volontaires ou involontaires: Je les ai laissées, comme on laisse aux bouteilles de bon vin les toiles d'araignées et les moisissures qui attestent leur antiquité: c'est aux lecteurs de les enlever en les buvant."⁵⁵⁰ According to Delvau, the romance translator no longer needs to worry about updating and modernizing the genre for a new era. The mouldy odour of an out-dated literary style is no longer an obstacle to be overcome; it is now simply part of the romance's antique charm.

I opened this dissertation by discussing how the pseudo-historical narratives that I have discussed here still operate in French culture today, functioning as source texts for a mythological and often xenophobic "*roman national*." Let us end, here, on a more hopeful note, with Delvau's argument that these same narratives can also be an "école de grandeur d'âme." As Delvau points out, drinking deeply from the past can also mean imbibing its prejudices and errors. Thus, in our childlike enjoyment of such narratives, our moral education comes from skimming the cobwebs from our wine, one by one.

⁵⁴⁸ Delvau, "Étude sur les romans de chevalerie," *Bibliothèque bleue*, 6.

⁵⁴⁹ Delvau, "Étude sur les romans de chevalerie," *Bibliothèque bleue*, 6.

⁵⁵⁰ Delvau, "Étude sur les romans de chevalerie," *Bibliothèque bleue*, 15.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Translations

- Amyot, Jacques. (Transl.) "Le Proësmes du translateur." *L'Histoire aethiopique de Heliodorus, contenant dix livres, traitant des loyales et pudiques amours de Théagènes Thessalien et Chariclea Aethiopienne, nouvellement traduite de grec en françoys [par Jacques Amyot]*. Paris: J. Longis, 1547. Bibliothèque nationale de France, département Réserve des livres rares, RES-Y2-14. [ark:/12148/btv1b8600170j](https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:fr:bnf-Y2-14-ark:/12148/btv1b8600170j).
- . *Les Vies des homes illustres, Grecs et Romains, comparées l'une avec l'autre par Plutarque de Chaeronee [...] seconde edition* Paris: Michel de Vascosan, 1565. Bibliothèque nationale de France, département Réserve des livres rares, RES-J-905. [ark:/12148/bpt6k857106b](https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:fr:bnf-J-905-ark:/12148/bpt6k857106b)
- Boessieres, Jean de. (Transl.) *L'Arioste Françoises de Jean de Boessieres ... Avec les argumans, & allegories, sur chascun chant*. Premier volume. [Cantos 1-12.] vol. 1. Lyon : T. Ancelin, 1580. British Library General Reference Collection 239.c.19.
- Chappuys, Gabriel. (Transl.) *Le quinziesme liure d'Amadis de Gaule, Continuant les hauts faits d'armes & amours de dom Silues de la Selue & de maints autres notables cheualiers ...* Lyon: Benoist Rigaud, 1578. British Library General Reference Collection 245.a.15.
- . *Le vingt uniesme et dernier livre d'Amadis de Gaule, Contenant la fin & mort d'iceluy... Traduict d'Hespagnol en François*. Lyon: Loys Cloquemin, 1581. British Library General Reference Collection 245.a.21.
- . *Roland furieux, par messier Loys Arioste, ... traduit naïvement de l'italien en françois et augmenté... de cinq chants nouvellement traduictz de l'italien du mesme auteur... Édition augmentée de la Suite...* Rouen: Claude Le Villain, 1618. Bibliothèque nationale de France YD-2303.
- Des Gouttes, Jean. (Ed.) *Roland Furieux. Composé premierement en ryme Thuscane par messire Loys Arioste, noble Ferraroys, & maintenant traduit en prose Françoise...* (Lyon : Sulpice Sabon, 1544). Bibliothèque nationale de France, département Fonds du service reproduction, Rés. Yd-41. [ark:/12148/bpt6k72718w](https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:fr:bnf-Yd-41-ark:/12148/bpt6k72718w)
- Fornier, Jean (Transl.) *Le premier volume de Roland Furieux ... mys en rime françoise par Ian Fornier de Montaulban, avec les arguments au commencement de chacun chant... et avec les allégories des chants à la fin d'un chacun*. M. de Vascosan: Paris, 1555. British Library General Reference Collection 83.f.14.
- Gillot de Saintonge, Mme. (Transl.) *La Diane de Montemayor, mise en nouveau langage. Avec une idile sur le mariage de Mme la duchesse de Lorraine, et des lettres en vers burlesques*.

- Paris: Vve D. Hortemels, 1699. Bibliothèque nationale de France, département Réserve des livres rares, Y2-75929.
- Herberay des Essarts, Nicolas. (Transl.) *Amadis de Gaule. Livre I*. Edited by Michel Bideaux. Paris: Honoré Champion, 2006.
- . *Le Premier livre de Amadis de Gaule*. Paris: Estienne Groulleau, 1548. British Library General Reference Collection 634.1.20.(1.).
- Isla, Francisco de. (Transl.) *Aventuras de Gil Blas de Santillana Robadas à España*. Tome 1. London: F. Wingrave et al., 1815.
- Le Maçon, Antoine. (Transl.) *Le Décaméron de Messire Jehan Bocace, florentin, nouvellement traduit d'italien en françoys par Maistre Anthoine Le Maçon,...* Paris: impr. pour Estienne Roffet, dict le Faulcheur, 1545. Bibliothèque nationale de France, RES-Y2-206. ark:/12148/btv1b8600071m.
- Le Sage, Alain René. (Transl.) *Nouvelles aventures de l'admirable Don Quichotte de la Manche. Œuvres Complètes*, Tome 9. Edited by Christine Bahier-Porte and Pierre Brunelle. Sources Classiques 89, 92-93, 99, 109. Paris: Honoré Champion, 2009.
- Oudin, César. (Transl.) *L'Ingenieux Don Quixote de la Manche, compose par Michel de Cervantes, Traduit fidellement d'Espagnol en François, et Dedié au Roy...* Paris: Jean Foüet, 1615. [Biblioteca Virtual Joan Lluís Vives](#).
- Perrot d'Ablancourt, Nicolas. (Transl.) *Lucien, de la traduction de N. Perrot, Sr d'Ablancourt...* Tome 1. Paris: A. Courbé, 1654. Bibliothèque nationale de France, département Réserve des livres rares, Z-3732.
- Rosset, François de. (Transl.) *Roland l'Amoureux, composé en Italien par Mre Matheo Maria Bayardo Comte de Scandian et Traduit fidelement de nouveau par F. de Rosset & enrichi de Figures*. Paris : Robert Foüet, 1629. British Library General Reference Collection 240.k.26.
- . *Seconde partie de l'histoire de l'ingenieux et redoubtable chevalier, Dom-Quichot de la Manche*. Paris: Jacques du Clou and Denis Moreau, 1618.
- Saint-Martin, Filleau de. (Transl.) *Histoire de L'admirable Don Quichotte de La Manche, Traduite de L'espagnol. Nouv. éd., rev., corr. et augm. avec figures*. Paris: F. Dufart, 1798. Bancroft Library [PQ6330 .A2 1798](#).
- Vincent, Jacques. (Transl.) *Le premier livre de Roland l'amoureux, mis en italien par le seigneur Mathieu Marie Bayard, comte de Scandian, et traduit en françoys, par Maistre Jaques Vincent du Crest Arnaud en Dauphiné, secrétaire de Monsieur l'évêque du Puy*. Paris : Vivant Gaultherot, 1549. Bibliothèque nationale de France, département Réserve des livres rares, YD-6. ark:/12148/btv1b8609506j.

Primary Sources

- Académie française. *Dictionnaire de l'Académie française*. Tome II. Avignon: Jacques Garrigan, 1777.
- Ariosto, Ludovico. *Orlando Furioso*. Edited by Lanfranco Caretti. Torino : Einaudi, 1992.
- Aristotle. *Aristotle: Poetics*. Translated by Gerald F. Else. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1967.
- Avellaneda, Alonso Fernandez de. *Segundo tomo del ingenioso hidalgo Don Quixote de La Mancha, que contiene su tercera salida y es la quinta parte de sus aventuras*. Tarragona: Felipe Roberto, 1614.
- Bagnyon, Jehan. *L'histoire de Charlemagne (parfois dite Roman de Fierabras)*. Edited by Hans-Erich Keller. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1992.
- . *Fierabras*. Rouen: I. Burges le Jeune, [1530]. BL General Reference Collection 12450.c.14.
- Callières, François de. *Histoire poétique de la guerre : nouvellement déclarée entre les Anciens et les Modernes ([Reproduction en fac-similé]) / François de Callières*. Paris: Pierre Aubouïn, Pierre Embry, and Charles Clousier, 1688. Bibliothèque nationale de France. [ark:/12148/bpt6k76680](https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:ark:/12148/bpt6k76680).
- Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de. *El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quijote de La Mancha*, Books I and II. Edited by Luis Andrés Murillo. Madrid: Editorial Castalia, 1984.
- . *L'ingénieux hidalgo Don Quichotte de La Manche*, edited by Jean Cassou. Transl. César Oudin and François de Rosset. Bibliothèque de La Pléiade 18. Mayenne: J. Floch, 1940.
- Challe, Robert. *Continuation de l'histoire de l'admirable Don Quichotte de la Manche*. Ed. Jacques Cormier et Michèle Weil. Geneva: Droz, 1994.
- Civardi, Jean-Marc. (Ed.) *La Querelle du Cid (1637-1638): Édition critique intégrale*. Sources Classiques 52. Paris: Champion, 2004.
- Corneille, Pierre. *Le Cid (1637-1660)*. Edited by Georges Forestier. Paris: Société des Textes Français Modernes, 2001.
- Delvau, Alfred, Editor. *Bibliothèque bleue : romans de chevalerie des XIIe, XIIIe, XIVe, XVe et XVIe siècles ; précédés d'une Etude sur les romans de chevalerie et sur les origines de la langue française*, Vol. 1. Paris: J. Bry aîné, 1859. Bibliothèque nationale de France. [ark:/12148/bpt6k2084241](https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:ark:/12148/bpt6k2084241).

- Du Bellay, Joachim. *Les Regrets, precede de Les Antiquités de Rome et suivi de La Défense et Illustration de la Langue française*. Ed. S. de Sacy. Paris: Gallimard, 1967.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. "Copia: Foundations of the Abundant Style." In *Literary and Educational Writings 2*. Edited by Craig R. Thompson, translated by Betty I. Knott. *Collected Works of Erasmus*, v. 24. Toronto; Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1978.
- Espinel, Vicente. *Vida del Escudero Marcos de Obregón*. Alicante: Biblioteca Virtual Miguel de Cervantes, 1999.
- Lepautre, Jean. "La Flandre Despouillée des habits d'Espagne et revestue à la Française." 1660. Engraving. Bibliothèque nationale de France, département Estampes et photographie, Reserve Fol-QB-201.
- Lesage, Alain-René. *Le Diable boiteux*. [Par A.-R. Lesage.] Paris: Chez la Veuve Barbin, 1707. Bibliothèque nationale de France. ark:/12148/btv1b8615750p.
- . *Histoire de Gil Blas de Santillane*. Paris: Lefèvre, 1836.
- López de Ayala, Pedro. *Libro Rimado de Palacio*, Edited by Kenneth Adams. *Letras Hispánicas* 297. Madrid: Cátedra, 1993.
- Montaigne, Michel de. *Essais de Michel de Montaigne*, André Tournon, ed. La Salamandre. Paris: Impr. nationale éditions, 1998.
- Motteville, Françoise de. *Mémoires, pour servir à l'histoire d'Anne d'Autriche, épouse de Louis XIII, Roi de France. Par Madame de Motteville, Une de ses Favorites*. Vol. 5. Amsterdam: Francois Changuion, 1723.
- Oudin, César. *Tesoro de los dos lenguas francese y española...* Paris: Adrien Tiffaine, 1621.
- Petrarca, Francesco. *Invectives*. Edited and translated by David Marsh. Cambridge, MA; London: Harvard University Press, 2003.
- La Pompe et magnificence faite au mariage du Roy et de l'infante d'Espagne. Ensemble les entretiens qui ont esté faits entre les deux Roys, & les deux Reynes, dans l'isle de la Conference et la relation de ce qui s'est passé, mesmes apres la Consommation*. Paris: Jean Promé, 1660. Médiathèque de Bayonne, Bibliothèque Numérique. <http://www.purl.org/yoolib/bmbayonne/1703>.
- Poole, Kevin R., ed. and transl. *The Chronicle of Pseudo-Turpin: Book IV of The Liber Sancti Jacobi (Codex Calixtinus)*. *Medieval & Renaissance Texts*. New York: Italica Press, 2014.
- Rodríguez de Montalvo, Garcí. *Amadís de Gaula*. Edited by Jesús Rodríguez Velasco. Madrid : Fundación José Antonio de Castro, 1997.

- . *Amadis de Gaula*, Tomo II. Edited by Juan Bautista Avallé-Arce. Madrid: Editorial Espasa-Calpe, Colección Austral, 1991.
- Ronsard, Pierre de. *Œuvres complètes V*. Edited by Paul Laumonier. [Paris]: Société des textes français modernes, 2015. (Reprint of 1985 edition by Librairie Nizet.)
- . *The Franciad (1572)*. Translated, annotated, and introduction by Philip John Usher. *Studies in the Renaissance*, 44. New York: AMS Press, 2010.
- . *Les quatre premiers livres de la Franciade par Pierre de Ronsard, ... revue, corrigée et augmentée*. Paris: G. Buon, 1573. Bibliothèque nationale de France, Rés. Ye-1111. <ark:/12148/bpt6k70042b>
- Roseo da Fabriano, M. Mambrino. *Della historia del principe Sferamundi Figliuolo di Don Rogello di Grecia, parte sesta Di nuouo tradotta dalla lingua Spagnuola nella Italiana. Per M. Mambrino Roseo da Fabriano [or rather, written by him]*. Lucio Spineda: Venetia, 1610. British Library General Reference Collection C.57.k.3.
- Rosset, François de. *Le romant des chevaliers de la gloire...*, Paris: Veuve de Pierre Bertaud, 1612. Bibliothèque nationale de France, 4-Lb36-143. <ark:/12148/bpt6k1115868>
- Rosset, François de. *La suite de Roland le furieux. Nouvellement compose en François, par Fr. De Rosset*. Paris: Robert Foüet, 1615. Bibliothèque nationale de France, département Fonds du service reproduction, Yd-410. <ark:/12148/bpt6k1110703>
- Sorel, Charles. *De la Connaissance des bons livres ou examen de plusieurs auteurs*. chez André Pralard, 1671.
- Sorel, Charles. *La Bibliothèque Française: 1667*. Edited by Filippo D'Angelo, Mathilde Bombart, Laurence Giavarini, Claudine Nédélec, Dinah Ribard, Michèle Rosellini, and Alain Viala. Sources Classiques 111. Paris: Honoré Champion Éditeur, 2015.
- Sorel, Charles. *L'anti-Roman, ou, L'histoire du berger Lysis, accompagnée de ses remarques: Seconde édition du Berger Extravagant revue et augmentée par l'auteur*, edited by Anne-Elisabeth Spica. Seconde édition. Sources Classiques 115. Paris: Honoré Champion, 2014.
- Le Tresor des Amadis, contenant les Epistres, Complaintes, Conciōs, Harengues, Deffis, & Cartelz: recueilliz des douze liures d'Amadis de Gaule, pour servir d'exemple, à ceux qui desirent apprendre à bien ecrire Missives, ou parler François. Auec vne table, etc.* Paris : Jaques Kerver; Jean Ruelle, 1563. British Library General Reference Collection 1163.a.41.
- Thresor de tous les livres d'Amadis de Gaule, Contenant les Harangues, Epistres, Concions, Lettres missives, Demandes, Responses, Repliques, Sentences, Cartels, Complaintes &*

autres choses les plus excellentes : tres-utile pour instruire la Noblesse Françoise à l'eloquence, grace, vertu & generosité. Derniere Edition. Lyon : Pierre Rigaud, 1605. British Library General Reference Collection 244.a.3-4.

Le Trésor des vies de Plutarque, contenant les beaux dictz et faicts, sentences notables, responses, apophthegmes et harangues des empereurs, roys, ambassadeurs et capitaines, tant grecs que romains... extraicts hors des vies de Plutarque de Cheronae... Anvers : G. Silvius impr., 1567. Bibliothèque nationale de France, RES- J- 2081 (1).

Vauquelin de La Fresnaye, Jean. *Les diverses poésies du sieur de La Fresnaie, Vauquelin...* Caen: C. Macé, 1605. Bibliothèque nationale de France, Rés. Ye-1804. [ark:/12148/bpt6k70136p](https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:fr:bnf-12148-bpt6k70136p).

———. *L'Art poétique*, Edited by Georges Pellissier. Paris: Garnier Frères, 1885.

Secondary Sources

Albrecht, Jörn. "La retraduction: Définition d'une problématique." In *Retraductions: De la Renaissance au XXIe siècle*, edited by Christine Lombez, 11-29. Horizons Comparatistes. Nantes: Edition Cécile Defaut, 2011.

Alduy, Cécile. *Politique des 'Amours': Poétique et genèse d'un genre français nouveau (1544-1560)*. Collection "Travaux d'humanisme et de Renaissance." Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2007).

Ardila, J.A.G. *The Cervantean Heritage: Reception and Influence of Cervantes in Britain*. London: Legenda, 2009.

Armstrong, Guyda. *English Boccaccio: A History in Books*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013.

Ascoli, Albert Russell. "Ariosto and the 'Fier Pastor': Form and History in Orlando Furioso." *Renaissance Quarterly* 54, no. 2 (2001): 487-522.

Austin, H.D. "Germanic Words in Uguiccone's Lexicon," *Speculum* 23, no. 2 (April 1948): 273-283.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. "Forms of Time and the Chronotope in the Novel." In *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin*, edited by Michael Holquist, translated by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, 84-258. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1981.

Ballard, M., and Lieven d'Hulst (Eds.). (1996). *La traduction en France à l'âge classique*. Presses Univ. Septentrion.

- Balsamo, Jean. "L'Arioste et le Tasse. Des poètes italiens, leurs libraires et leurs lecteurs français." In *L'Arioste et le Tasse en France au XVIe siècle*, 11-26. Cahiers V.L. Saulnier 20. Paris: Rue d'Ulm, 2003.
- Baron, Hans. "The Querelle of the Ancients and the Moderns as a Problem for Renaissance Scholarship," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 20, no. 1 (1959): 3-22.
- Bardon, Maurice. "*Don Quichotte*" en France au XVIIIe et au XVIIIe Siècle, Tome I. Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, 1931.
- Bastin, Georges L., and Paul F. Bandia (Eds.). *Charting the Future of Translation History*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 2006.
- Beaune, Colette. *The Birth of an Ideology: Myths and Symbols of Nation in Late-Medieval France*, translated by Fredric L. Cheyette. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.
- Benhaïm, Véronique. « Les Thresors d'Amadis ». In *Les Amadis en France au XVIe siècle*, 157-181. Cahiers V.L. Saulnier 17. Paris : Éditions rue d'Ulm, 2000.
- Berdah, Arthur. " 'Nos ancêtres sont Gaulois': Sarkozy sous le feu des critiques." *Le Figaro*, Setember 20, 2016. <http://www.lefigaro.fr/politique/le-scan/citations/2016/09/20/25002-20160920ARTFIG00084-nos-ancevres-sont-gaulois-sarkozy-sous-le-feu-des-critiques.php>
- Berman, Antoine. "La retraduction comme espace de la traduction." *Palimpsestes* 8, no. 4 (1990), 1-7.
- . *Jacques Amyot, traducteur français: Essai sur les origines de la traduction en France*. L'Extrême Contemporain. Paris: Belin, 2012.
- Bibliothèque Nationale de France. *Ronsard: La trompette et la lyre*. Paris: Bibliothèque nationale de France, 1985.
- Bideaux, Michel. "Fortune et reception critique." In *Amadis de Gaule, Livre I*. Paris: Honoré Champion Éditeur, 2006.
- Bistué, Belén. *Collaborative Translation and Multi-Version Texts in Early Modern Europe. Transculturalisms, 1400-1700*. Surrey, England; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2013.
- Bjaï, Denis. *La Franciade sur le métier: Ronsard et la pratique du poème héroïque*. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2001.
- Blanc, Joseph. *Bibliographie italico-française universelle*. Vol. II. Milan: L'auteur-éditeur, 1886.
- Blocker, Déborah. "The Hermeneutics of Transmission: Deciphering Discourses on Poetry and the Arts in Early Modern Europe (1500-1800)." *Intermédialités: Histoire et théorie des*

- arts, des lettres et des techniques/Intermediality: History and Theory of the Arts, Literature and Technologies* 5 (2005): 37-60.
- Brown, Elizabeth A.R. "Saint-Denis and the Turpin Legend." In *The Codex Calixtinus and the Shrine of St. James*. Edited by John Williams and Alison Stones. Tübingen: G. Narr, 1992.
- Brun, Laurie. "L'ingenio et le lexique de l'invention dans les premières traductions françaises du Quichotte." *Les chantiers de la création. Revue pluridisciplinaire en Lettres, Langues, Arts et Civilisations*, no. 1 (April 22, 2008).
- Burton, Gideon. "From *Ars dictaminis* to *Ars conscribendi epistolis*: Renaissance Letter-Writing Manuals in the Context of Humanism." In *Letter-writing manuals and instruction from antiquity to the present: historical and bibliographic studies*, Edited by Carol Poster and Linda C. Mitchell, 88-101. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2007.
- Buzon, Christine de. "Amadis de Gaule en français: continuation romanesque, collection, compilation." *French Studies* 65, no. 3 (July 1, 2011): 337-46.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/fs/knr074>.
- Camporeale, Salvatore I. "Lorenzo Valla's Oratio on the Pseudo-Donation of Constantine: Dissent and Innovation in Early Renaissance Humanism." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 57, no. 1 (1996): 9-26.
- Cascardi, Anthony J. *Cervantes, Literature, and the Discourse of Politics*. University of Toronto Press, 2012.
- Cassou, Jean. "Introduction." *L'Ingénieux Hidalgo Don Quichotte de la Manche*, by Cervantes. Trans. César Oudin and François Rosset. Mayenne: J. Floch, 1940, 7-12.
- Cavallo, Jo Ann. *The World Beyond Europe in the Romance Epics of Boiardo and Ariosto*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013.
- Charron, Marc. "De la question de la lisibilité des traductions françaises de Don Quijote." In *Doubts and Directions in Translation Studies: Selected Contributions from the EST Congress, Lisbon 2004*, Edited by Yves Gambier, Miriam Shlesinger, and Radegundis Stolze, 311-322. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2007.
- Cioranescu, Al[exandre]. "La première édition du Bernardo." *Bulletin Hispanique* 37, no. 4 (1935): 481-84. doi:10.3406/hispa.1935.2695.
- . *Le Masque et le visage: du baroque espagnol au classicisme français*. Paris: Librairie Droz, 1983.
- Centre V.L. Saulnier (Ed.). *L'Arioste et le Tasse en France au XVIe siècle*. Cahiers V.L. Saulnier 20. Paris: Rue d'Ulm, 2003.

- Chevrel, Yves, Annie Cointre, Yen-Mai Tran-Gervat (Eds.). *Histoire des traductions en langue française: XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles (1610-1815)*. Lagrasse: Verdier, 2014.
- Chiong Rivero, Horacio. *The Rise of Pseudo-Historical Fiction: Fray Antonio de Guevara's Novelizations*. New York: Peter Lang, 2004.
- Cochrane, Eric W. *Historians and Historiography in the Italian Renaissance*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.
- Cointre, Annie, et al., "Prose narrative." In *Histoire des traductions en langue française: XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles (1610-1815)*, Edited by Yves Chevrel, Annie Cointre, and Yen-Mai Tran-Gervat, 1121-1209. Paris: Éditions Verdier, 2014.
- Coldiron, Anne E. B. *Canon, Period, and the Poetry of Charles of Orleans Found in Translation*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000.
- . *English Printing, Verse Translation, and the Battle of the Sexes, 1476-1557*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, Ltd., 2009.
- . *Printers without Borders: Translation and Textuality in the Renaissance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Compagnon, Antoine. "Montaigne : de la traduction des autres à la traduction de soi." *Littérature* 55, no. 3 (1984): 37–44. <https://doi.org/10.3406/litt.1984.2232>.
- Copeland, Rita. *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages: Academic Traditions and Vernacular Texts*. Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature 11. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Cormier, Jacques and Michèle Weil. "Introduction." *Continuation de l'histoire de l'admirable Don Quichotte de la Manche*, by Robert Challe. Geneva: Droz, 1994: 13-81.
- Cormier, Jacques. "La Continuation de l'histoire de l'admirable Don Quichotte de la Manche de Robert Challe : Cervantès trahi ou compris ?" *Cahiers de l'Association internationale des études françaises* 48, no. 1 (1996): 263–82. doi:10.3406/caief.1996.1250.
- De Buzon, Christine. "Le règlement de lecture des Amadis à Lyon: quelques épîtres de Gabriel Chappuys." *Réforme Humanisme Renaissance* 71 (2010): 125-149.
- Deane-Cox, Sharon. *Retranslation: Translation, Literature and Reinterpretation*. London; New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2014.
- DeJean, Joan. *Ancients Against Moderns: Culture Wars and the Making of a Fin de Siecle*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997.

- DellaNeva, JoAnn. *Unlikely Exemplars: Reading and Imitating beyond the Italian Canon in French Renaissance Poetry*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2009.
- . “Teaching Du Bellay a Lesson: Ronsard’s Rewriting of Ariosto’s Sonnets.” *French Forum* 24, no. 3 (September 1, 1999): 285–301.
- Desmidt, Isabelle. “(Re)translation Revisited.” *Meta: Journal des traducteurs* 54, no. 4 (2009): 671-672. doi:10.7202/038898ar.
- Dotoli, Giovanni. *Traduire en français du Moyen Âge au XXIe siècle: Théorie, pratique et philosophie de la traduction*. Collection Savoir Lettres. Paris: Hermann, 2010.
- . (Ed.) *Les traductions de l’italien en français au XVIème siècle*. Bibliothèque des traductions de l’italien en français du XVIe au XXe siècle, Vol. 4. Fasano (Br-Italia): Schena ; Paris, France : Presses de l’Université de Paris-Sorbonne, 2009.
- . (Ed.) *Les Traductions de l’italien en français au XVIIe siècle*. Bibliothèque des traductions de l’italien en français du XVIe au XXe siècle, v. 1. Fasano (Br-Italia) : Paris, France: Schena ; Presses de l’Université de Paris-Sorbonne, 2001.
- Duché, Véronique. “Introduction.” *Le Cinqueisme Livre d’Amadis de Gaule, Traduit par Nicolas Herberay des Essarts*. Paris: Éditions Classiques Garnier, 2009.
- Duff, David. *Romance and Revolution: Shelley and the Politics of a Genre*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Duggan, J.J. “Medieval Epic as Popular Historiography: Appropriation of Historical Knowledge in the Vernacular Epic.” In *Grundriss der romanischen Literaturen des Mittelalters, t. 11/1, La littérature historiographique des origines à 1500 (Partie historique)*, edited by H.U. Gumbrecht, U. Link-Heer et P.M. Spangenberg, 285-311. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1986.
- . (General Editor.) *La Chanson de Roland - The Song of Roland: The French Corpus*, Vols. 1-3. Turnhout: Brepols, 2005.
- Dunn, Kevin. *Pretexts of Authority: The Rhetoric of Authorship in the Renaissance Preface*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1994.
- Dunn, Peter N. *Spanish Picaresque Fiction: A New Literary History*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1993.
- Eisenberg, Daniel. “El ‘Bernardo’ de Cervantes fue su libro de caballerías.” *Anales Cervantinos* 21 (1983), 103-117.
- Fernández, José María Pérez, and Edward Wilson-Lee (Eds.). *Translation and the Book Trade in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

- Ferrazzi, Jacopo. *Bibliografia Ariostesca*. Bassano: Tipografia Sante Possato, 1881.
- Fontaine, M. M. "Jean Martin Traducteur." In *Prose et prosateurs de la Renaissance. Mélanges offerts à Robert Aulotte*, 109-122. Paris: SEDES, 1988.
- Foz, Clara. "(Re)traduction(s) et (Re)présentation(s): première et dernière sortie du Quijote en français." *Cadernos de Tradução* (2003) 11.1: 39-57. Accessed April 15, 2012. <http://www.periodicos.ufsc.br/index.php/traducao/article/view/6176>
- Foz, Clara and María Sierra Córdoba Serrano. "Dynamique historique des (re)traductions du Quijote en français: questions méthodologiques et premiers résultats." *Meta: Journal des Traducteurs* 50.3 (August 2005): 1042-1050.
- Franklin, Albert B. "A Study of the Origins of the Legend of Bernardo Del Carpio." *Hispanic Review* 5, no. 4 (October 1937): 286-303. doi:10.2307/469961.
- Fryde, Edmund B. *Humanism and Renaissance Historiography*. London: The Hambledon Press 1983.
- Frye, Herman Northrop. *Anatomy of Criticism*. New Jersey: Princeton U. Press, 1957.
- Fubini, Riccardo. "Humanism and Truth: Valla Writes Against the Donation of Constantine." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 57, no. 1 (1996): 79-86.
- Fuchs, Barbara. *The Poetics of Piracy: Emulating Spain in English Literature*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013.
- Fumaroli, Marc. "Jacques Amyot and the Clerical Polemic Against the Chivalric Novel." *Renaissance Quarterly* 38, no. 1 (April 1, 1985): 22-40. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2861330>.
- Gambier, Yves. "La retraduction: Ambiguïtés et défis." In *Autour de la retraduction: Perspectives littéraires européennes*, edited by Enrico Monti and Peter Schnyder, 49-66. Paris: Editions Orizons, 2012.
- "Les Gaulois sont-ils nos ancêtres ? La réponse d'un historien." *RTL.fr*. September 21, 2016. <http://www.rtl.fr/actu/societe-faits-divers/nos-ancetres-les-gaulois-c-est-une-invention-romaine-explique-un-historien-7784935920>.
- Gaunt, Simon. "Romance and Other Genres." In *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval Romance*, edited by Roberta L. Krueger, 45-60. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Genette, Gérard. *Seuils*. Paris: Seuil, 1987.

- Gingras, Gerald L. "López De Ayala's Crónica Del Rey Don Pedro: The Politics of Chivalry." *Revista Canadiense De Estudios Hispánicos* 16, no. 2 (1992): 187-201.
- Gorris, Rosanna. "Non è lontano a scoprirsi il porto: Jean Martin, son oeuvre et ses rapports avec la ville des Este." In *Jean Martin: un traducteur au temps de François Ier et de Henri II*, 43-83. Cahiers V.L. Saulnier 16. Paris: Presses de l'École normale supérieure, 1999.
- Gorris-Camos, Rosanna. "Traduction et illustration de la langue française. Les enjeux du Roland furieux lyonnais de 1543." In *Lyon et l'illustration de la langue française à la Renaissance*, edited by G. Defaux, 231-260. Lyon, ENS Éditions, 2003.
- Grafton, Anthony. *Forgers and Critics: Creativity and Duplicity in Western Scholarship*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990.
- . *Defenders of the Text: The traditions of scholarship in an age of science, 1450-1800*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994.
- . *What Was History? The Art of History in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Grafton, Anthony and Lisa Jardine. *From Humanism to the Humanities: Education and the Liberal Arts in Fifteenth- and Sixteenth-Century Europe*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986.
- Gray, Hanna. "Renaissance Humanism: The Pursuit of Eloquence." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 24 (1963): 497-514.
- Greene, Thomas M. *The Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982.
- Grell, Chantal. "Les historiographes en France: XVIe-XVIIe Siècles." In *Les historiographes en Europe de la fin du Moyen Âge à la Révolution*, Ed. Chantal Grell. Paris: Presses de l'Université Paris-Sorbonne, 2006, pp. 127-156.
- Gross, Janice. "Revisiting 'nos Ancêtres Les Gaulois': Scripting and Postscripting Francophone Identity." *The French Review* 78, no. 5 (2005): 948-59.
- Guillén, Claudio. "Notes toward the Study of the Renaissance Letter." In *Renaissance Genres: Essays on Theory, History, and Interpretation*, Edited by Barbara Kiefer Lewalski, 70-101. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1986.
- . *Literature as System: Essays toward the Theory of Literary History*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971.

- Guillerm, Luce. *Sujet de l'écriture et traduction autour de 1540*. Lille : Paris: Atelier national Reproduction des thèses, Université Lille III, 1988.
- . "Introduction." In *Amadis de Gaule, Livre IV*. Textes de la Renaissance. "Romans de chevalerie de la Renaissance" 92. Paris: Honoré Champion Éditeur, 2005.
- Hainsworth, G. *Les Nouvelles Exemplaires de Cervantes et leur popularité en France au 17e siècle*. Paris, Champion, 1933.
- . "Quelques opinions françaises (1614-1664) sur les Nouvelles exemplaires de Cervantes (1613)." *Bulletin Hispanique* 32, no. 1 (1930): 63–70.
- Hampton, Timothy. *Writing from History: The Rhetoric of Exemplarity in Renaissance Literature*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1990.
- . *Fictions of Embassy : Literature and Diplomacy in Early Modern Europe* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2009).
- Hathaway, Baxter. *The Age of Criticism: The Late Renaissance in Italy*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1962.
- Henderson, Judith Rice. "Defining the Genre of the Letter: Juan Luis Vives' 'De Conscribendis Epistolis'." *Renaissance and Reformation/Renaissance et Réforme* 7, no. 2 (1983): 89-105.
- Hepp, Noémie. *Atti della Accademia delle Scienze de Torino*, t. XCVI (1961-1962).
- Hermans, Theo. "Introduction: How is Translation Possible?" In *Between Cultures and Texts: Itineraries in Translation History*, edited by Antoine Chalvin, Anne Lange and Daniele Monticelli, 11-18. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2011.
- Hohler, Christopher. "A Note on Jacobus," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 35 (1972): 31-80.
- Holt, Mack P. *The French Wars of Religion, 1562–1629*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005, 121-122.
- Huchon, Mireille. « Amadis, 'Parfaicte idée de nostre langue françoise' ». In *Les Amadis en France au XVIe siècle*, 183-200. Cahiers V.L. Saulnier 17. Paris : Éditions rue d'Ulm, 2000.
- Huppert, George. *The Idea of Perfect History*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1970.
- Ianziti, Gary. *Writing History in Renaissance Italy: Leonardo Bruni and the Uses of the Past*. I Tatti Studies in Italian Renaissance History. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012.

- Jameson, A. K. "Was There a French Original of the 'Amadis de Gaula'?" *The Modern Language Review* 28, no. 2 (April 1933): 176-193. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3714969>.
- Jameson, Fredric. "Magical Narratives: Romance as Genre." *New Literary History* 7, no. 1 (1975): 135-163.
- Jauss, Hans Robert. "Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory." Transl. Elizabeth Benzinger. *New Literary History* 2, no. 1 (1970): 7-37. <https://doi.org/10.2307/468585>.
- . "Chanson de geste et roman courtois." In *Chanson de geste und höfischer Roman*, edited by Kurt Baldinger et al., 61-77. Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1963.
- Javitch, Daniel. *Proclaiming a Classic: The Canonization of Orlando Furioso*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991.
- Jones, Joseph R. "Notes on the Diffusion and Influence of Avellaneda's 'Quixote.'" *Hispania* 56 (April 1, 1973): 229-37.
- Kahn, Victoria. *Rhetoric, Prudence, and Skepticism in the Renaissance*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1985.
- Kempshall, Matthew. *Rhetoric and the Writing of History, 400-1500*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2011.
- Kong, Katherine. *Lettering the Self in Medieval and Early Modern France*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2010.
- Krause, Virginia. "Serializing the French Amadis in the 1540s." In *Charting Change in France around 1540*, edited by Marian, Rothstein, 40-62. Selinsgrove: Susquehanna University Press, 2006.
- . "The End of Chivalric Romance: Barthélemy Aneau's 'Alector' (1560)," *Renaissance and Reformation / Renaissance et Réforme* 23, no. 2 (Spring 1999): 45-60.
- Laradji, Aline. *La légende de Roland: de la genèse française à l'épuisement de la figure du héros en Italie*. Paris: Harmattan, 2008.
- Lautel-Ribstein, Florence, et al., "Poésie." In *Histoire des traductions en langue française: XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles (1610-1815)*, Edited by Yves Chevrel, Annie Cointre, and Yen-Mai Tran-Gervat, 949-1120. Paris: Éditions Verdier, 2014.
- Le Moël, Sylvie, et al., "L'enjeu des langues." In *Histoire des traductions en langue française: XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles (1610-1815)*, Edited by Yves Chevrel, Annie Cointre, and Yen-Mai Tran-Gervat, 55-101. Paris: Éditions Verdier, 2014.

- Lehmann, Sabine. "Les prologues dans les textes en prose (XIVe-XVe siècles): modèles et déviances." In *Mettre en prose aux XIVe-XVe siècles*, edited by Maria Colombo Timelli, Barbara Ferrari, and Anne Schoysman, 177-186. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols Publishers, 2010.
- López Martínez-Morás, Santiago. "Le Pseudo-Turpin en Espagne," *Cahiers de recherches médiévales et humanistes. Journal of medieval and humanistic studies*, no. 25 (June 30, 2013): 471-494.
- Losada-Goya, José-Manuel. *Bibliographie critique de la littérature espagnole en France au XVIIe siècle: présence et influence*. Paris: Librairie Droz, 1999.
- Luteran, Paula. *The Theory of Translation in the Sixteenth Century: Analyzing Nicholas Herberay des Essarts' Amadis de Gaule*. Lewiston; Queenston; Lampeter: The Edwin Mellen Press, 2005.
- Menaca, Marie de. "Du «Liber Sancti Jacobi» au «Codex Calixtinus»: réécriture d'un texte et ses raisons politiques et religieuses." *Cahiers de linguistique hispanique médiévale* 14, no. 1 (1989): 121-146.
- Mentz, Steve. *Romance for Sale in Early Modern England: The Rise of Prose Fiction*. Aldershot, England ; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2006.
- Meyer-Minnemann, Klaus. "El género de la novela picaresca." In *La novela picaresca: concepto genérico y evolución del género (siglos XVI y XVII)*. Edited by Klaus Meyer-Minnemann and Sabine Schlickers. Madrid: Iberoamericana Editorial, 2008.
- Monfrin, M. Jacques. "La figure de Charlemagne dans l'historiographie du XVe siècle," *Annuaire-Bulletin de la Société de l'histoire de France* (1964) : 67-78.
- Monti, Enrico. "Introduction: La retraduction, un état des lieux." In *Autour de la retraduction: Perspectives littéraires européennes*, edited by Enrico Monti and Peter Schnyder, 9-29. Paris: Editions Orizons, 2012.
- Moss, Ann. *Printed Commonplace-Books and the Structuring of Renaissance Thought*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Murray, Timothy. "Theatrical Legitimation: Forms of French Patronage and Portraiture." *PMLA* 98, no. 2 (1983): 170-82. doi:10.2307/462044.
- Norton, Glyn P. *The Ideology and Language of Translation in Renaissance France and Their Humanist Antecedents*. Paris: Librairie Droz, 1984.
- Olds, Katrina B. *Forging the Past: Invented Histories in Counter-Reformation Spain*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2015.

- Paloposki, Outi. "Domestication and Foreignization." In *Handbook of Translation Studies*, Vol. 2, edited by Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer, 40-42. Philadelphia; Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, 2011.
- Paloposki, Outi and Kaisa Koskinen. "A Thousand and One Translations." In *Claims, Changes and Challenges in Translation Studies: Selected Contributions from the EST Congress, Copenhagen 2001*, edited by Gyde Hansen, Kirsten Malmkjaer, and Daniel Gile, 27-38. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2004.
- Palumbo, Giovanni. "David Aubert historien ? Le récit de la bataille de Roncevaux dans les Croniques et Conquestes de Charlemaigne." *Le Moyen Age* Tome CXII, no. 3 (January 15, 2007): 585-602.
- Parker, Patricia A. *Inescapable Romance: Studies in the Poetics of a Mode*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1979.
- Picciola, Liliane. "Traduire 'Don Quichotte' au début du XVIIe siècle," *Revue Des Deux Mondes*, 2001: 137-147.
- Place, Edwin B. "The Amadis Question." *Speculum* 25, no. 3 (1950): 357-366.
- . "Amadis of Gaul, Wales, or What?" *Hispanic Review* 23, no. 2 (1955): 99-107.
- . "El 'Amadis' de Montalvo como manual de cortesanía en Francia," *Revista de Filología Española* 38 (1954): 151-169.
- Pomian, Krzysztof. "Francs et Gaulois." In *Les Lieux de mémoire*, Vol. 1, edited by Pierre Nora, 40-105. Paris: Gallimard, 1992.
- Poole, Kevin R., ed. and transl. *The Chronicle of Pseudo-Turpin: Book IV of The Liber Sancti Jacobi (Codex Calixtinus)*. New York: Italica Press, 2014.
- "Pour Nicolas Sarkozy, nos ancêtres étaient les Gaulois mais aussi « les tirailleurs musulmans »." *Le Monde.fr*, September 24, 2016. http://www.lemonde.fr/election-presidentielle-2017/article/2016/09/24/pour-nicolas-sarkozy-nos-ancetres-etaient-les-gaulois-mais-aussi-les-tirailleurs-musulmans_5002989_4854003.html.
- Py, Albert. *Imitation et Renaissance dans la poésie de Ronsard*. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1984
- Pym, Anthony. *Method in Translation History*. Manchester: St. Jerome, 1998.
- . *Exploring Translation Theories*. London ; New York: Routledge, 2010.
- . "Complaint Concerning the Lack of History in Translation Histories." *Livius: Revista de Estudios de Traducción*, no. 1 (1992): 1-12.

- Quint, David. "Astolfo's Voyage to the Moon." *Yale Italian Studies* 1 (1977): 398-408.
- Rajchenbach-Teller, Élise. "Le *Roland Furieux*, Lyon, Sulpice Sabon pour Jean Thelusson, 1543-1544." *Réforme, Humanisme, Renaissance* 71, no. 1 (2011): 45-54.
- Ranum, Orest. *Artisans of Glory: Writers and Historical Thought in Seventeenth-Century France*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1980.
- Richardson, Brian. "The Italian of Renaissance Elites in Italy and Europe." In *Multilingualism in Italy: Past and Present*, edited by Anna Laura Lepschy and Arturo Tosi. Oxford: Legenda, 2002, pp. 5-23.
- Rigolot, François. "Ronsard's Pretext for Paratexts: The Case of the 'Franciade.'" *SubStance* 17, no. 2 (January 1, 1988): 29-41. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3685137>.
- Rodríguez-Moñino, Antonio. "El primer manuscrito del 'Amadís de Gaula' (Noticia bibliográfica)." *Boletín de la Real Academia Española*, 199-216. Tomo XXVI, Cuaderno CXLVII (May-August, 1956).
- Rothstein, Marian. *Reading in the Renaissance: Amadis de Gaule and the Lessons of Memory*. University of Delaware Press, 1999.
- . (Ed.) *Charting Change in France around 1540*. Selinsgrove: Susquehanna University Press, 2006.
- . Rothstein, Marian. "Le genre du roman à la Renaissance." *Études françaises* 32, no. 1 (1996): 35. <https://doi.org/10.7202/036009ar>.
- Sainte-Beuve, Charles-Augustin. *Tableau historique et critique de la poésie française et du théâtre française au seizième siècle*. Paris : A. Sautelet and Alexandre Mesnier, 1828.
- Short, Ian. "The Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle: Some Unnoticed Versions and Their Sources," *Medium Aevum* 38 (January 1, 1969): 13-15.
- Showalter, Jr., English. "Robert Challe and Don Quixote." *The French Review* 45, no. 6 (May 1972): 1136-1144.
- Simonin, Michel. "La disgrâce d'Amadis." *Studi Francesi* 28 (1984): 1-35.
- Spiegel, Gabrielle M. "Forging the Past: The Language of Historical Truth in Middle Ages." *The History Teacher* 17, no. 2 (1984): 267-83. doi:10.2307/492771.
- . "Pseudo-Turpin, the Crisis of the Aristocracy and the Beginnings of Vernacular Historiography in France," *Journal of Medieval History* 12, no. 3 (1986): 207-23.

- . “History, Historicism, and the Social Logic of the Text in the Middle Ages,” *Speculum* 65, no. 1 (1990): 59–86.
- . “Medieval Canon Formation and the Rise of Royal Historiography in Old French Prose,” *MLN* 108, no. 4 (September 1993): 638-658.
- . *Romancing the Past*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.
- Stephens, Walter. *Giants in Those Days: Folklore, Ancient History, and Nationalism*. Regents Studies in Medieval Culture. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1989.
- . “Complex Pseudonymity: Annius of Viterbo’s Multiple Persona Disorder.” *MLN* 126, no. 4 (2011): 689–708. doi:10.1353/mln.2011.0077.
- Stone, Donald. “The Boundaries of History and Literature: Belleforest’s ‘Les Grandes Annales’ and Ronsard’s ‘Franciade.’” *Renaissance and Reformation / Renaissance et Réforme* 12, no. 3 (Summer 1988): 207-213.
- Struever, Nancy. *The Language of History in the Renaissance*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1970.
- Suard, François. “Le passage à la prose.” *Cahiers de recherches médiévales et humanistes. Journal of medieval and humanistic studies*, no. 12 (December 30, 2005): 29–43. doi: 10.4000/crm.2182.
- Suárez, Jean Luis. “La historización de un mito: el tiempo como problema y como solución en Las mocedades del Cid.” *Revista Canadiense De Estudios Hispánicos* 26, no. 3 (2002): 493-509.
- Syrový, Daniel. *Tilting at Tradition: Problems of Genre in the Novels of Miguel de Cervantes and Charles Sorel*. Amsterdam; New York: Rodopi, 2013.
- Tate, Robert B. “López De Ayala, Humanist Historian?” *Hispanic Review* 25, no. 3 (1957): 157-174.
- Taylor, Jane H. M. *Rewriting Arthurian Romance in Renaissance France: From Manuscript to Printed Book*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2014.
- Thiry, Claude. “Les mises en prose: bilan des études philologiques.” In *Mettre en prose aux XIVe-XVIIe siècles*, edited by Maria Colombo Timelli, Barbara Ferrari, and Anne Schoysman, 53-64. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols Publishers, 2010.
- Tolan, John. “The Battle of Roncesvalles as National Polemic.” In *Bridging the Atlantic: Toward a Reassessment of Iberian and Latin American Cultural Ties*, edited by Marina Perez de Mendiola, 15-29. Albany: SUNY Press, 1996.

- Ullman, Berthold L. "Leonardo Bruni and Humanistic Historiography," *Medievalia et Humanistica* 4 (1946): 45-61.
- Usher, Phillip John. *Epic Arts in Renaissance France*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Van Gorp, Hendrik. "Traductions et Evolution d'un genre littéraire: Le roman picaresque en Europe au 17ème et 18ème siècles." *Poetics Today* (1981): 209-219.
- Van Wyke, Ben. "Imitating Bodies and Clothes: Refashioning the Western Conception of Translation." In *Thinking through Translation with Metaphors*, Edited by James St. André, 17-46. New York: Routledge, 2010.
- Venuti, Lawrence. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Vignes, Jean. "Traductions et imitations françaises de l'*Orlando furioso* (1544-1580): étude comparative." In *L'Arioste et le Tasse en France au XVIIe siècle*, Cahiers V.L. Saulnier 20, 75-98. Paris: Rue d'Ulm, 2003.
- Vilà, Lara. "De Roncesvalles a Pavía: Ariosto, la épica española y los poemas sobre Bernardo del Carpio." *Criticón*, no. 115 (January 15, 2012): 45–65. doi:10.4000/criticon.85
- Vinay, Jean-Paul and Jean Darbelnet. *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais: Méthode de traduction*. Nouv. éd. revue et corrigée. Bibliothèque de Stylistique Comparée 1. Paris: Didier, 1977.
- Vogeley, Nancy. "Two Arguments for the Spanish Authorship of *Gil Blas*: Francisco De Isla and Juan Antonio Llorente." *PMLA* 125, no. 2 (2010): 456-466.
- Weaver, Elissa B. "Francesco Berni's 'Rifacimento of the Orlando Innamorato': Why and How." *Pacific Coast Philology* 10 (April 1975): 53-58. doi:10.2307/1316384.
- . "The Spurious Text of Francesco Berni's 'Rifacimento' of Matteo Maria Boiardo's 'Orlando Innamorato.'" *Modern Philology* 75, no. 2 (1977): 111–131.
- Weiger, John G. "Sobre la originalidad e independencia de Guillén de Castro." *Hispanófila* 31 (1967): 1–15. doi:10.2307/43806843.
- Weinberg, Bernard, ed. *Critical Prefaces of the French Renaissance*. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1950.
- Williams, Grace. *The Amadis Question*. New York; Paris: Extrait de la Revue hispanique, 1909.
- Wilson, Louise. "The Publication of Iberian Romance in Early Modern Europe." In *Translation and the Book Trade in Early Modern Europe*, edited by José María Pérez Fernández and Edward Wilson-Lee, 201-215. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

- Witt, Ronald. "Medieval 'Ars Dictaminis' and the Beginnings of Humanism: A New Construction of the Problem." *Renaissance Quarterly* 35, no. 1 (1982), 1-35.
- Yllera Fernández, Alicia. "Cuando los traductores desean ser traidores." In *Traducción y adaptación cultural: España-Francia*, Edited by Francisco Lafarga and María Luisa Donaire Fernández, 639–655. Oviedo: Universidad de Oviedo, Servicio de Publicaciones, 1991.
- Zanger, Abby E. *Scenes from the Marriage of Louis XIV: Nuptial Fictions and the Making of Absolutist Power*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1997.
- Zatti, Sergio. "Turpin's Role: Poetry and Truth in the *Furioso*." In *The Quest for Epic: From Ariosto to Tasso*, edited by Dennis Looney, 60-94. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006.
- Zinguer, Ilana. "De la théorie à la pratique dans les traductions des nouvelles d'espagnol en Français au début du XVIIe siècle." *Bulletin de l'Association d'étude sur l'humanisme, la réforme et la renaissance* 15, no. 1 (1982): 86–95. doi:10.3406/rhren.1982.1298.
- Zuber, Roger. *Les "belles infidèles" et la formation du goût classique*. Nouvelle éd. revue et augmentée. Bibliothèque de l'évolution de l'humanité 14. Paris: Albin Michel, 1995.
- Zuili, Marc. "César Oudin y la difusión del español en Francia en el siglo XVII." In *La Cultura del otro: español en Francia, francés en España*, Edited by Manuel Bruña Cuevas et al., 278–289. Seville: Universidad de Sevilla, 2006.