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ABSTRACT

Much recent writing on the 'fortuna' of Machiavelli deals with predictable authors (mainly of historical treatises and popular political pamphlets) who have long been associated with Machiavelli. This thesis aims to set the discussion in a wider context by taking into account those poets and dramatists who can be shown to have had first hand knowledge of Machiavelli. Examination of classical and Biblical sources has helped to determine the precise influence of the Italian author. This method has revealed that sixteenth century writers, when unimpeded by political loyalties, were able to form an impartial and reasoned opinion of his works, and has extended considerably documentation of the range of passages in Machiavelli known to the sixteenth century.

As well as examining their poetry, I have discussed, where applicable these authors' prose treatises which confirm their preoccupation with Machiavelli and which often provide a key to the correct interpretation of their poetry and drama. Study of the ambivalent attitude of many of these writers towards Machiavelli helps to deepen our appreciation of the complexity and subtlety of the fiction of the period.

With the exception of Ronsard, there is a short biography of each of the authors considered - Pierre Matthieu, Estienne Jodelle, Jean de La Jessee, Louis Des Masures, Agrippa D'Aubigné, Alexandre de Pont-Aymery, Robert Garnier and the La Taille brothers. In some cases, this is the first time such biographies have been established and they have called attention to lesser known works which are nevertheless of historical value.

This study concludes that Machiavelli's ideas held an enduring interest and fascination for the major French poets and dramatists of the Renaissance.
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INTRODUCTION

There has as yet been little study of Machiavelli's impact on sixteenth century French poetry and drama. One of the aims of this thesis is to widen the discussion of Machiavelli's influence in France by taking into account poetry and theatre as well as prose works.

There are several reasons why it is appropriate to deal with poetry and drama together. Firstly, some of the writers examined in this thesis use both forms for example, Estienne Jodelle, Jean de La Taille, Louis Des Masures, and a decision to focus on poetry rather than drama (or vice versa) would leave the account of Machiavelli's influence on these authors' work incomplete.

Secondly, the decision to deal jointly with poetry and drama is very much in keeping with the spirit of the sixteenth century which recognised a close kinship between the two forms. In sixteenth century treatises on the art of poetry, it is usual to find drama described as a branch of poetry and most of the plays examined in this thesis are written in verse. In his Arte of English Poesie (1589), George Puttenham includes dramatists in his description of the various types of poets,

As the matter of Poesie is divers, so was the forme of their poer.es and maner of writing, for all of them wrote not in one sort, even as all of them wrote not upon one matter ... There were ... Poets that wrote only for the stage ... ¹

In his Deffence et Illustration de la Langue Françoise (1549), Du Bellay includes drama in his list of poetic genres (Book II, chapter 4).

Most sixteenth century theoreticians agreed, though, that drama was an inferior and as yet undeveloped, branch of poetry. Sir Philip Sidney says in his Apologie for Poetrie (1583),

But I have lavished out too many words of this Play-matter; I do it, because as they are excelling parts of Poesie, so is there none so much used in England, and none can be more pittifullly abused: which like an unmannerly daughter, shewing a bad education, causeth her mother Poesies honestie to be called in question.²
Nevertheless, despite drama's inferiority, Sidney makes it quite clear that poetry and drama were regarded as two aspects of the same form: fiction,

... A Tragidie is tied to the lawes of Poesie, and not of Historie: not bounde to follow the storie, but having libertie either to faine a quite new matter, or to frame the Historie to the most Tragicall conveniencie.

(Ed. cit., p. 39).

Renaissance poets saw themselves as writers of fiction following the etymology of the word 'poesie' from the Greek meaning 'to create' which was translated by the Latin 'fingere' and in English gave 'fiction'.

It was in this divine ability to create that the uniqueness of the poet-vates lay, so Sidney and his contemporaries believed. In the Solitaire Premier, ou, Discours des Muscs, et de la fureur Poétique (1552), Pontus de Tyard describes how poets are inspired by the Muses,

La fureur Poëtique proceâ des Muses (di-je) et est un ravissement de l'âme, qui est docile et invincible: au moyen duquel elle est esveillée, esmuè, et incitée par chants, et autres Poesies, à l'instruction des hommes.  

Dramatists were thought to share in this poetic inspiration for although the greatest Muse according to Tyard is Calliope, one of the lesser Muses is Melpomène, the tragic Muse.

The last part of the quotation from Tyard ('à l'instruction des hommes') reminds us of another link between poetry and drama in the Renaissance: both sought to give some moral lesson as well as entertainment to the reader or spectator. Sidney remarked,

it is that fayning notable images of vertues, vices, or what els, with that delightfull teaching, which must be the right describing note to know a Poet by.

(Ed. cit., p. 107).

So a poet like Ronsard teaches by proposing a high moral standard for his rulers, whilst a dramatist such as Robert Garnier teaches by setting before his audience flawed protagonists. In his poetry, D'Aubigné satirizes political opponents using methods similar to those of contemporary
pamphleteers, methods which are also employed by Pierre Matthieu in his drama as a means of giving Henry III a lesson in kingship.

Both poets and dramatists of the sixteenth century saw it as part of their duty to interpret and comment on contemporary events and policies. This type of poetry and drama dealing with contemporary issues can be included under O.E. Hardison's category of 'occasional poetry'. Such authors as Pierre Matthieu, D'Aubigné, Ronsard, Garnier and Alexandre de Pont-Aymery wrote to influence the King and other French leaders, and since they wished their poetry and drama to reach a wide audience, their views on politics are often more representative of ideas generally circulating at the time than perhaps are those of weightier and more original political theorists such as Jean Bodin, Estienne Pasquier and Louis Le Roy, whose reaction to Machiavelli has already been the subject of extensive research. It is therefore reasonable to expect that a thesis dealing with the influence of Machiavelli on writers of fiction, might afford in addition, an insight into the ordinary man's opinion of Machiavelli and machiavellianism in the sixteenth century.

The year of publication of the first French translations of *Il Principe* by Guillaume Cappel and Gaspard D'Auvergne, seems an appropriate starting point for an investigation of Machiavelli's influence in France. That Machiavelli was known in France before 1553 is, however, testified by Jacques Cohory's translations of the *Discorsi* (of which Book I appeared in 1544 and all three books in 1548) as well as by Jean Charrier's French translation of the *Arte della Guerra*, published in 1546. Moreover, an examination of French emblem books reveals that *Il Principe* is the source of two emblems in Guillaume de La Perrière's collection, *Le Théâtre des Bons Engins* published at Paris in 1539. Andrea Alciati also used *Il Principe* for his emblem *Consiliarii Principum* which first appeared in 1546. This 1546 edition of the *Emblemata* was
published in Venice by Aldus but was widely read in France.  

Another early use of Machiavelli in France is found in the book sometimes attributed to Guillaume Du Bellay, the Instructions sur le fait de la guerre, extractes des livres de Polybe, Frontin, Vegece, Cornazan, Machiavelle, et plusieurs autres bons auteurs, first published in 1548.  

This work relies heavily on the Arte della Guerra. In addition, the influence of Machiavelli on Claude de Seyssel's La Monarchie de France has been argued.  

La Monarchie was published in July 1519, that is, before the publication of Il Principe, but it is thought that Seyssel may have had access to a manuscript copy of Machiavelli's work, perhaps during his stay in Florence.  

The case has also been put for Machiavelli's influence on two more authors writing before 1553: Estienne de La Boëtie and François Rabelais. The similarities between certain of Machiavelli's political ideas and La Boëtie's Discours de la servitude volontaire (written around 1548) are striking, but a definite influence seems impossible to establish.  

Rabelais's opposition to Machiavelli's military theories in Gargantua (1535) and the Tierra Livre, Chapter 1 (1546) has also been discussed by scholars.  

The examples of Claude de Seyssel, La Boëtie and Rabelais may be fairly dubious instances of Machiavelli's influence, but the Italian author's early penetration into France is substantiated by the translations of Gohory and Charrier, the emblem books of La Perrière and Alciati, and by the Instructions sur le fait de la guerre. However, this thesis aims to deal with poems and plays which address themselves to a wide audience and there is no evidence that Machiavelli was known in France during the 1530's and 1540's other than to a handful of intellectuals. An examination of the prefaces to the French translations of his works appears to confirm this view. In the dedicatory epistle to his complete translation of the Discorsi, published in 1548, Jacques Gohory explains
that as yet he does not feel capable of producing an original work and therefore, 'je suis allé aux emprunts et ay trouvé credit en un Florentin nommé Machiavelli.' The wording of this phrase suggests that Gohory does not expect his readers to have prior knowledge of the Italian author ('un Florentin' rather than 'le Florentin'). The fact that Machiavelli was not yet well known in France is confirmed in the preface to Book II of this translation where Gohory says that he wished to write for posterity but was afraid of overreaching himself and therefore chose a relatively obscure author on whom to practise:

mais ay fait mon coup d'essay en l'oeuvre de cest autheur, duquel l'autorité n'estoit encore si sainte et auguste, que les fautes, que j'y pourrois commettre, me fussent imputées à sacrilege ou crime de lese majesté.  

(  ed. cit.  , p. 316).  

Even by 1548, then, Machiavelli's ideas do not seem to have been widely disseminated in France; certainly the popular legend of the wicked Machiavel had not yet grown up. Gohory apparently feels under no obligation to defend Machiavelli's views and treats him primarily as a historian in the classical tradition, useful for interpreting and developing the ideas of Roman historians such as Tacitus, Sallust and Livy. Similarly, the French translator of the Arte della Guerra, Jean Charrier, places Machiavelli's book in the tradition of ancient literature on military affairs. In the 1540's, therefore, the emphasis appears to be on Machiavelli's works as continuing the classical, humanist tradition of historical writing, rather than on the novelty of his political views.

The year 1553 provides the first obvious indication of a change in attitude towards Machiavelli on the part of French readers. In the preface to his translation of Il Principe, Guillaume Cappel finds himself obliged to defend Machiavelli against those who charge him with irreligion. The implication that popular hostility towards Machiavelli was developing in France, is confirmed by an examination of Gaspard D'Auvergne's translation of Il Principe which appeared in the same year. In the
dedicatory epistle addressed to James Hamilton, tutor of Mary Queen of Scots, D'Auvergne, whilst defending Machiavelli's 'realistic' approach to politics, is nevertheless compelled to make some concessions to contemporary criticisms of the Italian author:

quand tout sera bien examiné, encore que son langage semble estre un peu trop licentieux, et n'avoir du tout suyvie la plus vertueuse voye, pour autoriser en quelques endroits ce qui a apparence de vice: Si n'en a il peu parler autrement, voulant obeir au naturel de son sujet, et suyvre les fins qu'il se propose.  

In the face of his contemporaries' attitude towards Machiavelli, D'Auvergne obviously feels under some pressure to explain and defend Machiavelli's description of political behaviour - and his defensive arguments often seem specious in the extreme, as when he contrasts Machiavelli with those writers who have dealt with politics in a more idealistic way,

lesquels ont figure en leurs escrits je ne sçay quelle perfection de Prince non imitable à tous les humains ... Où au contraire cestuy ci a voulu accomodier la forme de ses preceptes seulement à ce, qui est sujet à l'experience, et la plus commune mode de faire.

(Dedicatory epistle, unpaginated).

D'Auvergne concludes in words reminiscent of the Italian author:

telle est la loy du monde, qui est naturellement vicieux, de n'y pouvoir longuement prosperer, mesmes en ces souveraines dignitez, sans se sçavoir aider au besoing du vice.

(ibid)

So between 1548 and 1553, hostility towards Machiavelli in France appears to have developed. Indeed, D'Auvergne's translation has been censored in three places by the addition of warnings in the margin to the reader. Marnef, the printer, explains why,

Les annotations que trouverez es feuilletz 4, 49 et 62 ont esté mises par les depputez à visiter les Livres à Imprimer: affin que telz endroitz soient leuz avec discretion et jugement.

(ed. cit., p. 94).

In his 1571 translation of Il Principe, Jacques Gohory was himself obliged to acknowledge this hostility to Machiavelli on the part of his fellow country men. He says of Machiavelli's works,
Vroy est qu'il les faut manier avec discretion comme euvres totalement fondées sur la sapience humaine: quoy que quelqu'un ayt osé bien hardiement affermer le contraire.

An examination of the prefaces to the French translations of Machiavelli's works confirms that the Italian author was not well known in France till the early 1550's when hostility towards him began to develop, as revealed in the defensive prefaces of Cappel and D'Auvergne and, later, of Gohory. And it is not until the next decade that Machiavelli's influence begins to appear in poetry and drama. The earliest poems discussed in this thesis with relation to Machiavelli's influence, are Estienne Jodelle's Discours de Jules Cesar, written around 1561/2 and Jean de La Taille's Remonstrance pour le Roy à tous ses subjects (first published in 1563). The first traces of hostility towards Machiavelli in drama appear in Estienne Jodelle's Didon se sacrifiant, probably written around 1560, in Jacques de La Taille's play Daire, written around 1562 but not published till 1573, and in Louis Des Masures's trilogy, the Tragedies Saintes published in 1563. The beginning of widespread knowledge of Machiavelli in the 1550's seems, therefore, an appropriate date at which to open our examination of Machiavelli's impact on writers of fiction who were aiming at a wide and often popular audience.

1610, the year of Henry IV's assassination, appears to set suitable limits on our study. The accusation of Machiavellianism made against Charles IX and Henry III continued during Henry IV's reign as part of the Spanish campaign against that ruler. After Henry's death, however, with Richelieu's bid to establish an absolute monarchy, Machiavelli's methods began to be looked upon with more favour and for the first time in France, the Italian author was openly defended. 1610 thus imposes itself as a date when the nature of French writers' attitudes towards Machiavelli began to alter.
Perhaps it would not be out of place in an introduction to the discussion of Machiavelli's influence in France to examine why the Italian author's ideas were likely to appeal to poets and dramatists of the sixteenth century.

Before the civil wars, writers of fiction such as Joachim Du Bellay, Olivier du Magny and Guillaume Des Autels could safely follow Erasmian ideals on politics. Humanist political assumptions (for example, that monarchy was the best form of government for France) had not yet been shaken by the upheavals caused by the wars of religion. Poets such as Du Bellay could speak of politics in philosophical terms, in the light of eternity and, like Erasmus, deal mainly with times of peace and security, regarding war as an exceptional circumstance.

Later, the terrible events in France were to force writers to turn away from the eternal to the particular and to re-examine their political theories in the context of the civil wars. With the growing decadence of the Valois line and two successive youthful kings, hereditary monarchy was not now automatically seen as the best type of government for France. During the minorities of Francis II and Charles IX, it was not the divinely appointed monarch who was the effective ruler; instead, government appeared to pass into the hands of anyone who gained sufficient support: the Guises under Francis II and Catherine de' Medici under Charles IX.

Machiavelli is a writer concerned above all with times of political crisis when power politics and de facto rule take over. In the introduction to his edition of *Il Principe*, L.A. Burd remarks,

... it is worth while to notice in conclusion that Machiavelli has never treated of the state at rest, self-sufficient and free from external dangers; he is much more exclusively concerned with the foundation of a state, and the establishing of a new power in the face of obstacles.26

*Il Principe* in particular suited the unstable times through which France was passing with weak leadership and several groups aiming for power - some, like the Catholic League, with a democratic basis, others,
like the Calvinists before 1584, with an aristocratic outlook. Frenchmen sought writers who matched their times. In 1571, Jacques Gohory gave an explanation of his preference for Machiavelli over ancient historians, namely that writing against a background similar to the period of civil war in France, Machiavelli held lessons for Gohory's time:

> il est estimé aujourd'hui par gens de bon jugement, de plus grande utilité à nous pour le maniement et conduite de nos negoces que ne pourroit estre Tucidide, Appian, Salluste, Tite Live, Corneile Tacite, et tous autres historiens antiques Grecz et Latins: d'autant qu'il traite des choses conformes et appropriées aux nostres, ausquelles les Grecques et Romaines sont trop differentes et difficiles à reduire à nostre usage.

The situation in France during the period with which we are dealing corresponded to the instability of Italian affairs described by Machiavelli, just as it corresponded to the turmoils in England during the seventeenth century with the execution of Charles I and the rise of Cromwell. A work by the historian Bernard Du Haillan testifies to the popularity of discussions on politics during the French civil wars:

> le plus commun discours qui soit aujourd'hui en la bouche des hommes est celui des affaires d'Estat, qui est manié selon le fait, et lequel la calamité de nostre siecle a trop licentieusement permis.

In his Lettre d'un eminent personnage à Stanislas Elvide, Pibrac laments the increasing number of political pamphlets and libels being produced at court and which often aimed at destroying the reputation of France's leaders.

Other writers point to the popularity of Machiavelli's writings in particular. In his Methodus, ad facilem historiarum cognitionem, published in 1566, Jean Bodin says that Machiavelli's political ideas are on everyone's lips. The author (probably Gentillet) of Brieve Remonstrance à la Noblesse de France sur le fait de la déclaration de Monseigneur le Duc d'Alençon faicte le 18 Septembre 1575, criticises foreigners for introducing Machiavelli into France:
Car chacun sçait et voit que tout ouvertement ils
les estrangers mespris toute piété, et qu'ils ont donné
vogue à un meschant et damnable livre écrit par un Machiavel
Italien (plein du mespris de la religion Chrestienne) lequel
ils ont fait pièce traduire et imprimer en François, afin que
le vulgaire même puisse estre infecté de leur poison: de
sorte qu'il est deja si commun és mains de chacun que rien plus.33

In a letter to Chandon, the king's secretary, Estienne Pasquier
describes Machiavelli as 'ce malheureux authour que je voy estre chery et
honorable presque de tous les courtizans.'34 In Les Recherches de la
France, he remarks,

si vous oyez les Predicateurs du jourd'hui dedans leurs chaires,
ils n'ont autres declarations dans leurs bouches que celles
qui sont encontre Machiavel: et neantmoins il n'y a que celui
d'eux qui ne soit vraiment Machiaveliste ...35

The lively debates provoked by the wide dissemination of
Machiavelli's ideas during the latter part of the sixteenth century have
not escaped the attention of scholars. Early studies of Machiavelli's
influence in France were, however, too generalized and often overtly hostile
to Machiavelli, as is the case of the works by V. Waille, Machiavel en
France (Paris, 1854), C. Benoist, Le Machiavelisme (Paris, 1907-36,
three volumes) and A. Cherel, La pensée de Machiavel en France (Paris,
1935).36 These early accounts have now been rendered out of date by
several good recent surveys of Machiavelli's influence on French political
theorists. In particular, S. Mastellone's book, Venalità e machiavellismo
in Francia (1572-1610), (Florence, 1972) is a very informative historical
account of changing attitudes towards Machiavelli in France with special
reference to political groups such as the 'politiques', the Catholic Leaguers
and the Reformers.

In his Studi sulla Fortuna del Machiavelli (Rome, 1963), Giuliano
Procacci gave the first detailed analysis of Machiavelli's direct influence
in certain areas such as the use of the Arte della Guerra by French
military theorists, Louis Le Roy's knowledge of Machiavelli, Agostino Nifo's
plagiarism of Il Principe and Jacopo Corbinelli's analysis of Machiavelli's
political theory. Other useful general studies of Machiavelli's influence on political theorists such as Bodin, Grimaudet, La Noue, Le Roy, Pasquier and Seyssel are those by V. de Caprariis, _Propaganda e pensiero politico in Francia durante le guerre di religione_, (Naples, 1959), R. De Mattei, _Dal premachiavellismo all' antimachiavellismo_ (Florence, 1970) and J. Parkin's thesis (see above, note 10). W.H. Bowen's article on 'Sixteenth Century French Translations of Machiavelli' (cited above, note 6) draws together important material on the translators and highlights their enthusiasm for Machiavelli. In 'Sull' antimachiavellismo francese del sec. XVI,' _Storia e politica_, (1962), pp. 413-447, A.M. Battista gives an interesting account of popular pamphlets written against Machiavelli by both Reformers and Catholics. As well as these general studies, there have been several accounts of Machiavelli's influence on individual authors such as Jean Bodin, Innocent Gentillet, Estienne de La Boëtie, Montaigne, Pasquier and Claude de Seyssel (see my bibliography for details of these articles).

Too often, however, research has centred round specific authors and one of the aims of my thesis is to widen the discussion by examining the work of authors not previously dealt with in relation to Machiavelli. For there has, as yet, been little research into Machiavelli's influence on sixteenth century French fiction writers. Jean de La Taille is the poet whose reaction to Machiavelli has been most closely analysed in recent times, mainly because he wrote a whole poem, _Le Prince Nécessaire_, modelled on Machiavelli's precepts. This poem has been examined by R. Pintard in his article 'Une adaptation de Machiavel au seizième siècle: _Le Prince Nécessaire de Jean de La Taille_,' _Revue Littéraire Comparée_, XIII, (1933), pp. 385-402, and is mentioned by Parkin in his thesis. However, these studies deal with Machiavelli's influence only on this one poem of La Taille and there is therefore a need for a complete examination of all La Taille's works, including his plays and those of
his brother, Jacques de La Taille.

The fact that Machiavelli's influence on Pierre de Ronsard has been pointed out recently by at least two scholars indicates the necessity of re-reading the entire 'opus' of the 'Prince of poets' in order to give a definitive account of his knowledge of the Italian author. The influence of Machiavelli on Robert Garnier is mentioned very briefly by M.M. Mouflard in Robert Garnier, 1545-1590, La Ferté-Bernard, 1964, volume III (Les Sources) and by G. Jondorf in Robert Garnier and the themes of political tragedy in the sixteenth century, Cambridge, 1969, but neither of these studies is exhaustive and in my chapter on Garnier, some of their attributions are questioned.

In her thesis on The Conception of King and Kingship in French Biblical Tragedy, R. Thomas discusses the theme of Machiavellianism in the plays of Louis Des Mases and Estienne Jodelle. I have aimed to take her discussion further by examining these plays in detail with the focus more specifically on Machiavelli and to include, in the case of Jodelle, an analysis of Machiavelli's influence on his poetry. To my knowledge, there has been no research into Machiavelli's influence on Pierre Matthieu, D'Aubigné, Jean de La Jessee or Alexandre de Pont-Aymery.

Research then, into the impact of Machiavelli on poetry and drama of the sixteenth century has been fragmentary and reference is hardly ever made to all of an author's works. I have found it necessary to include in my thesis, where appropriate, some examination of these writers' prose treatises which reveal more clearly their preoccupation with Machiavelli and which often, particularly in the case of Pierre Matthieu and D'Aubigné, provide a key to the correct interpretation of their drama or poetry.

As we have seen, Machiavelli was well known in France in the sixteenth century and, especially after the events of Saint Bartholomev's Day, became associated in popular writings with a certain kind of political
behaviour. In political pamphlets of the period it is usual to find Machiavelli's name loosely connected with any sort of underhand scheming, dissimulation, atheism, broken promises and tyranny, as well as with policies to crush the nobles and to keep one's subjects divided and in poverty. Such pamphlets are imbued with what Pierre de L'Estoile called 'la maladie du siècle, qui est la passion et la médiasance' and bear little relation to Machiavelli's true ideas. In order, therefore, not to fall into the same error as these sixteenth century pamphleteers, and to avoid making vague and unsatisfactory suppositions about Machiavelli's influence on any author who merely uses or opposes utilitarianism in politics, I have preferred to deal only with fiction writers who can be shown to have possessed first hand knowledge of Machiavelli. My final chapter discusses cases where Machiavelli's influence on certain poets and dramatists is more tenuous.

The decision to concentrate on those authors who can be proved to have been directly influenced by Machiavelli, rather than using reaction to Machiavelli as a yardstick by which to measure acceptance of the secular approach to politics, is in opposition to the trend of recent research into Machiavelli's 'fortuna' in France. Even such an eminent scholar as S. Mastellone has found little proof of textual knowledge of Machiavelli's works:

La polemica contro il pensiero machiavellico ha una precisa essenza politica, ed è in generale connessa con determinati avvenimenti storici, che hanno poco da fare con l'esame critico del Principe o dei Discorsi.40

The danger of attributing ideas to Machiavelli's influence where there are no textual echoes of the Italian author's works, is that such ideas may have arisen independently of Machiavelli, out of the poet's own observation of the political situation in France. French writers would probably have been led to discuss the possibility of an increasingly secular attitude to politics even if Machiavelli had never written a word,
because of the way society in general was moving — towards a questioning of the automatic sanctity of a hereditary monarch and the frank expression of the separation of politics and religion. Recent research into the question of Machiavelli's influence on French literature is still too vague in its attributions of influence to any author who demonstrates the ability to think empirically and who has a 'realistic' approach to politics.41

My examination is to be distinguished from the methods of earlier research into Machiavelli's influence on poetry and drama in France and England, for example, A. Stegmann's study of Machiavelli's impact on Corneille (L'Héroïsme Cornélien, Paris, 1968, especially Tome II, chapters 1-3). Although Stegmann is able to establish that Corneille is often opposing a machiavellian attitude to politics in his plays, there is no proof that Corneille had actually read Machiavelli. Indeed Stegmann states that Corneille probably knew the Italian author only through attacks on him, for example, by Gentillet. Corneille is therefore opposing the popular view of machiavellianism rather than giving a reasoned opinion of his works.42

Similarly in England, dramatists rarely possessed first-hand knowledge of Machiavelli — see A. D'Andrea, 'Studies on Machiavelli and his Reputation in the Sixteenth Century,' Medieval and Renaissance Studies, V, (1961), pp. 214-248. Indeed, the 'Machiavels' who figure in the drama of Christopher Marlowe and John Webster bear only a superficial resemblance to the real Machiavelli. One recent historian has established interesting parallels between the political thought of Machiavelli and the ideas expressed by Sir Philip Sidney in his poetry, but concludes that this is probably not due to a conscious adoption of Machiavelli's views by Sidney. The similarity seems rather to have arisen out of a long intellectual tradition, and a coincidental likeness
between the political situation in Florence at the time when Machiavelli was writing, and that of Sidney's England. In Shakespeare and the Stoicism of Seneca, T.S. Eliot speaks of the importance of Machiavelli in Elizabethan England, though this Machiavelli be only the Machiavelli of the Contre-Rachiavel, and not in the least the real Machiavelli ...

In contrast with these studies, I have preferred to deal with Machiavelli in his own right as a direct intellectual and literary influence on fiction writing, rather than with the popular figure of Machiavelli which frequently appears in political pamphlets and merely indicates acceptance or rejection of a 'pragmatic' approach to politics. As we have seen, this latter use of Machiavelli has its origins in political and historical events and was not usually an objective or reasoned reaction to Machiavelli's works. Whilst the authors dealt with in this thesis sometimes exploited popular hostility towards Machiavelli, for example, Pierre Matthieu in La Guisiade, D'Aubigné in Les Tragiques and the Histoire Universelle, and Pont-Aymery in his poem Le Roi Triomphant, I hope to establish that, in most cases, their real reaction to Machiavelli is a considered opinion formed through careful reading of the Italian's works: indeed the authors I examine often cite passages directly from II Principe and the Discorsi.

I have tried, too, to distinguish between concepts circulating generally in the sixteenth century and ideas which can be specifically attributed to Machiavelli's influence, either through direct acknowledgement of their source, or through direct quotation from Machiavelli without acknowledgement. This has frequently involved examining classical sources in order to distinguish between what is owed to ancient writers and what to Machiavelli. In order to isolate Machiavelli's influence in Garnier's plays, for example, it has been necessary to consider his debt to Seneca. Similarly, in the case of the plays by the La Taille brothers, it is important to look at their classical sources in order to determine precisely
It was Giuliano Procacci who first drew attention to the way in which French writers often display open hostility towards Machiavelli at the same time as they make use of his precepts:

Di fatto in Francia assistiamo al curioso fenomeno della coesistenza presso determinati ambienti di un antimachiavellismo esplicito e formale e di una implicita e sostanziale influenza del pensiero del Segretario Fiorentino.

In his Studi sulla Fortuna del Machiavelli, Procacci gives examples of this attraction/rejection phenomenon in Louis Le Roy, Jean Bodin and François de La Noue. E. Casquet's study of Machiavelli's influence in sixteenth century England finds many instances of a similar attitude on the part of English authors. An earlier article by D.W. Bleznick has pointed out that Spanish writers in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries openly opposed Machiavelli's ideas whilst secretly borrowing his advice on politics. It is one of the aims of my thesis to extend the analysis of this ambivalence towards Machiavelli into the area of French poetry and drama.

A final point to be made is that this thesis aims to give new insights into Machiavelli's influence on French writers rather than to discuss Machiavelli himself in a new light. A study of this kind must, unfortunately, omit certain aspects of Machiavelli's work which are important, but which do not appear in French Renaissance writing. Sixteenth century authors seem to have been unfamiliar for example, with Machiavelli's reports written when on diplomatic missions and which provide valuable background to his major works. Despite their reading of the Discorsi, French writers rarely acknowledged Machiavelli's liking for a republican style of government. Jean Bodin was one of the few authors to highlight the fact that in the Discorsi, Machiavelli supports a mixed constitution.

In popular pamphlets of the sixteenth century, Il Principe is seen mainly as a handbook for tyrants rather than as a book of advice for the new ruler. It is one of the aims of this thesis to examine whether fiction writers were aware that Machiavelli is writing above all for the leader who
has recently come to power. The idea that Il Principe describes a tyrant rather than a new ruler, may have penetrated into France by way of Agostino Nifo’s plagiarism of that work, entitled De Regnandi Peritia (Naples, 1523). Nifo turns Machiavelli’s new ruler into a tyrant and the book into a humanist treatise on various forms of government with special reference to tyranny, that is, into a treatise modelled on Aristotle.\textsuperscript{51}

There arose in France the theory that there was a correspondence between Book V of Aristotle’s Politics and Il Principe. Louis Le Roy was one French author who found a similarity between Aristotle’s description of tyrants in Book V and Machiavelli’s advice to his prince, and he used Machiavelli for the commentary to his 1568 edition of the Politics.\textsuperscript{52} In the Politiques Royales, François de Gravelle declares that Machiavelli’s precepts are ‘prains d’Aristote lors qu’il discourt des moyens que les tyrans de son temps gardoyent pour se maintenir ...\textsuperscript{53} In fact, Machiavelli’s advice to his prince seems to owe less to Aristotle than to the exigencies of the Italian situation at the time he was writing.\textsuperscript{54}

Nor would we expect sixteenth century poets and dramatists to have much knowledge of the personality and life of Machiavelli. The general ignorance on this subject permitted his opponents to spread all sorts of false rumours about his ‘wicked’ life. Innocent Gentillet admits,

\begin{quote}
De sa vie et de sa mort, je n’en puis rien dire, et ne m’en suis enquis, ny daigné enquérir, parce que sa mémoire meritieroit mieux d’estre ensevelie en perpetuelle oubliance, que refrasichie entre les hommes. Mais bien puis-je dire, que si sa vie a esté telle que sa doctrine (comme il est à presumer), il ne fut jamais homme au monde plus souillé et contaminé de tous vices et meschancotez que luy. Par la préface qu’il fait sur son livre intitulé De la Principauté, ou bien le Prince, il semble qu’il fut banny et chassé de Florence ... et en quelques autres endroits il recite qu’il estoit tantost en France, tantost à Rome, tantost ailleurs, non envoyé en Ambassade (car il n’eust pas oublié à le dire) mais, comme il est à presumer, fuitif et banny.
\end{quote}

(Discours contre N. Machiavel, ed. cit., preface to Part I, pp. 11-12).
In fact, of course, Machiavelli had been sent abroad on diplomatic missions for the city of Florence. Even his defenders often got their facts wrong: in his *Vie de Machiavel* published with the 1571 translation of *Il Principe*, Jacques Gohory says that Machiavelli dedicated this work to Lorenzo II Magnifico instead of Lorenzo de' Medici (grandson of the first Lorenzo).

It has been stated in this introduction that the following study is concerned only with poets and dramatists who can be proved to have had first hand knowledge of Machiavelli's works. Nevertheless, it may perhaps be appropriate at this stage to cite J.W. Allen's warning,

> Nothing in fact, seems to me more difficult to trace, nothing harder to estimate, than the influence of any man on the thought of others.  

And particularly, at the outset of this thesis, his warning about Machiavelli:

> Even more difficult than usual in such cases is it to trace the influence of Machiavelli upon the thought of the sixteenth century or even to make sure that he had any important influence ... Some modern students have attributed to Machiavelli a great amount of influence on sixteenth century thought. But a case can be made out for saying that he had no influence of any serious importance ... The influence of any writer who may be supposed to have had influence is, I believe, habitually exaggerated. It seems fairly safe to say that in no case has there been more exaggeration than in that of Machiavelli.  

(op. cit., pp. 489-492).

Allen is referring specifically to the study by V. Waille (see above, p.13). More recently, another historian warned of the danger of reducing the whole of sixteenth century political thought to a dialogue between Machiavelli and Christianity.

Yet it cannot be ignored that Machiavelli's reputation in sixteenth century France reached almost mythical proportions and consequently, study of his influence might be expected to afford some insight into the mind and thoughts of Renaissance man. As one recent scholar put it,
Il est certain que l'historien doit en toutes circonstances étudier de près symboles et mythes sociaux. Ils sont les principaux motifs des actions des hommes.\(^5\)

The impact of Machiavelli may be hard to establish but to do so is necessary for a full appreciation of Renaissance poetry and drama, if we believe with T.S. Eliot (and as the Renaissance certainly believed) that

\begin{quote}
No poet, no artist of any art has his complete meaning alone. His significance, his appreciation is the appreciation of his relation to the dead poets and artists.\(^5\)
\end{quote}

Eliot is speaking here of the influence of one poet on another, but his words could equally apply to the influence of prose writers on poets: we shall find that not only the best, but the most individual parts of his work may be those in which ... his ancestors assert their immortality most vigorously. (op. cit., p. 14).

It remains for us to examine the work of sixteenth century poets and dramatists to see whether the 'best parts' of their work are in fact those where the influence of one of the most individual of sixteenth century political thinkers is revealed.
Appendix

Most chapters include a short biography of the poet or dramatist dealt with. This was felt necessary since in many cases, particularly those of Pierre Matthieu, Jean de La Jessee and Alexandre de Pont-Aymery, no reliable account of their lives exists. With authors such as Jean de La Taille and Estienne Jodelle there has been much debate in recent times as to the nature of their religion and it was thought necessary to include some justification for the position adopted in this regard in the following study of Machiavelli's influence on their writing. Establishing biographical details is especially important when dealing with sixteenth century political poetry where the interpretation is often facilitated, if not determined, by knowledge of an author's political and religious allegiances.

Since each chapter is a complete entity the sequence of chapters is not of overriding importance. I have treated authors separately mainly because there are ambivalent attitudes towards Machiavelli even in works by the same writer. Similar reactions to Machiavelli can be found in both Catholic and Protestant authors making any division on the basis of religion arbitrary. Instead, I have tended to group together chapters where there may be some continuity in the authors' treatment of Machiavelli. The chapter on Pierre Matthieu is put first since Matthieu typifies in many ways French reaction to Machiavelli and much of the discussion here is relevant to the following chapters. The authors of the first three chapters reveal a certain similarity in that they all move from an anti-Machiavellian stance to use of Machiavelli. Louis Des Masures is an example of early hostility on the part of Reformers towards the Italian author, and the following chapters on D'Aubigné and Pont-Aymery point to a development in Protestant propaganda against Machiavelli. The last authors discussed - Garnier, the La Taille brothers and Ronsard - all display a more balanced and objective attitude towards Machiavelli. Finally, there is a chapter on poets and dramatists who reveal little or no reaction to
Machiavelli.

Note

The edition of Il Principe and the Discorsi used throughout this study is the edition by S. Bertelli (Milan, 1960).

The abbreviation BHR is used throughout for Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance.

In quoting from sixteenth century works, the original spelling has generally been retained, except that the letters i and u where used as consonants have been replaced by j and y; a cedilla has been inserted wherever its use is conventional in modern French; accents have been added (to differentiate between common words - 'des' and 'dès', 'a' and 'à', 'ou' and 'où' and the final 'e' of the past participle of verbs in 'er').

Bibliographical details are given in full at the point where a book or article are first cited in each chapter.


7. See Le Theatre des Bons Enrlns Auquel sont contenuz cent Emblemes moraulx ed. G. Dexter, Florida, 1964, emblems xxii and xcii. This early use of Machiavelli disproves, incidentally, Cardascia's statement that Machiavelli was not known in France till 1544, see Cardascia (G.), 'Machiavel et Jean Bodin', *EH*, III, (1943), pp. 129-167.

8. Andrea Alciati Emblematum Libellus, nuper in Lusce editus, Venice, 1546, BL 245 e 7. The emblem comes under the section Respublica, 28 r. For more on Machiavelli's influence in this emblem, see my forthcoming article on 'Machiavelli and Chiron'.

9. It has also been attributed to Raymond de Fourquevaux, see The *Instructions sur le Faict de la Guerre* of Raymond de Beccarie de Pavie Sieur de Fourquevaux ed. G. Dickinson, London, 1954.


11. Only the *Arte della Guerra* was published during Machiavelli's lifetime (at Florence in 1521). *Il Principe* was first published at Rome in 1532 by the Pope's own printer, A. Blado, and the *Istorie Fiorentine* appeared in the same year. The *Discorsi* were published at Rome in 1531, see Lenger (M-T), 'Contribution à la Bibliographie des éditions anciennes des Oeuvres de Machiavel', *Archives et Bibliothèques de Belgique*, numéro spécial, IX, 1973. Machiavelli's works were, however, circulated freely in manuscript form in Italy before 1532.
12. J. Barrère's work *Estienne de La Boétie contre N. Machiavel* (Bordeaux, 1908) is now considered erroneous - he bases his belief in La Boétie's knowledge of Machiavelli on a quotation which actually comes from Livy (see H. Weber, 'La Boétie et la tradition humaniste d'opposition au tyran', in *Culture et Politique en France à l'époque de l'humanisme et de la Renaissance* ed. F. Simone, Turin, 1974, p. 355). J. Parkin (op. cit., ch. 6) has pointed out the parallels between Machiavelli and La Boétie without being able to conclude positively that the latter had read Machiavelli.


15. See also Cohory's assurance that readers previously unfamiliar with Machiavelli will be well rewarded:

> Aussi je vous assure que quand vous l'aurez un peu acointé, vous ne voudriez pour chose du monde ne l'avoir conogeu: car il est homme rond et entier...

(Epistre, unpaginated).


19. The warnings come in chapter 3 where Machiavelli says that a ruler should remove any political rival (in the margin, there is the comment 'Crudele Turcorum consilium', p. 4); in chapter 13 where the description of Hiero of Syracuse murdering his mercenaries is called a 'Crudele factum', p. 49; and in chapter 18 where Machiavelli says that it is sometimes necessary for a ruler to act contrary to virtue, and the comment in the margin is,

> Consilium alienum à christiana religione. Sapius tamen contigit non servare promissum non esse contra fidem et charitatem: ut puta si superveniat causa rationabilis non implendi nempe novus causus impremeditatus.

(pp. 61-62).

21. Despite the fact that manuscript translations of Machiavelli circulated secretly in England during the sixteenth century (see E. Gasquet, Le Courant Machiavéllen dans la pensée et la littérature anglaises du seizième siècle, Paris, Brussels, Montreal, 1970, pp. 44-49), English translations of Machiavelli's work (with the exception of Peter Whitehorne's 1560 translation of the Arte della Guerra) were published much later than the French and their prefaces tend to be even more defensive. The first English translator of Il Principe, Edward Dacres, says in the Epistle to the Reader,

"Questionlesse some men will blame mee for making this Authour speake in our vulgar tongue. For his maxims and tenents are condemned of all, as pernicious to all Christian States, and hurtful to all humane Societies ... I grant, I find him blam'd and condemnd: I doe no lesse my selfe.

But he adds in self-defence,

"If thou consider well the actions of the world, thou shalt find him much practised by those that condemne him."

(Nicolas Machiavel's Prince, London, 1640, BL 521 a 9, Epistle to the Reader, unpaginated).

Compare Dacres's preface to his translation Machiavelli's Discourses upon the first Decade of T. Livius, London, 1636, BL 587 a 33.

In a dedication (dated April, 1568) to his translation of The Florentine Historie, Thomas Bedingfield explains his hesitation over translating Machiavelli, "for that the Author (in some other of his works) hath not (as is thought) written with due respect to pietie', London, 1595, BL 592 h 20, unpaginated.

22. Innocent Gentillet was perhaps referring to popular knowledge of Machiavelli when he stated that the Italian author was almost unknown in France before 1560, see Discours contre N. Machiavel ed. A. D'Andrea and P.D. Stewart, Florence, 1972, Part I, preface, p. 21.


25. In setting 1610 as the furthest limit of my thesis, I have not excluded those works by authors such as D'Aubigné and Matthieu, published after this date and which shed light on the attitude to Machiavelli revealed in earlier works by the same authors.


27. Machiavelli was not the only author whose ideas were thought appropriate for the troubled French situation: Montaigne's approval of Tacitus in Essais III, 8, arises from his belief that
the historical period described by the Roman historian held
lessons for his own age,

Son service est plus propre à un estât trouble et malade,
comme est le nostre present: vous diriez souvent qu'il
nous peint et qu'il nous pinse.

28. Le Prince de Nicolas Machiavel ed. cit., La Vie de Machiavel,
unpaginated.

29. In The English Face of Machiavelli: a changing interpretation
1500-1700, London, 1965, F. Raab has examined the upsurge of
interest in Machiavelli's works during this period of political
upheaval in England.

30. Recueil d'Advis et Conseils sur les Affaires d'Estat, tiré des
vies de Plutarque, Paris, 1578, BL 523 g 12, 2r.

31. See L'Apologie de la Saint-Barthélemy par Guy du Faur de Pibrac

32. Paris 1566, BL 580 g 2, p. 178.

33. S.l., 1576, BL 1193 c 4, p. 149.

34. Estienne Pasquier, Les Lettres, Paris, 1586, BL 636 i 21, Book IX,
274 v.

35. Estienne Pasquier, Les Recherches de la France, reveués et augmentées
de quatre livres, Paris, 1607, BL 596 g 3, Book V, p. 818.

36. For a critical assessment of Cherel's book, see J.H. Whitfield,

37. By Malcolm Smith in his edition of the Discours des misères de ce
temps, Geneva, 1979 and by D. Ménager in Ronsard. Le Roi, le Poète
et les Hommes, Geneva, 1979 (but see my chapter on Ronsard for
disagreement with some of Ménager's conclusions).


40. S. Mastellone, 'Antimachiavellismo, Machiavellismo, Tacitismo',
Machiavellismo e antimachiavellici nel Cinquecento, Atti del

41. D.R. Kelley in his article 'Murd'rous Machiavel in France: A Post-
Mortem', Political Science Quarterly, LXXV, (1970), pp. 545-559,
describing recent research, remarks that 'discussions of anti-
Machiavellian literature are repetitive and not very critical'
(p. 547, note 3).

42. Stegmann concludes
Plutôt qu’une attaque plus ou moins réussie contre Machiavel, le théâtre cornélien est l’opposition d’une morale de la générosité à une vertu trop intéressée, la restauration d’une confiance en l’homme face à un pessimisme profond.


46. E. Gasquet, Le Courant Machiavelien dans la pensée et la littérature angloises du seizième siècle (ed. cit.). The list of English authors who display this ambivalent attitude includes Gabriel Harvey (op. cit., p. 185, pp. 220-229), Thomas Nashe (p. 213) and Robert Dallington (p. 325). Sir Walter Raleigh also appears to have been divided in his attitude towards Machiavelli, see G. Procacci, Studi sulla Fortuna del Machiavelli, ed. cit., 'Machiavelli aristotelica', pp. 53-55.


49. An exception is the Remonstrance d'un bon Catholique François, aux trois estats de France, attributed to Mornay, s.l., 1576, BL 1193 c 4 (2). This pamphlet sees Machiavelli and his followers as supporters of a Republic (p. 74).

50. See Les Six Livres de la Republique, Lyons, 1579, BL 1476 dd 19, Book II, ch.1. In Book VI, ch. 4, Bodin attacks Machiavelli's support for a mixed constitution, and see also Methodus, ad facilem historiarum cognitionem, ed. cit., chapter 6.


53. Lyons, 1596, BNHE 3289, chapter 3, p. 27.


PIERRE MATTHIEU

LIFE

Very little information is available about the life of Pierre Matthieu: the few known facts derive from Pierre de L'Estoile's Journal d'Henri III in which the third edition of Matthieu's play, La Cuisiade, is published, together with a short biography. As a Reformer, Pierre de L'Estoile was hostile to Matthieu who at one point joined the Catholic League, and consequently L'Estoile's interpretation of his life and works is rather biased. There is no modern account of Matthieu's life and the details given here have been gleaned mainly from his own works.

L'Estoile states that Matthieu was born on 10 December 1563 in an obscure village in the Franche-Comté called Pesmes (according to L'Estoile, Matthieu later liked to pretend that he was a native of Forez, a larger, more impressive town). Matthieu was the son of a weaver but received a good education, first under a local group of Jesuits and then at Paris. He studied law at Valence and became a fully-fledged lawyer in 1586.

Matthieu settled at Lyons but appears to have scarcely practised his profession: possibly his literary activities were already occupying most of his time. In 1585 he published his first tragedy, Esther, which had been performed as early as 1583 at the college of Verceli where he was principal. Esther is a very rare work since Matthieu apparently destroyed all the copies he could find. The tragedy is prefaced by a number of sonnets flattering Matthieu's skill as a poet. One, by a certain Anthoine Junot, even goes so far as to praise Matthieu above Grévin, Garnier and Jodelle. Perhaps Junot was a young student at Verceli college...

At any rate, this tragedy seems to have brought Matthieu some local fame. A prefatory poem by Matthieu extols the virtues and importance of writing historical works, foreshadowing Matthieu's later career as royal historiographer.

Footnotes start on p. 41
During this period at Lyons in the 1580's, Matthieu was an admirer of the Duke of Guise and actually joined the Catholic League. As a member of the League, Matthieu welcomed the Edict of Union which the League forced Henry III to swear at Blois with the aim of stamping out Protestantism. In Esther we see something of Matthieu's feelings at this time for King Assuerus possesses several of the characteristics of Henry III as seen by (hostile) contemporaries. After the assassination of the Duke and his brother, the Cardinal of Lorraine, at Blois in 1588, Matthieu wrote another tragedy, La Cuisiade, which continues the hostility to Henry III found in Esther. There were three editions in 1589 and the 'privilège' for the first edition is dated May 1, 1589. The tragedy defends the League and attacks Henry III's advisers such as Espernon who is depicted urging the King to perform the assassinations. This piece of propaganda may have been paid for by Spanish money. It was dedicated to the Duke of Mayenne. Most historians speak only of the third edition of La Cuisiade but in fact the first edition is available in the Bibliothèque de L'Arsenal in Paris. This first edition appeared under the initials I.R.D.L. (Jacques Roussin de Lyon, the printer) and seems to have been hastily composed. The third edition has been revised and expanded and appears under Matthieu's own name, suggesting that it was published after the assassination of Henry III on August 1, 1589.

Despite these three editions, La Cuisiade seems to have been a rare book even in the sixteenth century, probably because of its boldness in portraying a contemporary monarch on stage as weak and vacillating. L'Estoile concludes his commentary on La Cuisiade by saying,

Je ne puis disconvenir que je n'aye pris bien de la peine à faire des Notes sur une aussi mauvaise piece que cette Tragedie; mais je ne les ai faites qu'en consideration de sa rareté.


At the end of the play, Matthieu promises us 'une suite' recounting the deaths of the Cardinal of Lorraine and the Queen Mother. This tragedy,
to be entitled Sacrilege, appears to be lost now, if indeed it was ever written.

Also published in 1589 were three other tragedies not mentioned by L’Estoile - Vashti (an adaptation of the first part of Esther), Aman (an adaptation of the second part of Esther) and Clytemnestre, ou l’adultère (a loose adaptation of Seneca’s Agamemnon). In the prefatory epistle to the reader of Clytemnestre, Matthieu apologizes for the youthful nature of these three works,

je ne rougiray pourtant de confesser que les miens pour estre faicts il y a longtemps sur le troisieme lustre de mon aage, ne seront dignes du nom qu’ils portent, mais bien promettray-je que poursuivant mes erres en ceste maniere d’escrire, je te feray voir quelques autres fruicts plus meurs et assaisonnez, si tu ne te degoustes en ces premiers essais.

(unpaginated).

This suggests that these three tragedies were published earlier in 1589 than La Cuisiade. It is possible that with the decline of Henry III’s reputation, Matthieu felt that he could allow himself more open criticism of the French monarch than in these previous three plays.

Another piece of propaganda for the League written at this time by Matthieu is the pamphlet entitled Pompe Funebre des Penitens de Lyon, en Deploration du Massacre faict à Bloys sur les Illustres et genereuses personnes de Louys et Henry de Lorraine. Avec l’Oraison su le mesme sujet, prononcée par M. Pierre Matthieu, Docteur és Droicts et Advocat à Lyon. The speech appears to have been given in the context of a service held at Lyons on 16 June 1589 to commemorate the death of the Guises. The service was partly a protest against Henry III’s refusal to allow a proper burial ceremony to be performed. By this time, Matthieu must thus have become a prominent member of the community in Lyons.

There exists a League pamphlet published in Paris in 1589, signed with the initials P.M. and attacking Henry III in terms which recall the Pompe Funebre and La Guisiade. Henry III is seen as a perfidious follower
of Machiavelli and his assassination of the Guises is dwelt upon in particular. As in the previous two works, the author uses Machiavelli's name as a weapon with which to indict Henry III (this will be examined later in the chapter). In the light of this, it seems not unreasonable to attribute the authorship to Pierre Matthieu, some of whose later works were also published in Paris.  

After the death of Henry III, says L'Estoile, Matthieu 'se convertit, et devint Royaliste' (ed. cit., p. 516). This is an over-simplification since Matthieu is consistent in his reverence for the institution of the French monarch, if not the person, throughout his life. Likewise, his dislike of the Protestant 'heresy' never wavered: he continued to oppose Henry IV as long as the latter remained a Reformer. In 1593, an anonymous author, probably Matthieu, published a pamphlet justifying the Catholic League taking up arms against the King's representative at Lyons, on the grounds that Henry IV was a heretic. The Catholics at Lyons, he says, have gone over to Mayenne's side

en attendant qu'il plaise à Dieu nous donner un Roy vraiment Catholique, agréable à nostre saint Pere, et aux Estats de ce Royaume.  

It was his faith in the sincerity of Henry IV's conversion to Catholicism, together with his fear of Spanish domination, that led Matthieu along with other deputies from Lyons, to swear an oath of allegiance to Henry in February 1594 and to take part in the King's triumphal entry into Lyons in 1595. The King's entry is described by Matthieu in his pamphlet entitled L'Entree de Tres-Grand, Tres-Chrestien, Tres-Magnanime, et victorieux Prince HenryIII Roy de France et de Navarre, en sa bonne ville de Lyon...  

His personal attitude is perhaps revealed in the pamphlet he wrote much later entitled Petit Sommaire de la Vie, Actes et Faits de Tres-Heureuse mémoire HenryIII Roy de France et de Navarre.  

Describing Henry's succession, Matthieu says,
Lors les vrays François tous desolez, aperhendans pour un Roy plusieurs Tyrans, et recognoissans la juste cause de leur Roy legitime se jettent entre ses bras.

(p. 5).

Around this time, Matthieu began to revise his opinion of Henry III and this may have been due as much to the passage of time bringing with it a new objectivity and understanding of events and to his renewed support for the position of the monarchy, as to a mere desire to pander to the new King. Thus in 1594 he published a Harangue aux consuls et peuple de Lyon. Du devoir et obeissance des subjects envers le Roy et du soing perpetuel de la Providence de Dieu sur ceste Monarchie Françoise. This speech was given by Matthieu on December 23 1594 at Lyons. In it, he recognises Henry IV as the true King, criticises the League for their rebellion against the monarchy and deplores the assassination of Henry III.

Under Henry IV, Matthieu embarked on his long career as a prolific, not to say prolix, writer of histories and historical pamphlets. In 1594 or 95, he published his Histoire des derniers troubles de France describing the conflict between the Guises and Henry III particularly during the years 1585 to 1588 when the Guises were assassinated, that is, covering almost the same historical period as La Guisiade. In 1604, there was another edition containing a fifth book describing events during the reign of Henry IV. In 1598, he published at Lyons a short treatise entitled Les Causes, les Cours et les Effects des Guerres entre les deux maisons de France et d'Autriche.

Matthieu continued to comment on local events at Lyons. In 1598, he published pamphlets describing L'Accueil de Madame de La Guiche à Lyon and Les Deux plus grandes, plus célèbres et mémorables resjouissances de la ville de Lyon. Madame de La Guiche was the wife of the new Governor of Lyons and in a volume of collected poetry published in 1603, there appears a poem by Matthieu on the death of her son, François de La Guiche. In 1600, Matthieu married Louise Croccieri, the daughter
of a Florentine noble who had settled in Lyons. She was the niece of Pope Clement VIII and they had four children. One is inclined to wonder whether Matthieu's later interest in Florentine history was inspired by his wife. Certainly his next publication displays this knowledge appropriately, in his description of L'Entree de Tres-Grande, Tres-Chrestienne, et Tres-Auguste Princesse Marie de Medicis Reine de France et de Navarre en la Ville de Lyon. In 1603, there appeared his Histoire véritable des guerres entre les deux maisons de France et d'Espagne. In 1605, he published the first edition of his Histoire de France. Des choses mémorables advenues aux provinces estrangeres durant sept années de Paix du regne du Roy Henry III. By this time, Matthieu's fame as an historian must have spread beyond the confines of Lyons, for in 1606, he was appointed royal historiographer succeeding Du Haillan. His duties required frequent attendance at court and he returned less and less often to see his family at Lyons. L'Estoile describes how Matthieu was encouraged in his work by Henry IV,

Ce Prince Henry IV communiqua à Matthieu beaucoup de Mémoires sur les Faits les plus interressans. C'est dommage qu'avec un pareil secours il n'ait pas mieux réussi. (ed. cit., p. 516).

The modern reader is forced to agree.

In 1607, Matthieu published a history concerning Elizabeth, fille du roy d'Hongrie and in 1610, he published a Panegyre sur le coronement de la Royne and a Histoire de Louys XI Roy de France. Matthieu's final tribute to Henry IV appeared in 1611 and was entitled Histoire de la Mort Deplorable de Henry III. In this (p. 7), he acknowledges the help Henry IV had given him with his histories. However, his work as royal historiographer did not end with the passing of the King and Matthieu continued to record events under the Regency.
In 1612, he published a book of quatrains meditating on life and death entitled *Tablettes de la Vie et de la Mort*. These were immensely popular, especially at court, and went through many editions and translations. D'Aubigné accused Matthieu of plagiarizing his *Traité de la Douceur des Afflictions* for his *Tablettes* and it was perhaps for this reason that D'Aubigné wrote a satirical sonnet against Matthieu (see *Agrippa D'Aubigné: Pages Inédites* ed. P-P. Plan, Geneva, 1945, p. 139, No. XXXV).

Matthieu was particularly concerned about the threat to the authority of the French monarchy posed by the ambitions of Concino Concini and his wife, and in 1617 he returned to his old theme of the dangers of ambitious advisers. As with his criticism of Henry III's 'mignons', Matthieu seems first to have veiled his attacks on the Concinis by using historical analogy and only ventured to accuse them openly when it was safe to do so (he was a somewhat timorous critic). Thus, in 1617, he published *Aelius Sejanus* where he gives an account of the life of Sejanus, favourite of the Emperor Tiberius. Sejanus, of course, represents Concini. The following year, he published *La Coniuration de Conchine* openly criticising the Concinis. His policy of 'playing safe' appears to have been successful since Louis XIII followed his father's example and treated Matthieu kindly. For all his caution, however, Matthieu had had the disturbing experience in 1610 of narrowly escaping imprisonment when he was wrongly accused of the authorship of a book published in France attacking James I of England.

In 1619, Matthieu published the *Alliances de France et de Savoye*. This was to be the last work published in his life-time for in 1621, he died at Toulouse of a fever contracted through following the King to the siege of Montauban. Several of his works were published posthumously by his son, Jean Baptiste Matthieu, who succeeded him in the post of royal historiographer. Thus his *Eloge Histurial de Marie de Medicis* appeared in
Paris in 1626 and his Histoire de France soubs les Regnes de Francois I, Henry II, Francois II, Charles IX, Henry III, Henry IV, Louys XIII et des choses plus memorables advenues aux autres Estats de la Chrestiente depuis cent ans was published in 1622. For this, Matthieu's most important work, L’Estoile has some grudging praise—

quoique mil ecrite, on y trouve des Faits tres-curieux, qu'il a voulu decorer de plusieurs Reflexions Philosophiques et Politiques, avec force Citations d'anciens Auteurs Grece et Latins.

(ed. cit., p. 516).

There exist two anonymous plays attacking Concini and his wife which may or may not be by Matthieu. The first, La Magicienne estrangere, has been attributed to Matthieu by the BN catalogue. It describes the trial and execution of Concini's wife and, like La Guisiade, deals with a contemporary subject in a polemical way whilst at the same time disguising the names of the characters. Like Espernon in La Guisiade, Concini's wife is depicted as being in touch with the spirits of the underworld. More significant perhaps, is the treatment of the theme of the King's favourites which Matthieu had used in Esther and La Guisiade as well as in his prose work Aelius Sejanus (a veiled criticism of the power of the Concini). In La Magicienne Estrangere, Concini is twice compared with Aman who appeared in Matthieu's play of that name and in Esther. In Act I, a French noble says,

Ainsi le fier Aman envant Mardoché,
Se vit a son gibet comme d'Ancre attaché.

(p. 10).

In Act IV, the same nobleman remarking on the death of Concini says,

Ce mutin ignoroit l'exemple d'un Aman,
De Plaute, de Morus, d'Alvare, de Sejan,
De Guast, de Marigny et de mille infidelles
Qui furent chastiez comme traistres rebelles.

(p. 31).

Concini is compared to Aman in another work by Matthieu - La Coniuration de Conchine (ed. cit., p. 21 and 55). It is perhaps also significant that in this passage from Act IV, Sejanus is mentioned as an example of
a favourite who came to a bad end.

The second anonymous play deals with events preceding those of La Magicienne Estrangere that is, the execution of Concini and the arrest of his wife. There are such strong resemblances between the two plays that one is inclined to believe that they must have been written by the same hand. This second play is called La Victoire du Phebus François contre le Python de ce Temps and again the characters' names are veiled, some of the pseudonyms being identical with the ones in La Magicienne Estrangere. The play contains anti-Semitism typical of Matthieu. It also contains the phrase 'faire du Renard sous la peau d'un Lyon' (p. 16), an echo of Machiavelli reminiscent of Matthieu's style in La Guisiade. It is thus fairly reasonable to suppose that Matthieu may have been the author. Certainly, it would be typical of him to jump on the bandwagon of popular hostility towards the King's favourites by writing two plays depicting recent events.

There remain several legal and historical works with commentaries by Matthieu. Whilst not useful for the purpose of establishing Machiavelli's influence on the French author it may be of benefit to list these commentaries in order to give a complete account of Matthieu's work as a historian. They are (in chronological order)-

i) Summa Constitutionum Summorum Pontificum et Rerum in Ecclesia Romana gestarum a Gregorio IX usque ad Sixtum V, Lyons, 1588, (BN E 2917).


iii) Septimus Decretalium Constitutionum Apostolicarum Post Sextum, Clementinas et extravagantes usque in hodiernum diem editorum... Opera Petri Mattaei I.U.D., Frankfurt, 1590 (with a preface by


v) *Decisiones Guidonis Papae*, Lyons, 1607 (Sainte Geneviève F 4° sup. 438 Rés pièce I).

vi) In collaboration with R. Boutrays - *Historiopolitographia sive Opus Historicopoliticum duorum praeclarissimorum huius aetatis historicorum*, Frankfurt, 1610 (BN G 3940, Sainte Geneviève G 4° 439 Rés Inv. 90).

Although Matthieu is little more than a name to us now, in his life-time he seems to have gained some prominence, firstly in Lyons and then at court as historiographer to the King. Certainly he was well enough known in England for James I to single him out for reproof. He had a high moral concept of the duties of a historian and although exceedingly arid, his writings are interesting for our purposes because of the knowledge displayed of classical and modern historians, not the least Machiavelli.
FOOTNOTES


2. See the dedicatory epistle in Esther to Madame de La Villeneuve and Madame d'Achey where Matthieu signs himself as 'Principal du College de Vercueil'. As an appendix to the tragedy there is a Latin poem by Matthieu in praise of the city of Vercueil.


4. R. Thomas in The Conception of King and Kingship in French Biblical Tragedy (University of London Th.D. thesis, 1978, p. 54) points out that the dedications of Matthieu's plays show his increasing involvement with the League. He dedicated them first to citizens of Lyons, then to members of the Guise family and finally, in La Guisiade, to Mayenne himself.

5. See Matthieu's Stances sur l'heureuse publication de la paix et saïnte union, Lyons, 1588, (EN Res Ye 4381).

6. See R. Thomas (op. cit.), pp. 415-450. Characteristics which Assuerus has in common with Henry III are his preoccupation with his physical appearance, his desire to appear knowledgeable in the arts, his eloquence, his immoderation in his pleasures to the extent of neglecting his royal duties and the excessive taxes he has introduced. Aman is a warning to those advisers who abuse their influence with the King and R. Thomas suggests that he could represent either Coligny or Joyeuse. She also suggests a parallel between Esther and Henry's Queen, Louise of Lorraine. The word 'mignon' is mentioned several times and there seems to be a deliberate comparison between the corruption of Persia under Aman as described in the laments of Mordecai and the troubles in France under Henry III's advisers.


8. There are copies of this edition in the BL (1073 d 35) and in the EN (Res Yf 4534, Res Yf 3894 and Yf 6442).

9. Under the pressmark Rf 1403; I have found no trace of the second edition, however.

10. For further comparisons of the first and third editions, see my examination of La Guisiade later in this chapter.

11. Published at Lyons in 1589. There is a copy in the EN Lb34 584.

12. There are two copies of this pamphlet, one in the EN entitled La Contrepoison contre les Artifices et Inventions des Politiques et autres ennemis de la Religion Catholique (Lb34 716) and one in a volume of League pamphlets in the BL entitled Advis aux Catholiques François, sur l'importance de ce qui traicte aujourd'hui, sur l'Irresolution de quelques scrupuleux: ensemble et principalement
sur les ruzes des Politiques, Atheistes, forgeurs de nouvelles, et autres enemys de Dieu (BL 3900 a 60). These pamphlets are identical and both are signed with the initials P.M.


14. Discours véritable et sans passion. Sur la prise des armes, et changemens advenus en la ville de Lyon ..., Lyons, 1593, (BN Lb^S 490), p. 11. This pamphlet is attributed to Pierre Matthieu by Père Lelong. The attribution seems reasonable not only because of the political sentiments expressed, but also because of the author's use of Machiavelli's name as a weapon with which to indict Henry IV's representative at Lyons (see p. 64 of this chapter).

15. Lyons, s.d., BL 596 f 18 (6) and EN Lb^S 642, and Bodleian Douce 121 390.


17. Lyons, 1594, EN Lb^S 579.

18. There were many editions of this history. The EN possesses the edition of 1594-95 (La^S 5). The BL has copies of both the 1597 edition published at Lyons (1059 b 11) and the 1604 edition (no place), (1059 b 13).

19. B. Arsenal Ra^4 141. The EN has the 1599 edition (La^17 3).

20. EN Lk^7 4356 and BL C 38 g 13 (this edition contains a copy of the Causes).


22. Published Rouen, 1601, EN Lb^S 762 and BL C 38 b 24.

23. No place, (EN La^13 3b). The BL has the 1604 edition at 1059 b 13.


25. Despite this, L'Estoile calls Matthieu disparagingly 'un Provincial ... qui n'avait pas l'usage du grand monde' (p. 569).


30. Paris, EN Ye 27469. The Tabletes are already mentioned in the Histoire de Louis XI (1610, B. IX, p. 348) and the BL has an edition dated 1610-1622 (the 'privilege' is dated 1610 and there is a third part published posthumously by Matthieu's son), BL 11474 a 39.

31. They were still popular in the seventeenth century for they are cited approvingly, along with Pibrac's Quatrains (with which they were often published) in Molière's Scapinelle, sc. 1.

32. Paris, EN J 16489. The BL has the second edition of 1618 (587 a 211, 2) and the fourth edition published at Rouen in 1626 (587 a 22). This copy also contains Matthieu's translation of Boccaccio's Histoire des Prosperitez Malheureuses and his life of Villeroi - Remarques d'Estat et d'Histoire sur la vie et les services de M. de Villeroy. The Remarques were first published in 1618 (see the Histoire de France, 1631, tome II, p. 165). The BL also possesses seventeenth century English, German and Italian translations of Sejanus.


34. See F. A. Yates (op. cit., pp. 27-33a). Yates describes how James I, believing that the author was Matthieu, ordered the British Ambassador at Paris to have Matthieu arrested. Matthieu was finally able to satisfy the authorities that a certain Rebout and not he, was the author. Rebout was executed at Rome the following year.


36. BN Lb. and EN Ye 27469.

37. The BN (Fol. La2o 28) and the BL (188 e 6) possess the 1631 edition. The history of Louis XIII's reign was written by Jean Baptiste Matthieu.

38. The full title is La Magicienne Etrangere, Tragedie. En laquelle on voit les tiranniques comportemens, origine, entreprise, desseins, sortileges, arrest, mort et supplice, tant du Marquis d'Ancre que de Leonor Galligav sa femme, avec l'aventureuse rencontre de leurs funestes ombres, Lyons and Rouen, 1617, BN Yf 9993. The Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal has a copy of this tragedy (s.l., 1626, Rf 5233 (2)).

39. Published in Paris (BL 11737 a 26). The edition is undated but it must have been published during the course of 1617 if it was to be at all topical and probably before La Magicienne Etrangere since it deals with earlier events.
40. Contemporaries often borrowed from his works for example, S. D'Huerville uses Matthieu frequently in his *Henrici Magni Augusti ... Galliarum Regis. Anagrapate Quinquaginta Novem His comprehensa nominibus heroicis* (Paris, 1612, Mazarine library 10174 pièce 16) and goes so far as to reprint Matthieu's *Eloge du Roy*. Matthieu's fame continued into the next century: Andrea Sevelenbergius, a great admirer of Matthieu's histories, based a tragedy on his historical writings - *Bironius Tragoedia Politica, ex opere Historico, quod Petrus Matthae Gallicè ededit, ut plurimum expressa. Cum Notis, Bratislavia, 1658, (BN Yc 9159).*
THE INFLUENCE OF MACHIAVELLI

A) OPPOSITION TO MACHIAVELLI

Study of Pierre Matthieu's opposition to Machiavelli largely centres around the period of his adherence to the Catholic League and the works of propaganda he wrote for the cause of the Guises against Henry III. In order to have a full picture of Matthieu's reaction towards Machiavelli at this time, it will be necessary to examine his prose works of propaganda such as the Advis aux Catholiques François, the Discours véritable (1593) and the Pompe Funebre des Penitens de Lyon, as well as his dramatic work, La Cuisiade. Apart from the Discours, all these works were published in the same year (1589).

La Cuisiade is one of a handful of plays written in the latter half of the sixteenth century describing contemporary events and portraying important contemporary figures on stage. These dramatizations of contemporary events have been labelled 'political journalism' and certainly they treat events in the sensational, biased way one finds in the poorer forms of journalism. Pierre Matthieu's play dealing with the assassination of the Duke of Guise by Henry III at Blois in 1588, is no exception. As a member of the Catholic League, Matthieu uses every opportunity to blacken Henry III's character and one of his techniques for doing this, is to present Henry III as surrounded by councillors who give him Machiavellian advice on how to rule, advice which Henry III is eventually led to adopt. In this way, Matthieu applies traits normally associated in the sixteenth century with Machiavelli to Henry III.

Yet Matthieu is primarily a historian and in La Cuisiade he writes like a historian trying to be a dramatist. As a dramatist, Matthieu wishes to create a contrast between the 'wicked' King and the 'noble' Duke of Guise, but as a historian he is unable to omit the other side of...
the story. Thus, he gives a long account of the speeches at the meeting of the General Estates at Blois which slows down the progress of the play and unbalances the drama by showing Henry III briefly in a noble light. A dramatist would have omitted this scene, but as a historian, Matthieu obviously felt that he must record all the events surrounding the assassination. Indeed the subtitle of the play reflects a historian's aim, 'Tragédie nouvelle. En laquelle au vray, et sans passion, est représenté le massacre du Duc de Guise.'

Comparison of La Cuisiade with Simon Belyard's play Le Guysien ou Perfidie Tyrannique (published in 1592) on the same subject of the assassination, reveals Matthieu's tendency towards history rather than drama. Rhetoric and sentiment figure prominently in Belyard's play and his Henry III is portrayed as a bloodthirsty tyrant who owes more to Seneca than to history. In La Cuisiade, Matthieu depicts Henry as he was seen by his (hostile) contemporaries - irresolute, weak and afraid of using severe measures. He remains human: he needs to be persuaded into the assassination of the Duke of Guise and at one stage he even repents of having succumbed to the influence of his 'mignons' when he remembers that he began his reign with the reputation of a great warrior. Matthieu's Henry III remains an uneven mixture of the historical personage and a dramatic invention (the wicked, Machiavellian ruler). He mirrors the conflict in Matthieu's own mind between historian and dramatist, a conflict which goes some way to explaining Matthieu's use of Machiavelli in La Cuisiade: the accusation of Machiavellianism was an easy weapon with which to indict one's political opponents in the sixteenth century and it was especially appropriate in the case of Henry III as it was generally believed that he was reading Machiavelli with Florentine exiles at court - Jacopo Corbinelli and Bartolomeo Del Bene.
HENRY III AS A MACHIAVELLIAN RULER

1) In political pamphlets of the late sixteenth century.

That Matthieu is able to use Machiavelli (or the 'Machiavel' figure) in his play as a weapon with which to oppose certain ways of ruling, is an indication of how well-known the Machiavellian legend had become in France in the latter part of the sixteenth century. It had become customary in French political pamphlets to accuse one's opponents of Machiavellianism, that is, it was a facile technique rather than implying any deep knowledge of Machiavelli's political theories. The author of the English pamphlet The Atheistical Politician; or a Brief Discourse concerning N. Machiavell (1642) sums up this facile use of Machiavelli,

He that intends to express a dishonest man calls him a Machiavillian, _sic_ ... We embrace the first apparition of virtue or vice, and let the substance pass by untouched.


Accusations of Henry's Machiavellianism abound in political pamphlets of the time and Matthieu's attacks on Henry in La Guisiade must be seen in the context of this polemic against the King. One of the prints reproduced in Keith Cameron's fascinating study of Aspects of the Satirical Iconography of Henry de Valois (Exeter, 1978), presents Henry as a hermaphrodite holding in one hand a rosary and in the other a portrait of Machiavelli. The lines accompanying this print accuse Henry III of being a disciple of Machiavelli,

Le petit portrait qu'il tient de la main droite, est celuy du perfide Machiavel sur lequel il s'est reglé depuis qu'il est sur le throsne oû il a pratiqué toutes ses pernicieuses maximes pour tyranniser ses peuples. Ils luy ont mis en l'autre main un chapelet pendant au bas de son ventre pour monstrer que ce prince hypocrite s'est toujours servi du voile de la religion pour couvrir son impudicité ...

('An allegorical portrait of Henri' from the B.N. Cabinet des Estampes Qb 1 (1589), reproduced in K. Cameron, op. cit., pp. 77-80).

In the Protestant pamphlet Dialogue auquel sont traitées plusieurs choses avances aux Lutheriens et Huguenots de la France, Henry is depicted...
as surrounded by tutors who instruct him in Machiavellianism,

Considérez, que le Roy depuis douze ans en ça, a eu des maistres et instituteurs qui l'ont appris à jurer, blasphemer, se perjurer, paillarder, dissimuler sa foy, sa religion, ses pensées ... Prenez garde, que le Roy a esté persuadé par la doctrine de Machiavelli ...

This is probably a veiled reference to Corbinelli who was tutor to Henry III. The author describes these tutors reading Machiavelli's works with Henry III, especially Il Principe chapter 18,

... surquoy ses maistres d'escole (aussi peu soucieux de sa conscience que de sa reputation) font des additions et gloses plus dangereuses que le mesme texte.

Corbinelli did in fact annotate his copy of the Discorsi with private notes in an attempt to discern the causes of Henry III's failure to keep the peace between Reformers and Catholics, and to control his rivals, the Guises. He concludes that Henry III failed through not following Machiavelli's advice.

Henrico Davila writing in 1630 puts the beginning of Henry's interest in Machiavelli at a later date (1579),

Il Re ... per indirizzare piú regolamente il filo del suo disegno aggiungendo la teorica alla practica, si riduceva ogni giornodopo pranzo, con Braccio Del Bene e con Giacomo Corbinelli Fiorentini ... da' quali si faceva leggere Polibio, Cornelio Tacito, e molto piú spesso i Discorsi e il Principe di Machiavelli.

Davila's comment is quoted by the anonymous author of the 'Advertissement d'un ami de l'auteur' of Corbinelli's Les Anciens Historiens Latins Réduits en Maximes - Premier Volume. Tite-Live, Paris, 1694, BL 1486 m 18.

The League preacher, Jean Boucher, described Henry III as carrying Il Principe around in his pocket (as indeed Thomas Cromwell was reputed to do). He speaks of Il Principe 'qui perpetuus ei in sacculo atque manibus est.' The author, probably the same Jean Boucher, of the Histoire Tragique et Memorable, de Pierre de Gaverston, says of Edward II
(who represents Henry III),

Quand je contemple les faicts et dictz de ce miserable Roy, il semble qu'il ay practiqué toutes les reigles pernicieuses de ce perdu Machiavel...

(p. 50).

This pamphlet is useful since the author goes on to cite those Machiavellian precepts particularly followed by Edward II and which were the criticisms most frequently brought against Henry III—

... comme est celle /reigle/ qui dit, qu'il suffit à un Roy faire semblant d'homme de bien, oars qu'il ne le soit, d'estre plus craint qu'ayme, d'entretenir divisions entre ses subjects, de ne craindre se parjurer, de ne garder sa foy, d'appauvrir ses subjects pour les tenir en bride, de faire une multitude d'Officiers et plusieurs autres semblables.

(p. 50).

It thus seems fairly certain that Henry III was familiar with Machiavelli's works, or at least with *Il Principe* which was among the books in Catherine de' Medici's library. Indeed, new evidence for his knowledge of *Il Principe*, based on his correspondence with Villeroy, has recently come to light. It is, of course, almost impossible to say whether Henry consciously put Machiavelli's precepts into practice, but nevertheless, this common knowledge of his familiarity with Machiavelli's works made him and his followers credible targets for the accusation of Machiavellianism.

Most of these accusations came from members of the Catholic League and were written during the last year of Henry's life when his unpopularity with his subjects was at its height. In a footnote to his commentary on Laboureur's life of Henry III, Pierre de L'Estoile says,

C'est-ce que les Ligueurs reprochèrent le plus à Henri III, de gouverner suivant les Maximes de Machiavel, qui deviennent presque toujours fatales à celui qui les suit.

(op. cit., p. 270).

Keith Cameron has analysed the extent to which Henry III was made the target of 'one of the most intensive and successful propaganda campaigns ever mounted.' To establish the truth of these allegations is the work of the historian, but it is important to note that Henry's opponents were
eager to depict him as the opposite of the Erasmian ideal in kingship and for this purpose, they often chose to compare him with the Machiavellian ruler. 12

2) In La Guisiade

Matthieu had therefore, a whole popular tradition linking Machiavelli with Henry III on which to draw upon when blackening his portrayal of the King in La Guisiade.

i) Broken Promises.

One of the ideas most commonly associated with Machiavelli in the sixteenth century, was that he advised Princes not to keep their promises to their subjects when it was no longer to their advantage to do so. 13 Matthieu exploits this popular knowledge of Machiavelli to the full in La Guisiade. In his prefatory Discours sur le sujet de ceste Tragedie, he says,

la chose la plus calamiteuse qui soit en ce monde, c'est quand la foy est violée par ses amis, sans laquelle nulle vertu ne peut être assurée, ny mesme les Monarchies ne sont au proufit de ceux qui les gouvernent, quand la foy en est exilée.

(Bv).

Nevertheless, he says, Henry III 'qui n'a prins la leçon de ceste perfidie que de Machiavel' (B2v) is prepared to break his oath to Guise. 14 Matthieu gives examples of cities ruined through people breaking their promises and implies that this is what will happen to France. He concludes,

De telle perfidie sont venues les plus apparentes ruines des Monarchies, et n'y a rien en icelles plus dangereux ny pernicieux. 15

(B2v).

The theme of broken promises is emphasised throughout La Guisiade. In Act II, the Queen Mother prepares the theme by saying of Guise,

Sous le serment Royal de la foy maintenu,
Il s'en vient aux Estats.

(p. 20).
Later in the same Act, Henry III swears to keep the Edict of Union made with Guise in July 1588 in an effort to stamp out Protestantism. He says,

\[ \text{Je suis Prince de foy, un Roy jamais ne ment.} \]

(p. 32).

This stress on the importance of the promise to Guise being kept is a preparation for Henry's later, Machiavellian act of breaking it. 16

In Act III, Espernon is depicted as a Machiavellian character when he tells us that he has taught Henry III

\[ \text{Qu'un Roy n'est pas subject à garder son serment,} \]
\[ \text{S'il veut de sa vengeance avoir contentement.} \]

(p. 38). 17

Later in the same Act, Henry's promise to keep the Edict is lent greater solemnity by being placed in the context of the celebration of Mass. Thus the theme of breaking promises becomes linked with the presentation of Henry as an atheist.

In Act IV, Henry tells his adviser, N.N.,

\[ \text{Quand je pense au serment que j'ay juré, je tremble:} \]
\[ \text{J'ay juré de garder tous ces Princes ensemble,} \]
\[ \text{Que dira on de moy? . . .} \]

(p. 70). 18

N.N., who is concerned with building up Henry's power in any way possible, replies in Machiavellian accents,

\[ \text{On dira que vraiment} \]
\[ \text{Vous scavez manier vos desseins sagement.} \]

(p. 70).

The Chorus asks,

\[ \text{Est-ce ainsi qu'un tel Prince doit} \]
\[ \text{Garder la foy, qui tous oblige?...} \]
\[ \text{La leçon de Loys onziesme,} \]
\[ \text{Qui ne scait simuler /sic/ la foy,} \]
\[ \text{N'entend comme il faut estre Roy,} \]
\[ \text{Est celle aussi d'Henry troisiesme.} \]

(p. 74).

In the 'Argument', Matthieu comments on Henry's decision to kill the Duke of Guise-
Matthieu is thus using Machiavelli's name as an easy way of criticising Henry III's action at Blois since for the majority of Frenchmen in the latter part of the sixteenth century, any policy popularly associated with Machiavelli was automatically 'wrong'. The theme of broken promises is continued in Henry's soliloquy in Act IV where he debates whether or not to keep his promise (p. 81). In Act V, the Messenger stresses that Henry has murdered the Duke of Guise 'contre la foy publique' (p. 85) and Madame de Nemours emphasises the loss of trust between the King and his subjects as a result of Henry's action.

In the 'Argument' to Act IV we are told that the initials N.N. represent those councillors who urged the King to assassinate Guise and whom Matthieu will not (or, more probably, dare not) name on stage. In the first edition of La Guisiade, the connection between N.N. and Machiavelli is made more precise—

Et comme il n'est pas vray-semblable, qu'un tel acte aye trouvé une ame humaine, et qui plus est Françoise, issue des Monarques de France, tant enclinée au mal, que se proposer la pensée seulement d'un tel tort sans se laisser eschapper à quelque traistre et oblique conseil, le Poète au quatrièmsme acte introduit le Roy, discourant du massacre de Monsieur de Guise, avec un anonyme ou plusieurs, notez par ces deux lettres N.N. tels qu'on peut presumer diables incarnez, Machiavelistes, Heretiques, conjurez ennemis de la Religion Catholique, l'avoir accouragé, pour en faire assassiner les protecteurs sous les vaines et calomnieuses accusations de l'ambition, et de la Ligue. ('Argument de la Tragedie').

The theme of broken promises in connection with this episode in Henry's life reappears in the Histoire des derniers troubles de France, B. IV where Matthieu describes how the King's advisers urged him to break his oath and assassinate Guise—

On dict au Roy que tout ainsi comme entre le serf et le Seigneur, il n'y a point d'obligation, qu'il ne peut avoir aussi
in the Histoire by justifying Henry's assassination of Guise in the following way—

_Ces grands mouvemens ont tousjours je ne sçay quoi d'extraordinaire: mais la nécessité et l'utilité publique les authorise._

This is very close to Machiavelli's frequent justification of extraordinary measures on the grounds of necessity and public welfare for example, in the Discorsi I, 18 he says,

_non basta usare termini ordinari essendo modi ordinari cattivi; ma è necessario venire allo straordinaio..._ (p. 182).

This suggests that Matthieu knew Machiavelli's ideas on promises more thoroughly than his deliberately superficial and polemical treatment of Machiavelli in La Guisiade would lead us to think.²²

**ii) Atheism.**

A trait commonly associated with Machiavelli in the sixteenth century was atheism. It will be necessary to digress momentarily to examine this accusation in other writings of the period in order to shed light on the way in which Matthieu has exploited a popular legend.

Innocent Gentillet devotes the whole of the second part of his Discours contre N. Machiavel to attacking Machiavelli for his atheism—

_ceste Atheiste Machiavel enseigne au Prince d'estre un contempteur de Dieu et de Religion, et de faire seulement la mine, et beau semblant exteriorement devant le monde, pour estre estimé religieux et devot, bien qu'il ne le soit pas. Car de punition divine d'une telle hypocrisie et dissimulation, Machiavel n'en craint point, parce qu'il ne croit pas qu'il y ait un Dieu._²³
Jean Bodin tries to dissociate himself from Machiavelli in the dedicatory epistle of *Les Six Livres de la Republique* by criticising Machiavelli on the grounds of atheism—'*quant à l'atheisme il en fait gloire par ses escrits.'*

In his *Traicté de la Majesté Royalle en France*, Pierre Poisson speaks of the true religion,

> Laquelle vraye religion est bien au contraire de l'hypocrisie dont parle Machiavel, de contrefaire le religieux et devotieux, encore qu'il ne le soit pas. Car le prince qui n'a rien de religion que l'exterieur, ne craint aucunement d'offenser Dieu, et en consequence devient tyran et oppresseur du peuple.

(9v). 24

See also D. Rivault's criticism of Machiavelli's views on religion in *Les Estats* (Lyons, 1595, p. 53, BL. 8005 b 26) and those of Pierre Gregoire in *De Republica* (London, 1609, B. 13, ch. 12, BL. C 77 f 12)—

> Scio quid Machiavellus, vir pernitiosissimus, voluerit principibus persuadere, lib. 4 de principe cap. 18 sufficere principi si quod pertinet ad exteriora, habeatur pius et religiosus, et si talis non sit, ut decipiat multitudinem talem cum arbitrantera... Scio et plura alia his peiora addita... Sed quid mihi cum atheis? Si enim crederent Deum esse, si mandata eius reverentur, et sequerentur, tantas blasphemias non admisissent.

In the *Response de F. Portus Candiot, aux lettres diffamatoires de Pierre Carpentier*, (s.l, 1574, BL 804 d 2 (2)), the author cites Machiavelli—

> la Religion n'est autre chose, sinon une certaine police exterieure tenant les hommes en quelque devoir. C'est ainsi que ce meschant Florentin Machiavel faconne son Prince.

(p. 29).

François de Gravelle believes that Machiavelli derived his views on religion from a false reading of Aristotle (*Politiques Royales*, Lyons, 1596, BN*E* 3289, pp. 212-213). In chapter 19, Gravelle admits that religion can lead to conflict within a state but adds—

> Neantmoins pour l'abus qui se commet en cela, je ne seray pas de l'opinion des Machiavelistes, qu'il ne faille point se soucier de la Religion Chrestienne, ains la mespriser comme obscure contentieuse et mal propre pour une grande republique: voila le sot jugement qu'en fait ce malheureux Atheiste,
admiré toutesfois par ses compatriotes Italiens, comme un Apostre envoyé du profond d'enfer, et selon sa doctrine conseillent au Prince de mespriser toute Religion, laquelle n'est pas cause du mal, mais ceux qui la traitent indignement. (p. 222).

The author of the Catholic pamphlet Discours sur les Calomnies (no place, 1590, BN. Lb.434) is familiar with Machiavelli's views on the political utility of religion (p. 26).

So common was this accusation of atheism that French translators of Machiavelli's work felt obliged to defend him on this point. Guillaume Capel says in the preface to his 1553 translation of Il Principe, that those who accuse Machiavelli of atheism

mettent en avant une chose si énorme sans aucune occasion qu'on puisse apercevoir en ce livre. 25 (A iii v).

In Il Principe and the Discorsi Machiavelli sees religion largely as an instrument of State, a useful way for the ruler to command loyalty from his subjects. He is superstitious, believing in Fortune and portents rather than God's power (see Discorsi I, 56) and several times he misinterprets well-known Biblical passages. For example, in the Discorsi I, 26 he applies a line of the Magnificat ('qui esurientes implevit bonis, et divites dimisit inanes') to David rather than to God, reinforcing the idea that he sees religion only in human terms. In Il Principe ch. 13, he talks of David facing Goliath with a sling and a knife. This misinterpretation of extremely familiar Biblical passages is all the more noticeable since Machiavelli had such a retentive memory for the works of classical pagan authors. But his contemporaries were shocked above all by the absence of the consciousness of the role of Providence in Machiavelli's work: he seemed to want to work everything out according to mere 'sens humain'. 26

In defence of Machiavelli, it may be argued that many of his criticisms of the Catholic Church were endorsed by his contemporaries, such as the anti-clerical attitude in the comedy La Mandragola. 27 Machiavelli's most vigorous opposition was to what he considered to be a false interpretation
of Christianity as encouraging contemplation rather than practical action. He blames the Christian religion for the present decline in military virtue. Consequently, he often praises pagan religions above Christianity because he believed they encouraged patriotism and a working together for the good of the State. It was customary in the sixteenth century, especially during the conflicts between Reformers and Catholics, to accuse one's opponents of atheism - even a committed Catholic like Michel de L'Hospital did not escape this charge. Often when French writers call Machiavelli irreligious, they really mean immoral. Moreover, Italians in general had a reputation in France for atheism but this was more part of anti-Italian propaganda than a serious criticism of their religion. Machiavelli's works were placed on the Papal Index in 1559, but so were many others for example, those of Erasmus; and it must not be forgotten that it was a Pope who actually authorised the publication of the first edition of Machiavelli's works at Rome.

There was a whole popular tradition of atheism associated with Henry III and Machiavelli and linking the two upon which Matthieu could draw in _La Guisiade_ for a facile way of blackening Henry III's character. The contemplative and mystical side of Henry's nature led him into extremes of religious observance so that it was easy to accuse him of sorcery and diabolical practices. The accusations became particularly prevalent after 1584 when his apparent willingness to leave the crown to the heretic Henry of Navarre was seen as an indication of his lack of religious principles. He is accused of dabbling in sorcery in the League pamphlet _Les Sorceleries de Henry de Valois_ where there is mention of a peculiar crucifix with two satyrs on either side (he did in fact possess this). He is accused of atheism in _La Vie et faits notables de Henry de Valois_ and in _Le Martyre des Deux Frères_ where he is described as stealing a valuable cross and selling it in order to raise money, following in this
la detestables, /sic/ malheureuse et damnable doctrine de l'ateiste Machiavel.\textsuperscript{36}

In the pamphlet entitled Contre les fausses allegations, \textsuperscript{37} Henry is again associated with Machiavelli on the subject of atheism-

Mais \textsuperscript{Henry III}/ imbu de la religion de Machiavel, et ayant ouy en son cabinet les lectures d'un vieillard bazannê, conroyé en l'Atheisme, il a cruë, comme il y a apparence qu'il croy encore, que les ames meuvent avec les corps.\textsuperscript{38}

Another Leaguer, Claude de Rubys, describes Henry III's monastery at Vincennes as 'une vraye escole d'Atheisme' and states that it was founded on Machiavellian precepts-

ceste feincte et simulée devotion n'estoit qu'une vraye et pure hypocrisie, tirée du conseil de l'Atheiste Machiavel, principal docteur de ce Sarrail: Lequel dit, qu'il faut que le Prince, encore qu'il ne croye rien, neantmoins feigne en apparence d'estre fort devot et Religieux.\textsuperscript{39}

Rubys asks

n'a il pas fait contenance de vouloir bastir nouvelles Eglises et monasteres, et cependant en secret en son Sarrail, au Cabinet il lisoit un Aretin, un Machiavel et autres tels docteurs de l'atheisme\textsuperscript{i}/.\textsuperscript{40}

The Catholic author of the pamphlet L'Atheisme de Henry de Valois:

\textsuperscript{o}ù est monstre le vray but de ses dissimulations et cruautez accuses Henry of leading moderate Catholics away from the Church

pour se retirer vers cest apostat, embrasser l'evangile de Machiavel, finalement suivre tel nouveau Alcoran qu'il luy plaira leur prescrire et ceux la sont nos politiques tant renommez au jourd'huy.\textsuperscript{41}

The author of the pamphlet Discours en Forme d'Oraison Funebre, sur le Massacre et parricide, de Messeigneurs le Duc, et Cardinal de Guyse (Paris, s.d., EN Lb\textsuperscript{34}557) declares

Vous me confesserez qu'il \textsuperscript{Henry III}/ est neutre, et que suivant le precepte de Machæl /sic/ son grand pedagogue, il est Atheiste de coeur, se contentant d'exterieur, de faire profession pour regner, de la religion, la plus commune qui est la Catholique.

(p. 20).

Another contemporary states,

Henry de Valois, qui n'estudioit en autres leçons qu'en celles de Machiavel (quelque hypocrite qu'il fust) ne se
soucioit de l'une ny de l'autre religion.
(La Vie, Moeurs et Deportemens de Henry Bearnos..., Paris, 1589, BN Lb 173, p. 24).

The author of the Response aux justifications pretendues par Henry de Valois (Paris, 1589, BN Lb 677, p. 18) says that Henry's action in having the Guises assassinated was not motivated by a desire to preserve the Catholic religion, but to obey Machiavelli and destroy religion.

The propaganda was not limited to Henry: it was customary to accuse his followers of atheism and diabolism for example, Espernon in La Vie et faits notables de Henry de Valois and in the Testament de Henri de Valois (1589). And see the print reproduced by K. Cameron (op. cit., p. 177) from the Recueil de l'Estoile, depicting Espernon as a devil.

Matthieu's indictment of Henry III's religion as Machiavellian must thus be examined against the background of this Catholic propaganda during the last year of Henry's reign. In this context, it appears neither very original nor very daring.

In Act II of La Cuisiade, the Queen Mother warns Henry III not to let the Catholic faith fall into ruin by favouring the Reformers (we have seen that this was a common accusation against him). It is argued that Henry is a secret heretic because he refuses to use force against the Reformers in contrast with the Duke of Guise, presented in Act I as an upholder of the Catholic faith who is prepared to eliminate the Reformers by force. The Queen Mother tells her son:

En vous on ne voit rien
Qui responde au devoir d'un Prince Treschrestien.
Si vous aviez de Dieu la cognoissance saintce,
Si l'alme Foy estoit en vostre cier saveinte,
Le Turc, ny l'Alcoran, ny l'Epicurien,
Ny le Calvinien, ny le Lutherien,
Le Machiaveliste, et l'homme de fortune,
Ne trouveroit en vous tant de grace opportune.
(p. 17).

The link with Machiavelli provided, at least in the eyes of the sixteenth century French reader, an extra indictment of Henry's religious beliefs.
A second connection with Machiavelli is established a few lines further on when the Queen Mother accuses Henry of hypocrisy in religion. She says,

Pour devenir lyon vous faictes du renard.
(p. 18).

This is a clear echo of *Il Principe* chapter 18 and fits in, incidentally, with a number of political pamphlets charging Henry with adopting the behaviour of a fox and a lion. 43

True to the tradition of political pamphlets, not only Henry III, but also his adviser, Espernon, is accused of atheism and sorcery. In the 'Argument' to Act III, Matthieu describes him as 'un desesperê, un sorcier' (p. 35). Espernon is depicted as siding with the Reformers and giving Henry Machiavellian advice about religion—

Qu'il suffit à un Roy d'avoir par fiction Quelque zele de foy, ou de Religion.
(p. 38).

Compare *Il Principe* chapter 18 where Machiavelli says,

Debbe adunque avere uno principe gran cura che...paia, a vederlo et udirlo, tutto pietà, tutto fede, tutto integrità, tutto umanitâ, tutto religione. E non è cosa più necessaria parere di avere, che questa ultima qualità.
(p. 74).

Again, Matthieu, a serious historian, seems to be deliberately playing up to the popular idea of Henry III and his followers in his tragedy. 44 In his *Histoire des derniers troubles de France* on the other hand, the criticisms of Espernon favouring the heretics are dismissed as unjust and in Book I Henry III's piety and his desire to unite his kingdom in one religion are praised. His reluctance to use force against the Reformers is seen as a Christian attitude of trust in God, rather than force, to change men's hearts. Although Matthieu does not entirely approve of the zealous piety which caused Henry III to neglect his duty as a King, he gives a much fairer view of Henry in his histories than in *La Guisiade* where, for dramatic purposes, he makes Henry into a villain
opposing the righteous Duke of Guise — and in order to complete the black portrait, calls upon the name of Machiavelli.

iii) The Subjects' Poverty

It was often believed in the sixteenth century that Machiavelli had advised his ruler to keep his subjects in poverty. This view of Machiavelli resulted from a distortion of II Principe chapter 16 where he says that it is preferable for a ruler to be avaricious rather than extravagant, and of his admiration in the Discorsi for countries such as Germany where he believed that the poverty of the subjects encouraged civic 'virtù'.

In Act III, Espemon's lesson to Henry III echoes this pseudo-Machiavellian policy—

Qu'il faut pour éviter des Princes l'insolence, Donnez prou de travaux, et peu de recompense.

(p. 38).

This is all the more noticeable as Machiavellian as it is sandwiched between two other pieces of Machiavellian advice — that a King can break his promises and that he should pretend to be religious. Moreover, in works of propaganda, there was a certain tendency to accuse Henry III of deliberately following the Machiavellian policy of keeping his subjects in poverty.

In Act III of La Guisiade, the speaker for the Third Estate at the assembly of the General Estates at Blois complains of

L'usure Italienne, hostesse de la France, Qui devore en un jour du peuple la substance.

(p. 60).

This may be a reference to particular Italian moneylenders in France, but it also reveals Matthieu's willingness to exploit the anti-Italian feeling rife in France in the sixteenth century and which was frequently linked specifically with anti-Machiavellian propaganda.
iv) Dissimulation.

Machiavelli was not alone among his contemporaries in advising dissimulation but his originality lies in making it the duty of a prince to manipulate appearances so that he has the kind of reputation he needs to rule effectively. In Il Principe chapters 16, 17, 18, Machiavelli shows how a ruler can appear generous, compassionate, faithful which will enable him then to be avaricious, cruel and disloyal when the need arises. There is great stress on reputation—

A uno principe, adunque, non è necessario avere tutte le soprascritte qualità, ma è bene necessario parere di averle. Anzi, andirò di dire questo, che avendole et osservandole sempre, sono dannose, e parendo di averle, sono utile.

(p. 73).

Writers in the sixteenth century were usually hostile to Machiavelli's advice on dissimulation. Opponents of Henry III often claimed that he had learned the lesson of dissimulation from the Italian author. Thus, the Catholic Leaguer, Charles de Boss, describing how Henry III pretended to ally with the Guises at Blois in 1588, says,

Bref on n'oublie aucun artifice ny maxime de Machiavel, touchant ce qui est requis pour bâllier au peuple une bonne opinion de son prince.

Another accusation of dissimulation can be found in Les Meurs, Humeurs et Comportements de Henry de Valois where the author says that Henry learned from Machiavelli how to dissimulate his allegiance to the Reformers—

Ainsi ne faut-il attendre au moins si tost une profession toute ouverte de l'hérésie qui couve dedans le coeur de Henry de Valois. Car son maistre Machiavel ne. luy a fait telle leçon.

Yet again, Matthieu is adopting a popular line of attack against Henry III when he portrays him as a dissimulator in La Guisiade.

The Queen Mother accuses Henry III of dissimulation in Act I of Matthieu's play—

Que vous sert d'estre Roy casanier, inhumain...
Et tenir inconstant en la bouche deux langues?

(p. 9).
In Act III, Espernon is depicted as encouraging Henry in dissimulation (see the last six lines of his soliloquoy on p. 39). Henry's dissimulation in pretending to ally himself with the Duke of Guise whilst preparing to have him killed is emphasised many times for example, in Act V where the Messenger says,

Le Roy...de long temps déguisoit sa vengeance
De parole, de foy, d'amour, de bienveuillance...
(p. 85).

In the Histoire des derniers troubles de France, however, Matthieu has rather different views on dissimulation: in Book III, he says that Henry III failed because he did not dissimulate enough his fear of the Guises-

C'est icy qu'il faut user de ceste sage prudence et dissimulation qui servist de devise à Loy XI, de conseil à Sigismond, de Loy à Frederic Empereur, de vertu aux vertus de Tibere. Aussi n'y a il point de danger de dissimuler, pourveu comme dit Platon que ceste finesse revienne au profit des subjets.
(7r).

Once more, we see that although Matthieu opposed Machiavellian methods of ruling in La Cuisiade, nevertheless, when writing his histories, he acknowledges the utility of some of the Italian's ideas. He is aware that the very nature of the times may force one to adopt Machiavellian principles.

Matthieu's exploitation of popular ideas about Machiavelli and Henry III is continued as we shall now see, in the two prose pamphlets also published in 1589.

3) In Advis aux Catholiques François.

This pamphlet discusses the assassination of Guise at Blois and, as in La Cuisiade, Henry III is depicted as a perfidious tyrant, whilst Guise is praised as a defender of the Catholic Church. Henry's hypocrisy in religion is emphasised (p. 26), and the author exhorts Catholics to support their Church and stand firm against the King. He asks whether
La dépravation de ce siècle, et les propositions de c'est athée Machiavel, Evangéliste des politiques du jour'hui, vous ont elles peu faire oublier les commandemens du Dieu vivant, lesquels doivent estre engravez et bûrnez au plus profond d'un coeur vrayement Christien?  
(p. 13-14).

Addressing Henry III, the author says,

et toy (tyran) ose tu dresser tes conseils contre Dieu? tu ratiocinois en Machiaveliste, et ne jettois l'œil que sur la cause seconde...  
(p. 6).

In this way, as in La Cuisiade, the author (probably Matthieu) condemns Henry III as a Machiavellian ruler.

4) In _Pompe Funèbre des Penitens de Lyon_.

This pamphlet may have been written slightly later in 1589 than the _Advis_ since Matthieu discusses the death of the Cardinal of Lorraine as well as that of his brother. As in the _Advis_ the Guises are praised as supporters of the Catholic religion who would never separate 'proffit de l'honneste' (p. 9). Henry III is described as a supporter of heretics and as jealous of Guise's valour (characteristics which he also possesses in _La Cuisiade_). In particular, his lack of faith is stressed-

...fallot-il qu'avec vous /The Guises/ mourut la foy de vostre Roy? Ah! trompeuse foy, foy dissimulée, foy de paille, foy hypocrite, foy meurtrière...

Quelque race de Machiavel, vray esclave de la tyrannie, quelques colonies d'Angleterre, disons plustost vray levain des mignons en ce Royaume, qui despuis quelques années ont enaigri nostre paste, veulent icy lascher le merf de la loy, et briser son autorité. Eux qui ont l'œil moins voyant à la clarté de ces affaires, que le chahuant ne l'a aux rayons du Soleil, jugent à travers pays des motifs d'autruy, crient qu'il ne faut garder la foy à ceux qui la rompent, font leur paralogisme sur le Duc de Guise. Fausse proposition...Jamais la perfidie ne fut louable qui venge la perfidie.  
(pp. 18-19).

Francis I, says Matthieu, knew the importance of keeping faith-

Le Roy François premier, pere des arts, pere de la patrie, quand il juroit foy de Gentilhomme, l'arrest estoit donné: ceste simple parole estoit une loy, sa foy estoit un oracle.  
(p. 19).
But

Quand son fils Henry III dit, foy de Roy, il ne respecte non plus son Dieu, son serment, sa parole, que Lisandre sa promesse. (pp. 19-20).

These two prose pamphlets thus extend our insight into Matthieu's opposition to Henry III during the period 1588 to 1589 and in particular, into the methods he used to blacken the King's name, that is, by building up a picture of Henry as a Machiavellian ruler.

It is interesting to note that Pasquier, writing in defence of Henry III's action at Blois in his Remonstrance aux François sur leur sedition et rebellion (1589) is forced into the opposite position to Matthieu, that is, he presents the Duke of Guise as a Machiavellian figure

Car quant au duc de Guise, si l'ambition et désir de tyranniser, masqué d'un faux visage de religion selon la doctrine de Machiavel, se doit appeler zèle de religion et affection à l'Eglise Catholique, je vous confesse votre proposition. Mais au contraire, si telle chose se doit appeler... atheisme encombré de superstition, qui pourra denier que le duc de Guise ait esté un atheiste, hypocrite et superstitieux...


Machiavelli's name was thus invoked by partisans of both sides.

5) In Discours veritable et sans passion.

After Henry III's death, Matthieu continued to use Machiavelli as a political weapon against those in power: in this pamphlet it is Henry IV's representative at Lyons, Sorlin, who is indicted as a Machiavellian. Matthieu paints an evocative picture of the type of advice the governor is given by his councillors-

En ce Conseil estoict du cabinet on luy apprend, que le manteau de la piété est asses grand pour couvrir l'hypocrisie. Qu'il ne faut qu'une contenance exterieure de devotion pour se faire admirer au peuple. Que la vaillance et l'humilité Chrestienne ne marche jamais ensemble. Que la crainte de Dieu affoiblist la generosité de l'ame, et estouffe l'ardeur d'un coeur haut et courageux. On ne voit autre chose sur le tapis
de ce conseil que la conference des Principautez estrangeres: que l'histoire Florentine, et le Prince de Machiavel: que le plan de vingt et deux citadelles: les memoires de dixhuit sortes d'inventions pour trouver argent sur le peuple...
(p. 5).

Here we have the first mention by Matthieu of the Istorie Fiorentine, but in such a casually dismissive manner as to suggest he may not actually have read it yet.

The author continues

En ce conseil il apprend à violer la foy publique, à rompre les tresves: à s'affubler tantost de la peau du renard, tantost de celle du Lyon, pour venir au dessus de ses conceptions: à entreprendre indifferemment tout ce qui pouvoit avancer sa grandeur...
(pp. 5-6).

He concludes by describing the Governor as

ce miserable estranger, qui sous le credit de quelques maximes de Machiavel a quitté le soing de la marmite pour presider aux affaires d'Estat...
(p. 9).

In this way, Matthieu exploits popular hostility against Machiavelli in order to justify the Catholics at Lyons having taken up arms against their Governor. Only with the conversion of Henry IV to Catholicism did Matthieu feel France had a King of whom he could sincerely approve and so ceased his use of Machiavelli as a weapon with which to indict his nation's leaders; he did not, however, cease to use Machiavelli altogether, rather it was his attitude towards the Italian author which altered.

B) USE OF MACHIAVELLI.

Since Matthieu's recognition of Machiavelli as a serious historian appears to have developed gradually, it will be simpler to deal with the works in which he makes use of Machiavelli in chronological order.
Histoire des derniers troubles de France

This, Matthieu's first historical work, is interesting since it reveals the French author using Machiavelli's works but not wishing (or daring) yet to acknowledge his source.

In Book II, Matthieu discusses the building of a fortress at Lyons by Charles IX and its later demolition by Henry III on the grounds that it was not increasing the loyalty of his subjects and could be easily captured. Henry's Council was against this demolition, believing that the fortress held the inhabitants of Lyons in check, but

Les plus sages Politiques remonstroient que telles forteresses ne servoient que pour la deffence ou des propres subjects ou des ennemis, et qu'en l'un elles estoient dangereuses, en l'autre peu necessaires.

In Discorsi II, 24, Machiavelli says,

Debbesi adunque considerare come le fortezze si fanno o per difendersi dagl'inimici o per difendersi da'suggetti. Nel primo caso le non sono necessarie, nel secondo dannose.

Matthieu has made an almost literal, unacknowledged translation of Machiavelli (he merely reverses 'inimici' and 'suggetti'). Furthermore, in what is supposed to be his own comment in the margin, Matthieu says,

Les forteresses généralement sont plus dommageables que nécessaires.

The title of Discorsi II, 24 is

Le fortezze generalmente sono molto più dannose che utili.

The translation of Machiavelli by Matthieu proves several things. Firstly, that Matthieu was so interested in Machiavelli's work that by 1594 he had read not only the well-known II Principe but also the Discorsi. Secondly, it shows that Matthieu must have been working with a copy of the Discorsi to hand in order to give such a close rendering of the original. His translation differs from Gohory's French translation of the Discorsi (published in 1548) and it seems likely that he was working from the Italian.
Thirdly, it proves that on traditional questions of methods of ruling, Matthieu sometimes preferred to follow Machiavelli rather than ancient sources and was perfectly well able, when he wished, to distinguish between the popular Machiavelli and the real Machiavelli. He ignores the popular opinion, begun by Gentillet, that Machiavelli was a supporter of fortresses. It is also significant that the people who put forward these Machiavellian views, are described as 'les plus sages Politiques'. This approval of Machiavelli contrasts sharply with the superficial, anti-Machiavellian stance Matthieu adopts in La Guisiade.

An interesting footnote to this use of Machiavelli in connection with the fortress at Lyons, is N. Montand's attack on Machiavelli in Le Miroir des François. This pamphlet is violently anti-Italian and criticises the growing absolutism of French monarchs under the influence of Machiavelli, (see p. 333). Archimedes, the author's mouthpiece, says,

Vous devez entendre que si peuple a jamais aimé son Roy, c'est le Francois, comme desja a esté deduit en ce traité: mais depuis qu'on a voulu pratiquer la Chronique de ce monstre de Machiavel, extraitte sur les faits de ce Cesar Borgia, bastard du Pape, on a ...aimé suivre les maximes corrompus de ce villain infame, ignorant, si jamais homme le fut... (p. 409).

He blames Machiavelli's advice for the building of fortresses in France and particularly mentions the 'disaster' of the Lyons fortress built by Catherine on the advice of Charles IX's 'wicked councillors'.

Likewise, Pasquier may be thinking of Machiavelli's views when he speaks of the demolition of this fortress at Lyons and says that fortresses are more harmful than useful (Lettres Historiques ed. D. Thickett, Paris, 1966, p. 147 and see p. 174). Pasquier was familiar with Machiavelli's true ideas on fortresses for in the Pourparler du Prince (1560), the Machiavellian figure, the Curial, is against
establishing fortresses.

In the military sphere, Matthieu may be echoing Machiavelli in Histoire des derniers troubles de France Book I, where he argues that small groups of desperate soldiers have frequently overcome much larger armies—

... le nombre ne donne pas les victoires... une petite poignée de desespères a mis en route de grandes armées. (10r).

He adds,

Il ne faut jamais attaquer ceux qui n'espèrent rien qu'un desespoir. (10v).

A note in the margin reveals that Matthieu is thinking specifically of the battle of Poitiers here, but he may also have in mind the Discorsi where Machiavelli speaks of the importance of a commander relieving the enemy of despair. In L'Arte della Guerra Book VI, he advises a commander to flee combat with a desperate enemy.66

There are several other echoes of Machiavelli's ideas in the history but they may owe their existence rather to Matthieu's knowledge of classical authors. For example, in Book III, Matthieu says that Henry III failed in his policy towards the Duke of Guise through choosing the middle way: he should either have severely repressed Guise or done nothing at all—

Le Roy ne devoit pas remuer ceste contention pour en laisser le despit et le desdain en l'âme du Duc de Guyse, ny laisser ceste lancette en la veine qu'il ait ouverte, il luy fallût faire la peur et le mal tout ensemble, ou ne faire ny l'un ny l'autre. Mais c'est chose estrange, que les hommes faillent tousjours en ce qu'ils sont, et au point principal qui les fait estre. (4v).

Machiavelli, too, is an ardent opponent of those who take the middle way in politics for example, Discorsi I, 27 is entitled 'Sanno rarissime volte gli uomini essere al tutto cattivi o al tutto buoni.' In Discorsi I, 26, he says that in politics,

gli uomini pigliono certe vie del mezzo che sono dannossissime; perché non sanno essere né tutti cattivi né tutti buoni. (p. 194).67
Matthieu is close to Machiavelli's views and expression here. However, avoidance of the middle way had also been advocated by Seneca.

In Book II, Matthieu says that hunting is a good training for the art of war because it teaches one the lie of the land. He comments in the margin:

La chasse est inventée pour remarquer l'assiette du pays, et Xenophon dit que c'est un tableau de la guerre.

Matthieu was familiar with Xenophon from whom he often borrows in his histories, but he may also have been aware that in Il Principe chapter 14, Machiavelli says that hunting is useful for the art of war. Moreover in Discorsi III, 39, he gives as his source Xenophon—

Questo si dice per mostrare come le cacce, secondo che Senofonte appruova, sono una imagine di una guerra.

A final example of a possible echo of Machiavelli occurs in the Histoire des derniers troubles de France B. II in the description of the Duke of Mayenne—

Ce Prince... n'a jamais sceu que c' estoit de joindre un lopin de la peau du renard, quand celle du Lyon n'estoit assez grande.

The terms in which the fox and lion vocabulary is couched recall Plutarch rather than Machiavelli, though Matthieu knew very well that Machiavelli uses similar terms in Il Principe chapter 18.

These three examples of Matthieu using a classical source instead of Machiavelli, may show that his knowledge of the Italian author was not yet as thorough as it was later to be, or they may be another indication of Matthieu's unwillingness to acknowledge his debt to Machiavelli. A classical author's name was often used as a front by French authors in the sixteenth century in order to avoid any linking of their name with Machiavelli and hence with the attitude of pragmatism in politics. Writers were aware that their works might carry less conviction with their readers if they
used Machiavelli's precepts openly. This was especially so in the period when Matthieu was writing, in the 1590's; by this time French public opinion no longer saw Machiavelli as a serious author with valid advice on politics and war, but as the legendary evil adviser of tyrants.

Consequently, despite the verbal echo of Machiavelli pointed out pp.66-7, the only attitude towards Machiavelli Matthieu admits to holding in the Histoire des derniers troubles de France is one of hostility. In Book III, replying to the League's accusation against Henry III for refusing to support it, Matthieu says,

\[ 	ext{Et qui conseilla jamais (si ce n'est Machiavel) à un Prince, pere commun de ses subjects, entretenir des partialitez parmi eux?} \]

\[(24v).73\]

Matthieu gives chapter 20 of Il Principe as a reference for this advice. If we read chapter 20, however, we see that Machiavelli is in fact opposed to keeping one's subjects divided. He says,

\[ \text{Solevano li antiqui nostri, e quelli che erano stimati savi, dire come era necessario tenere Pistoia con le parte... e per questo nutrivano in qualche terra loro suddita le differenze, per possederle più facilmente. Questo, in quelli tempi che Italia era in uno certo modo bilanciata, doveva essere ben fatto; ma non credo che si possa dare oggi per precetto: perché io non credo che le divisioni facessino mai bene alcuno.} \]

\[(p. 86).74\]

Matthieu is deliberately playing on a popular misinterpretation of Machiavelli's work in the sixteenth century which arose through the influence of Innocent Gentillet.75

Examination of the Histoire des derniers troubles de France reveals that Matthieu's knowledge of Machiavelli appears to have developed in so far as he is now familiar with the Discorsi, but he is still unwilling to acknowledge his source, preferring to exploit popular hostility against the Italian writer.
ii) L'Entree de Tres-Grande, Tres-Chrestienne, et Tres-Auguste Princesse Marie de Medicis Reine de France et de Navarre en la Ville de Lyon

Marie de’ Medici made her entrance into Lyons on the third of December 1600 and Matthieu's book describing the preparations for the triumphal entry was published in 1601. As a tribute to Marie, Matthieu gives a short history of Florence under the Medici rulers and for this, he uses Machiavelli as one of his sources, this time openly acknowledging his debt.

Thus he gives Machiavelli's opinion of Viery de' Medici, borrowed from the Istorie Fiorentine B.V, ch. IV:

Viery de Medicis appaisa ceste division, rendit au Senat son authorité, au peuple sa franchise. Machiavel après tous ceux qui ont écrit l'histoire de Florence, dit qu'il avoit telle reputation que s'il eust eu plus d'ambition que de prud'homme, il pouvoit sans difficulté s'emparer de la puissance souveraine de la republique. (37v).

The same objective use of Machiavelli as a historian of Florence is found later in the same work when Matthieu repeats Machiavelli's opinion of Jean de' Medici (45r).

Matthieu is no longer afraid of mentioning Machiavelli by name as a source. This may be because the climate of opinion in France was no longer so hostile to Machiavelli as it had been in the previous decade, or, more likely, now that Matthieu had read the Istorie Fiorentine, he felt he could respect Machiavelli as a serious historian.


This work was published in Leyden in 1605. The history is prefaced by an 'Avertissement' in which Matthieu gives his views on the qualities needed in a historian, such as objectivity, moral seriousness etc. Speaking of the sources he has used, contemporary as well as ancient, he says,
Quelque scrupuleux rejettara de ce nombre Machiavel et Aretin, desquels j'ay tire plusieurs beaux mots comme Epictete et Seneque des escrits d'Epicure, mais je les conjure de considerer qu'encores que ces deux grands esprits ayent eu peu de conscience, ils ont eu beaucoup de science et de connoissance aux choses du monde. Un beau trait est toujours beau, et n'est jamais hors de saison de quelque endroit qu'il vienne.

This is Matthieu's most explicit comment on his divided attitude towards Machiavelli: he says that he cannot approve of much of his work, but confesses his admiration for him as a historian. It is in the light of this statement that Matthieu's later histories should be considered for in them, he frequently acknowledges Machiavelli as his source.

It would be tedious and unnecessary to discuss all Matthieu's references to Machiavelli's works in this Histoire de France since many of them are straightforward quotations with acknowledgement of their source. Such references are found in:-

B.II p. 388 from the Istorie Fiorentine, on the customs at Florence.
   p. 395 from the Istorie Fiorentine B. III, on Viery de' Medici
   (as in L'Entree see p.71 )

B.III p. 528 from Il Principe ch. 21 (in Italian): a Prince should avoid being at the discretion of others.
   pp. 576, 582 from Il Principe ch. 18 (in Italian), on broken promises.

B.IV p. 20 from the Discorsi II, 11 (in Italian): countries should make peace with their more powerful enemies.

B.V p. 226 from Discorsi I, 8, on rumours.
   p. 352 from the Istorie Fiorentine B. 7.

B.VI p. 491 from Discorsi I, 25 (in Italian), on changing the religion of a State.
pp. 504-505 from Il Principe ch. 22, on the three sorts of councillors.  

p. 550 from the Discorsi III, 21: men's fondness for change.  

p. 617 from Discorsi II, 23: on punishment.  

B.VII p. 669 from Il Principe ch. 22, a Prince's advisers.  

p. 693 from the Discorsi II, 1. The Romans acquired power by virtù rather than by wealth.  

p. 697 from the Discorsi I, 38: the dangers of irresolution.  


This long list of references from Machiavelli indicates that Matthieu must have been writing with a copy of his works to hand. The ease with which he moves from one book to another, reveals Matthieu's familiarity not only with Il Principe, but also with the Discorsi and the Istorie Fiorentine.  

iv) Histoire de Louys XI Roy de France  

This Histoire was published in Paris in 1610. In the dedicatory epistle to Henry IV and in the 'Avertissement' to the reader, Matthieu builds up a picture of Louis XI as an absolute monarch prone to using ruse (Bv) and dissimulation in ruling (B ii v). He is compared unfavourably with Henry IV and it is suggested that he was indifferent to the welfare of his subjects. In French Renaissance writing, Louis XI is often credited with having said,  

Nescit regnare, qui nescit dissimulare.  

Perhaps it was for this reason that Louis XI is so often linked with Machiavelli in the political writings of the time. It is perhaps worth examining this connection at some length, in order to place Matthieu's view of Louis XI within a certain tradition of anti-Machiavellian writing.
In Du Droit des Magistrats sur leurs subjects, Theodore de Bèze links Louis XI with the Machiavellian policy of breaking promises—

ce Roi... se jojoit de tous sermens et de toutes promesses (p. 42)

and there is an echo of Il Principe when Bèze says that Louis never found peace of mind

essaiant mesmes à la mort que c'est d'estre plustost craint qu'aimé de ses subjets.

(p. 42).

The author of the Lunettes de Cristal de Roche attributes to Louis XI the Machiavellian policy of breaking promises and executing anyone who acted against his wishes. In Trois Livres des Offices d'Estat (ed. cit., B. I), Jacques Hurault cites Machiavelli's advice to a ruler to dissimulate and adopt the behaviour of a lion and a fox. Hurault calls these 'Maximes tyranniques et bestiales de Machiavel' and says that they are bound to fail. The example he gives is Louis XI whose use of dissimulation turned out to his disadvantage. Gabriel Naudé in Considerations Politiques sur les Coups d'Estat (ed. cit., pp. 59-61, p. 115) also mentions Louis XI's dissimulation.

In Le Bouclier de la Reunion des Vrais Catholiques François (1589), Claude de Rubys speaks of Louis XI

que les Machiavelistes disent avoir esté le premier qui meist les Roys hors de page: parce que ce fust le premier qui introduisit la tyrannie en France.

(ed. cit., p. 67).

The author of the English pamphlet The Atheistical Politition; or a Brief Discourse concerning N. Machiavel (1642) says that Louis XI ruled even more wickedly than a Machiavellian Prince,

For, if we examine the Life of Lewis the 11th of France, we shall find he acted more ill, than Machiavell writ, or, for aught we know, ever thought, yet he hath wisdome inscribed on his Tomb...

Guillaume de la Perrière describes how the Princes of the Blood rose up against Louis XI because he had excluded them from office—


In his *Discours sur les Duels*, Brantôme accuses Louis XI of the Machiavellian policy of putting responsibility for an unpopular action on subordinates.  

Matthieu must have been aware of this tradition of linking Louis XI with Machiavelli: in *La Guisiade* Act IV, the Chorus criticises Henry III, a Machiavellian figure, for following Louis XI’s advice on dissimulation (cited above, p.51 of this chapter).  

In the *Histoire des derniers troubles de France* B. III, Matthieu says that Henry failed because he did not know how to dissimulate like Louis XI (cited above, p.62).  

In the *Histoire de Louys XI* B. XI, Matthieu describes Louis XI cultivating the appearance of piety and points out that Machiavellian behaviour existed before the publication of *Il Principe*, even though

> On ne parloit point encore en ce temps de ceste impie maxime. Qu’il suffit que le Prince semble estre exterieurement religieux et devotieux, encore qu’il ne le soit point.

*(471v).*

A note in the margin describes this as a 'Maxime de Machiavel' and Matthieu continues by quoting from *Il Principe* chapter 18—

> On fait auteur Macchiavel de ceste maxime, que le Prince nouveau ne peut observer toutes les choses pour lesquelles les hommes sont estimez bons, estant souvent contrainct pour maintenir son estat, de faire des choses contre la foy et la religion, sortir du bien quand il le peut, entrer au mal quand il y est contraint.

*(471v).*

The attack on Machiavelli’s advice and its links with Louis XI is continued as Matthieu adds another note to the effect that reliance on appearances must fail in the end—
L'hypocrisie ne peut durer long temps... Les jugemens s'arrestent bien sur ce qu'ils voyent. Perché dit Macchiavel tocca à ciascuno, à vedere, à pochi, à sentire, mais à la fin le masque tombe.

(472r).

A little further on (480r), Matthieu cites Louis XI's notorious words on the necessity of dissimulation but without, however, linking them explicitly with Machiavelli's advice.

More Machiavellianism 'avant la lettre' appears in the behaviour of two of Louis XI's advisers who plan for the King to make a treaty which he will later break if necessary. In the note in the margin, Matthieu remarks,

Desja ceste Maxime Que le Prince contraint de faire quelque paix ou traité à son disadvantage, s'en peut départir quand il luy plaist, a pris pied par les conseils des Princes.

(B. V, p. 199).

Although he is not mentioned by name, it is obvious that Matthieu is thinking of Machiavelli here. He seems to have been struck by the prevalence of so-called Machiavellian behaviour in politics even before Machiavelli described it in his books. 91

Another Machiavellian theme found in this Histoire is that of broken promises. Machiavelli is never actually mentioned in connection with this topic, but we have seen that Matthieu was familiar with Machiavelli's views on this subject. So when Matthieu opposes the policy of breaking promises, we may assume that he has Machiavelli at the back of his mind. Several of his statements on broken promises appear to be contradictory. In Book IV (p. 150) he says that it is permissible to break a forced promise, but in Book II (p. 84) he says that a ruler should never break his word and in Book VI (p. 229) he says that a broken promise is never forgotten. In Book IX (p. 348) he repeats this, quoting Saint Augustine. In Book IX, the distinction becomes clearer as he distinguishes between just and unjust promises, citing Livy in his support (p. 335). He appears to believe that just promises which one has been forced into
should be kept, but that one is allowed to break forced unjust promises.\textsuperscript{92} One of Matthieu's problems throughout his work is always the conflict between his moral scruples and his recognition of the political utility of advice such as that given by Machiavelli. Often, he seems very reluctant to give up the latter in favour of the former. Hence we have all these hedgings and quibblings on the subject of broken promises.

Following his statement in the \textit{Histoire de France} (1608) - cited above p.72 that although he cannot approve of Machiavelli on moral grounds, he is nevertheless useful as a historian, Matthieu proceeds to use Machiavelli in the \textit{Histoire de Louys XI} at the same time as he opposes the Italian author over the question of dissimulation and (half-heartedly) of broken promises. Thus, in Book I, he quotes from the \textit{Discorsi} III, 19 on the necessity of using severity in order to have one's commands obeyed, and acknowledges his source (p. 16). In Book X, there is a literal quote from \textit{Il Principe} chapter 18 on the necessity of being both loved and feared, but here, Matthieu does not acknowledge his source (p. 422) - perhaps he thought that this passage was too well-known to need it.

There are several other echoes of Machiavellian topics in this \textit{Histoire} - that men and steel are more important than money in waging war (B. I, p. 6);\textsuperscript{93} that a Prince will be feared if he acquires a reputation for good deeds (B. I, p. 15); that the Romans never fought against two enemies at the same time (B. III, p. 96) from \textit{Discorsi} II, 1; that foreign war is preferable to civil war (B. III, p. 97, B. VII, p. 324) - but he cites Livy on this subject; that a new ruler should give examples of striking actions (B. IV, p. 133);\textsuperscript{94} that a ruler should not hazard all his fortune on only part of his forces (B. IV, p. 145) from \textit{Discorsi} I, 23; the dangers of neutrality (B. VI, p. 221) from \textit{Discorsi} II, 22; by different methods rulers arrive at the same ends (from \textit{Discorsi} III, 21), and he gives the examples of Hannibal and Scipio (B. VI, p. 234);\textsuperscript{95} necessity drives men to fight harder (B. VII, p. 284) from \textit{Discorsi} III, 12;
that a Prince should have his own troops (B. X, p. 434) from Discorsi I, 21; and that a Prince should go out to meet the enemy and not wait for him to invade (B. X, p. 437). Some of these borrowings are closer to the original than others but they reveal Matthieu's continuing fascination with Machiavelli's works.

v) Remarques d'Estat et d'Histoire, sur la Vie et les services de Monsieur de Villeroy.

This was first published in 1618. Matthieu begins by placing his work in the context of practical politics and rejects the kind of ideal Republic described by Plato (p. 438). Matthieu may have at the back of his mind Il Principe chapter 15 where Machiavelli rejects utopian literature. The necessity of being both loved and feared by one's subjects is then discussed (pp. 459-460) as Matthieu says of Charles IX,

Si ce Prince eut des conseils extremes, Villeroy ne les luy donna pas car il luy dit souvent que le Prince qui avoit plus de soin de se faire craindre qu'aymer estoit asseuré d'estre à la fin plus hay que craint.

(p. 459).

But the terms in which this theme is expressed are not very close to Machiavelli and moreover, Matthieu goes on to cite Seneca ('Qu'ils haissent pourveu qu'ils CRAIGNENT,' pp. 459-460).

There is a closer echo of Machiavelli when Villeroy tells Henry IV,

L'homme d'Estat doit sçavoir surquoy, et comme il faut donner et refuser le Conseil. En certaines choses c'est lascheté de se taire, en d'autres c'est temerité de parler, mais il n'y en a point qui permette de donner son advis avant qu'on le demande.

(pp. 486-7).

In Il Principe chapter 23, Machiavelli says,

...uno principe prudente debbe tenere uno terzo modo, eleggendo nel suo stato uomini savi, e solo a quelli debbe dare libero arbitrio a parlarli la verità, e di quelle cose sole che lui domanda e non d'altro,

(p. 95).
A little later, Matthieu depicts Villeroy expressing another Machiavellian theme: that punishment can be used to set an example to others—

Une teste coupée en la place de Greve estourdit et estonna la sedition et affermit l'autorité de la Regence qui ne faisoit que naistre, et Villeroy jugea cest exemple necessaire...

In Il Principe chapter 17, Machiavelli advises making an example of a few in order to deter others. Moreover, Villeroy's words are placed in the context of a new ruler (a specifically Machiavellian theme).

Matthieu may thus have deliberately allowed his Villeroy to express some Machiavellian ideas on rule. This was probably not intended as a criticism since Matthieu frequently praises Villeroy in his works and at the end of the Remarques he describes his personal friendship with the minister who recommended Matthieu's books to Henry IV and even made some corrections to them himself. Matthieu was probably intending to emphasise Villeroy's practical approach to governing (see his rejection of utopian theories at the beginning of the treatise) and for this, he uses Machiavelli.99

vi) Histoire de France sous les Regnes de François I, Henri II

Published posthumously, this is Matthieu's most important historical work.100 His preface tells us that he had intended to write just a history of Henry IV's reign but that he found he needed to go back and recount what had happened in the previous reigns. His son, Jean Baptiste Matthieu, is responsible for the history of Louis XIII's reign.

In the Histoire de François Premier, Matthieu describes how Francis allowed Charles V to pass freely through his lands and comments in the margin—
Les grands Princes doivent toujours garder leur parole, quelque avantage qu'ils en puissent tirer.
(B. I, p. 14).

There is no reference to Machiavelli, but as we have seen (note 59) Francis I was often portrayed as the opposite of a Machiavellian ruler and Matthieu seems to be following in this tradition here.

In the section on Henry III's reign, Matthieu remarks that hunting is a good training for the art of war (B. VIII, p. 535). This is a Machiavellian idea (see above p. 69) and a little later, Machiavelli is opposed by name as encouraging rulers to cause divisions amongst their subjects (B. VIII, p. 593).

Also in Book VIII, Matthieu describes how Savonarola used religion as a means of keeping the populace in order. In the margin, he says,

Mach. dit que Savanarole fit croire à dix mille Florentins qu'il parloit à Dieu.
(B. VIII, p. 710).

His source is acknowledged here, but on the next page, he lifts a passage almost literally from Il Principe chapter 17, without acknowledging his debt—

Il Principe chapter 17 has

Nasce da questa una disputa: s'elli è meglio essere amato che temuto, o e converso. Respondesi, che si vorrebbe essere l'uno e l'altro; ma, perché elli è difficile accozzarlì insieme, è molto piú sicuro essere temuto che amato, quando si abbia a mancare dell'uno de'dua. Perché delli uomini si può dire questo generalmente: che sieno ingrati, volubili...
(p. 69).

In general, it seems that Matthieu is more often prepared to acknowledge his debt to the Istorie Fiorentine and to the Discorsi, than to the notorious Il Principe. In the section on the reign of Henry IV, Matthieu
frequently refers to these two works as sources for his comments in the margin. Again, it is only necessary to list these references since Matthieu's use of Machiavelli usually consists in straightforward quotation with acknowledgement of source:

B. II p. 339 from the *Istorie Fiorentine* B. II on the Duke of Florence. 104

p. 425 from Discorsi III, 6 (in Italian). Few men can make war openly on a Prince, but many can lead conspiracies.

B. III p. 488 from Discorsi III, 9 (in Italian). Men should know how to adapt themselves to the times. 105

p. 492 from Discorsi II, 12 (in Italian). An army should go out to meet the enemy. 106

p. 497 no source given (in Italian). Those who have bad consciences easily believe rumours about themselves. 107 (This is from Discorsi I, 8).

p. 508 from Discorsi II, 13. Men rise from low to high positions by use of fraud and force.

p. 551 *Il Principe* ch. 3. Men feel those injuries most which affect their property, their life, or their honour.

p. 598 In Italian. Do not ally yourself with a Prince whose reputation is greater than his strength, from Discorsi II, 11.

p. 638 In Italian. A councillor should think only of the Prince's welfare, from *Il Principe*, chapter 22.


p. 656 men prefer appearances to reality. In Italian, from Discorsi I, 25. 109

From this analysis, Matthieu's intimate knowledge of Machiavelli's major works emerges, but once more we can note his unwillingness to acknowledge *Il Principe* openly as his source: only one passage is admitted to have been taken from this work.
CONCLUSION.

The study of Machiavelli's influence on Matthieu falls into two parts: Matthieu's exploitation of popular ideas about Machiavelli around the time of his adherence to the Catholic League (1588-1589) and his increasing use of Machiavelli in his histories.

In La Gueissiade and the two pamphlets of Catholic propaganda written in 1589 - the Pompe Funebre and the Advis aux Catholiques François - he keeps to the popular idea of Machiavelli as an atheist, encouraging tyrants to break promises, dissimulate and keep their subjects poor. Lesser writers like Belyard had been content with this kind of superficial opposition to Machiavelli, often based on an erroneous interpretation of his ideas. But in the histories, Matthieu frequently approves of the very policies he criticised in La Guisiade for example, he now sees the need for dissimulation and the breaking of forced promises. He gradually comes to respect Machiavelli as a serious historian. In the Histoire des derniers troubles de France (1597) he quotes from the Discorsi but is still unwilling to name his source. But by 1601 (in L'Entree de Marie de Medicis) he has become familiar with the Istorie Fiorentine and feels able to acknowledge his debt to Machiavelli, either because it was now safer to do so or because he has come to respect Machiavelli as a serious writer on a level with the other classical and contemporary authors he cites. By 1608 with the Histoire de France, he has become so thoroughly versed in Il Principe, the Discorsi and the Istorie Fiorentine that he can turn from one to the other with considerable ease.

The question remains as to what benefit Matthieu derived from exploiting popular ideas about Machiavelli in La Gueissiade. Matthieu was a serious historian concerned with examining all the facts and analyzing events in an impartial way. Bias did not come easily to him: yet he knew that drama must contain a conflict between the good and the wicked and therefore he used any tools available in order to blacken Henry III's
character. Popular political propaganda had already adopted the technique of criticising one's opponents by calling them Machiavellian and moreover, this technique had frequently been used against Henry III himself. Matthieu had a ready-made method of criticising Henry III and his followers. The final result is flawed because his historian's concern for the truth and his innate respect for the French monarchy as an institution would not allow him to blacken Henry's character so entirely that the real man - weak, irresolute, yet regretful of his misdeeds and longing for his former glory as a soldier - does not show through from time to time. It is fair to point out that at this time, Matthieu may have been familiar only with Il Principe and was probably genuinely shocked by some of the ideas expressed there. He also seems to have been sincerely appalled at Henry III's action in breaking his oath sworn through the taking of the Sacrament and, despite his respect for the French monarchy, felt he could not keep silent.

In the Histoire des derniers troubles de France (1597) he has begun to use Machiavelli's ideas but without acknowledging them. This deliberate dissociation from Machiavelli's name is due to two causes. Firstly, Matthieu did not want to lay himself open to the charge of amorality or atheism or any of the other traits popularly associated with Machiavelli and his followers. Secondly, he was writing an important history of France and he wanted his readers to take his account seriously as they would probably not have done at that time if he had openly said he was using Machiavelli. By 1605, the hostility towards Machiavelli in France may have died down a little, the cessation of the civil wars having brought with it an ending to the use of Machiavelli's name in political propaganda. In the Histoire de France, Matthieu finds it sufficient merely to excuse his use of Machiavelli on the grounds that the Italian author was a good historian.
Why did Matthieu use Machiavelli so often in his histories? After the death of Henry III, Matthieu's gradual acquaintance with the political figures of his time - Villeroy, Henry IV - may have given him a new insight into the political world and caused him to read Machiavelli with renewed interest.

He also needed Machiavelli because by nature Matthieu was a historian rather than a politician. His task was a careful reconstruction of the past bringing to light the facts and events surrounding the leading political figures with some explanation of the causes for their success or failure. It was for this political analysis, interspersed generally as comments in the margin, within the framework of the traditional historical narrative and drama of personalities that Matthieu needed Machiavelli: for Matthieu's talents lay in the type of character portrayal typical of humanist histories - see his studies of Henry III, Guise, Villeroy and Henry IV. In politics he was a conservative thinker, never questioning the authority of the French monarchy as an institution. Yet he needed to give some analysis of political causes and results which would take into account his readers' new interest in political behaviour. For this, he turned to Machiavelli, using him not to give a complete set of rules by which to govern - laying down guidelines for political behaviour in the future is the task of the political analyst rather than the historian - but to explain various events and mistakes in the past. Matthieu uses Il Principe, the Discorsi and the Istorie Fiorentine selectively (and frequently repetitively) rather than in any comprehensive way.

Matthieu is one of the more important authors in a study of Machiavelli's influence in France, for he had read not only Il Principe but also the Discorsi and the Istorie Fiorentine in the original and was able to distinguish between Machiavelli and the popular legend of Machiavellianism used in political propaganda. Matthieu's unbiased use of Machiavelli in his histories is interesting in that it shows that it was still possible,
despite all the erroneous interpretations and indictments of Machiavelli current in France after the Saint Bartholomew's Day Massacres, for French writers in the latter part of the sixteenth century and the early seventeenth century to use Machiavelli's ideas in a respectful and impartial way.
FOOTNOTES


2. Matthieu, like other contemporary historians hostile to Henry III, exaggerates the influence of the so-called 'mignons' over the King. Henry was obliged to surround himself with young men to whom he gave power and rank, as a bulwark against the influence of the old-established Catholic nobility (see P. Champion, 'La légende des mignons', *BHR*, VI (1939), pp. 494-528). Another contemporary writer, Pierre de L'Estoile, described Henry's reasons for surrounding himself with these youthful advisers,

   Et ce faisait-il, à ce qu'on disait, pour ce que beaucoup de ses sujets, agités du vent de la Ligue ..., tendaient comme à rebellion ... A quoi Sa Majesté désirant pouvoir, s'était avisée de se fortifier desdits nouveaux chevaliers, qu'elle croyait, avec ses mignons et un régiment des gardes qui journellement l'assistaient, lui être prompts et fidèles adjuteurs et defenseurs, advenant quelque émotion.


3. See my introduction pp. lX-lX.

4. Published at Basle, 1573 and attributed to Nicolas Barnaud in the BL Catalogue (701 a 29).


6. R. J. Sealy's article, 'The Palace Academy of Henry III', *BHR*, XL, (1978), pp. 61-83, notes that 1579 was the year in which the meetings of the Palace Academy founded by Henry to increase his learning in subjects such as moral philosophy, came to an end. Citing Davila, Sealy says that in 1579, Henry turned his attention away from philosophy and began to read historians such as Polybius, Tacitus, and Machiavelli. Sealy believes that Henry III was inspired by Pontus de Tyard's plan for the education of a King drawn up in the preface to the *Deux Discours* (1578) where one of the subjects listed is history. However, on the evidence of the Protestant pamphlet cited above, Henry's interest in Machiavelli seems to have been apparent to his subjects even as early as 1573.

7. Ce Prince [the Duke of Anjou] ... qui étudiait principalement la politique, prenait plaisir, même étant Roi, aux entretiens de Corbinelli qui lui lisait tous les jours Polybe, Tacite, souvent les Discours et le Prince de Machiavel ...

   (3r).

8. Published 1588, (BL 806 a 35). This work is a translation of Thomas Walsingham's description of Edward II's relationship with Gaverston transformed into a political pamphlet against Henry III and Espernon by P.H.D.T. (a pseudonym for Jean Boucher). Matthieu was familiar with this work, for he mentions it in the *Histoire des derniers troubles de France*, B. III, 49r-v.

10. In The Image of Henry III in Contemporary French Pamphlets (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1971), S. Haynie examines pamphlets written during Henry's reign and concludes that even as late as 1587, the tone is generally respectful. It was not till the assassination of the Guises that Henry began to be attacked by pamphleteers, mostly members of the Catholic League who had a definite political aim in wishing to discredit Henry III, and with him, Navarre.


12. But for a defence of Henry III's action at Blois, see Estienne Pasquier's Remonstrance aux Francais sur leur sedition et rebellion (1589), quoted below, p. 64.


14. Contemporary political pamphlets also accused Henry of following Machiavelli's advice to the ruler to break his promises when necessary, for example, the author of the Dialogue auquel sont traitées plusieurs choses (see above, note 4), says that Henry was instructed in 'le chapitre dixhuitième du livre du prince de Machiavel, où il traite comme c'est que les princes doyvent garder la foi', (p. 41). See also Le Faux-Visage Descouvert du fin Renard de la France Poitiers, 1589, p. 17, and Coppie de Trois Epistres Catholicues du droict de prendre les armes, et de reconnoistre son Roy legitime, Orleans, 1589, (BN Lb 34 700), p. 49.

15. I shall use the third edition of La Guisiade. In the corresponding 'Argument' of the first edition, the long description of the ruinous policy of breaking promises and its attribution to Machiavelli is omitted. This preface to the first edition seems to have been hastily composed: by the third edition Matthieu has been able to find many more historical examples to support his arguments.

16. In Act III we have already had a hint of Henry's willingness to break his promise if it is to his political advantage to do so, when he describes his breaking the oath of allegiance to Poland in order to be King of France,

\[\text{Je passe sur l'honneur de mon serment Royal,}\\ \text{Et pour te [France] secourir me monstre desloyal.} (p. 23)\]

This passage has been added only in the third edition.

17. In contemporary political pamphlets, it was not unusual to find Espernon connected with instructing Henry III in Machiavellianism. In L'atheisme de Henry de Valois: où est montré le vray but de ses dissimulations et cruautéz (Paris, 1589, BN Lb 34 593) Espernon is placed with Machiavelli as contributing to Henry III's education in kingship. Henry III had good teachers, says the author with irony -
... les bons traits de ceste divine Italienn[e] [Catherine], la
gentille façon de laquelle elle l'a nourry, Machiavel, Belloy,
les diables de Nogaret, pensez qu'outs ces gens de bien ont
employé toute leur industrie et moyens pour le faire maistre
passé: Loys unziesme n'estoit qu'un lourdaut au pris de luy.
(p. 28).

P. de Dieudonné in La Vie et Condition des Politiques et Atheistes de
detemps, Paris, (1589), (BL 8042 a 55 (3)), describes Henry III as
'Italiannisé mais plustost Espernonisé' (p. 15) and indeed Espernon
was seen as possessing an almost diabolical control over Henry III's
soul (see K. Cameron, art. cit., pp. 160-161). Espernon's hold over
Henry III was frequently compared to that of Gaverston over Edward
II of England - see the Histoire Tragique et Memorable, de Pierre de
Gaverston (see above, note 8), the Réponse à l'Antigaverston de
Nogaret (s.l., 1588, attributed by the BL Catalogue to Jean Boucher,
1192 i 1), the Replique à l'Antigaverston, ou respence faiçte à
l'histoire de Gaverston par le Duc d'Espernon (s.l., 1588, BL G
15441 (15)), La Complainte de la France sur les demerites de Jean
Louis de Nogaret, de la Valette Duc D'Espernon (Paris, 1588, BN Ye
18890), Nouvelle Lettre escrîpte à D'Espernon, (s.l., 1588, BN Rép
Ye 4481), and the poem Declaration par laquelle Henry de Valois
confesse estrre Tyran et ennemy de l'Eglise Catholique, Apostolique
et Romaine (s.l.n.d., BN Ye 19557). It is noticeable that all this
propaganda against Espernon centres around the last two years of
Henry's reign. Once again, Matthieu seems to be jumping on the band-
wagon of popular hostility against a contemporary figure.

18. Compare that other tyrant, Nero, and his hesitation in Act IV, sc. iv
of Racine's Britannicus. Like Nero, Henry is hesitant whether to
accept the advice of his 'evil' councillor. Nero also asks his
councillor Narcisse,

   Mais de tout l'univers quel sera le langage?

19. This 'Argument' does not appear in the first edition of La Guisiade.

20. In L'Ant 1-Martyr of 1590 however, Pasquier argues that Henry III was
not obliged to keep his promise to Guise because it was extracted by
force, and he cites Aquinas in favour of breaking forced promises

21. The initials N.N. may have been in current use in the sixteenth
century to designate someone anonymous - they are used by the
anonymous author of the dedicatory epistle to the tragedy Le Triomphe
de la Ligue (Leyden, 1607, BN Yf 6527). This tragedy has been
attributed, wrongly, to Matthieu, see F. A. Yates - Contribution to
the Study of French Social Drama in the Sixteenth Century (University
of London M.A. thesis, 1926, pp. 66-67). The initial N. is used by
René de Lucinge to designate anonymity (see his Œuvres, ed. A.

22. In general, Matthieu's view of Henry III has become much more
favourable by the time he was writing his histories. In the Histoire
des derniers troubles de France, he blames provocation by the League
for Henry's massacre of the Guises and suggests that the League broke
the Edict of Union first by their dealings with foreigners (B. IV,
71v, 79v, and 84v-86r). He praises the Catholic Counter-Reformation
Henry began at court (B. I, 13r).


25. In England, Spain and Italy, Machiavelli was likewise associated with atheism. Reginald Pole early expressed horror at Machiavelli's ideas on religion in Apologia Reginaldi Poli ad Carolum V where he says that Machiavelli's doctrine denies the power of God (Epistolarum Reginaldi Poli et aliorum ad ipsum Pars I-V, Brixiae, 1744, vol. I, p. 142). In Christopher Marlowe's prelogue to the Jew of Malta, the Machiavel figure says, 'I count religion but a childish toy, / And hold there is no sin but ignorance'. In his Admonitioun to the Trewe Lordis (written in 1570), George Buchanan speaks of those 'Machiavel mockers of all religion and virtue'. The Spanish writer, Tommaso Campanella, devotes two chapters (18 and 19) of his Atheismus Triumphatus (1631) to criticising Machiavelli's ideas on religion. P. Ribadeneira wrote a whole book attacking Machiavelli's attitude to religion - Princeps Christianus adversus Nicolaum Machiavellum (1603). In his Difesa della Città di Firenze, et dei Fiorentini. Contra le calunnie et maledicentie de maligni, (Lyons, 1577, BL 662 b 20), P. Minio defends Machiavelli against the charges of atheism: the works of Calvin and Luther are as likely to lead men into atheism as those of Machiavelli, he says (pp. 149-154). Minio's work is essentially an attack on Gentillet's statement that all Florentines are atheists.

26. See my chapter on D'Aubigné, pp.26-8, for a fuller examination of the question of Providence in relation to Machiavelli.

27. The Reformer, Nicolas Barnaud, agrees with Machiavelli that the Catholic Church has been responsible for keeping Italy divided - Le Cabinet du Roy de France (Paris, 1581, BL C 125 aa 1, p. 252). In Le Mystère d'iniquité, c'est à dire, l'histoire de la Papauté, (Saumur, 1611, BL 699 m 15, p. 567), Mornay agrees with the Istorie Fiorentine's analysis of the Popes' greed for temporal power. In the apocryphal A True Copy of a Letter written by N. Machiavill, in defence of himself and his religion (London, 1691, BL 702 e 15, pp. 16-30), 'Machiavelli' denies the charge of atheism, saying that he intended merely to criticise the corruption of the Roman Catholic Church.

28. In L'Asino d'oro, Machiavelli says,

Creder che senza te per te contrasti
Dio standoti otioso e ginocchioni
Ha molti regni e molti stati guasti.


30. Ribadeneira attacks Machiavelli's praise of paganism (op. cit., B. II, ch. 34).

31. See, for example, Jacques-Auguste de Thou's remark about Corbinelli, 'l'on ne savoit pas de quelle religion estoit Corbinel, c'estoit une religion politique, à la florentine'. 
32. See F. A. Yates, *French Academies of the Sixteenth Century* (London, 1947, passim) for a description of the non-violent religious revival initiated by Henry III as a way of appealing to the heretics through works of charity and exhibitions of penitence without resorting to the methods of the Inquisition or to war.


34. Paris, 1589, BL C 33 a 33 (1). An illustration from this pamphlet is reproduced in K. Cameron's *Aspects of the Satirical Iconography of Henri de Valois* (ed. cit.), pp. 121-124. For other prints emphasising Henry's interest in sorcery, see plates 13, 14, 17, 19, 20.

35. Paris, 1589, BL 610 c 21 (1), attributed to Jean Boucher.

36. s.l., 1589, BL 1193 h 27 (1), p. 6.


38. Compare another League pamphlet, *Pasasant escrivant à son amy des nouvelles de la cour* -

On dit que frère Henry ce n'est qu'un Sodomite,
Ravisseeur de Nonains et Machiaveliste,
(p. 10 in *Le Testament de Henry de Valois, Recommandé à son amy Jean d'Espernon*, s.l., 1589, BL 8042 a 55 (2)).


40. Op. cit., p. 55. Claude de Rubys seems to have been fond of accusing his opponents of Machiavellianism. In his *Responce à l'Anti-Espagnol*, Lyons, 1590, EN Lb35 315, it is Henry of Navarre who is accused of using Machiavellian policies (p. 38).

41. p. 15. Published Paris, 1589, (BN Lb34 593). See also *Advis aux Princes, Seigneurs, Gentilhommes, et autres Catholiques de France* (Paris, 1589, BL 1192 g 15) where Henry's alliance with Navarre is criticised -

... prenez garde comment par ses industries et finesses, le tyran Machiaveliste vous embarque peu à peu avec les Calvinistes, et autres Hereticques de ce Royaume.
(pp. 49-50. See also p. 24).

42. The anonymous author of the pamphlet *Le Dispositif, avec advertissement et advi à Messieurs les deputez des estats generaux* (no place, 1588, EN Lb34 528) specifically warns the deputies to oppose any anti-Christian ideas put forward by the King at Blois under Machiavelli's influence (p. 5) and says that Henry III's attitude to religion has been corrupted by his Machiavellian advisers (p. 9). Simon Belyard also draws on this propaganda in *Le Guysien*. In Act III, Espernon is made to say,
Sainteté, Pieté, Foy, Justice, Clemence
Doivent estre en un Roy sans plus en apparence;
Il ne luy est besoin que le nom en avoir,
Pour tenir par douceur le peuple en son devoir.
(p. 35).

In a note, Belyard remarks that this is a 'Precepte abominable de l'Atheiste Machiavel pour les Roys contre le peuple'. In Act V, Henry is called 'l'Atheiste perfide', (p. 59).

43. For example, Le Martyre des Deux Freres (ed. cit.) where Henry is described as deciding 'en la maxime de son bon pedagogue Machiavel, que pour un temps il faut prendre l'habit de regnard, et puis apres l'habit de Lyon', (p. 9). The author of the League pamphlet Le Faux-Visahe descouvert du fin Renard de la France (Poitiers, 1589, BN Lb 34 611) includes in his attack on Henry III a popular poem comparing his behaviour to that of a fox and a lion—

Ce meurtrier de Princes a joué deux rolets
Comme un farceur boufon sur l'echafaut de France,
Soubs la peau du Renard, avec belle apparence,
Portant à son costé de ces gros chapellets:
Et un grand manteau gris flotant sur ses jarets
Et la barbe razée: ayant changé de chance,
Soubs le cuir du Lyon bousouflé de vengence,
S'enivre du beau sang de deux Princes immortels.
(p. 19).

Earlier, Machiavelli has been attacked by name and Henry III denounced as one of his followers. The fox and lion imagery in connection with Henry III appears also in the pamphlet Les Vrais Pieges et moyens pour atraper ce fau Heretique et cauteleux grison, Henry de Valois (Paris, s.d., EL 1193 h 27 (10), p. 15) and in the poems Recepte pour la toux du Regnard de la France (Paris, 1589. Reprinted in Recueil des Poesies Francais des XV et XVI siecles, ed. Montaiglon and Rothschild, Paris, 1855-78, vol. 9, p. 238) and La Detestation des Cruautez sanguinaires et abominables de Henry Devalé (Paris, 1589, BN Rés Ye 3848, p. 5). The use of the fox and lion to symbolize certain qualities did not originate with Machiavelli. In B. I of De Officiis, for example, Cicero uses the fox and the lion to illustrate the way in which injury is perpetrated (see The Discourses of Niccolò Machiavelli, ed. L. J. Walker, London, 1950, vol. II, pp. 277-278). See also note 60 below for the fox and lion in Plutarch. However, unlike previous authors, Machiavelli approves of the use of a fox-like cunning and a lion-like force — and his approval was endorsed by at least one sixteenth century French author, Guillaume de La Perrière in his emblem book Le theatre des bons engins (Paris, 1539, BL C 29 d 4, Diiir).

44. Matthieu was well aware of the uses to which Machiavelli's name was put in religious propaganda. In the Histoire des derniers troubles de France he quotes from a popular pamphlet—

Pour l'Evangil' Machiavel tenir,
De l'autre monde en rien se souvenir,
Sont les couleurs du masqué Politique.
(B. I, 17v).

45. See Discorsi I, 37; II, 19; III, 16, 25. See my chapter on D'Aubigné for a fuller discussion of this topic.
46. The first edition has—

_user de grands travaux, et peu de recompense._

47. The author of _Les Meurs, Humeurs et Comportemens de Henry de Valois_ (Paris, 1589, attributed in the BL Catalogue to André de Rossant, 3900 a 60) says of Henry III,

... il a imposé ... selon la leçon mesme de son Machiavel, tailles sur tailles, gabelles sur gabelles ...

(p. 22).

The author of the _Remonstrance très humble au Roy de France et de Pologne, Henri III, s.l., (1588)_ warns Henry that

Ceux-la vous trompent grandement, Sire, qui vous instruisent aux conseils de cest ignorant atheiste Machiavel et vous font croire que tenant les biens de vos subjects en vos mains par la vendition de si grand nombre d'offices et de rentes constituées, il vous sera facile de contenir vos subjects.

(quoted by A. M. Battista, art. _cit._, p. 421, note 20).

48. In _La Guisiade_, Catherine de' Medici is described as 'non seulement Italienne de nation, et qui plus est, Florentine, accorte au maniment de ses affaires', (p. 8). See my chapter on D'Aubigne for a fuller discussion of anti-Italian propaganda in France and its link with Machiavelli.

49. In his _Ricordi_ (nos. 104, 105), Guicciardini advocates the use of dissimulation and argues that even if one has a reputation for dissimulation, there will always be someone ready to believe your lies (see also nos. 132, 133) in F. Guicciardini: _Selected Writings_, ed. C. Grayson, Oxford, 1965.

50. In _Le Vray Resveille-Hatin des Calvinistes_ (Paris, 1575, BL 700 c 2 (1)), Arnaud Sorbin reminds Henry III,

_Il te fault aussi penser, ô Roy, comment Dieu est amateur de vérité. Si Machiavel, et ses sectateurs ... avaient pensé ceste question, et sa response, malaisément pourroient ils louer les mensonges, dissimulations et feintises, et autres semblables tours, dont ils taschent d'empoisonner les ames genereuses des bons Princes, pour les faire degenerer._

(B. IV, 128v).

The author (probably Mornay) of _Double d'une lettre envoyée à un certain personage contenante le discours de ce qui se passa au Cabinet du Roy de Navarre_ (Frankfurt, 1585, BL G 15441) says that a prince should never dissimulate—

Et si j'avois à discourir ce point contre Machiavel, je luy prouverois fort aisément que la plus seure finesse que puisse pratiquer un Prince, est de ne n'user jamais de finesse, d'aller rondement en besongne, et avoir le cueur entier devant Dieu, et devant les hommes.

(p. 54)

Others who attack Machiavelli's views on dissimulation are—

François de Gravelle in _Politiques Royales_ (Lyons, 1596, p. 123, BN* E 3289), Claude de Rubys in _Responce à l'Anti-Espagnol_ (Lyons, 1590,

51. Le Theatre de France, auquel est contenu la resolution sur chacun doubté, qui a retenu la Noblesse de se joindre à l'Union Catholique (Paris, 1589, 12v, BN Lb34 707).

52. Ed. cit., p. 112.

53. These lines are not found in the first edition.

54. See Belyard's portrayal of Espernon encouraging Henry in dissimulation in Le Guysien (quoted above note 42).

55. In La Guisiade Act IV, Henry III had been criticized for following Louis XI's policy of dissimulation (see p.51). See pp.73 – 75 of this chapter for the link often made by French writers between Machiavelli and Louis XI.

56. For a discussion of the repulsion/attraction phenomenon as regards attitudes to Machiavelli in France, see p.19 of the introduction to this thesis.

57. This is the edition in the BL (3900 a 60). The copy in the BN is entitled La Contrepoison contre les artifices et inventions des Politiques et autres ennemis de la Religion Catholique (Paris, 1589, BN Lb34 716). Both bear the initials P.M. and it is reasonable to attribute them to Matthieu (see p.34 of this chapter).

58. Published Lyons, 1589, BN Lb34 584.

59. It was quite usual in popular political pamphlets of the time to depict Francis I as the opposite of the Machiavellian ruler in relation to the subject of keeping one's promises. In particular, Francis I's promise to allow his political rival, Charles V, free passage through France is often cited. René de Lucinge contrasts the example of Francis I keeping his promise to Charles V with Machiavelli's advice on breaking promises (De la Naissance, Duree et Cheute des Estats, Paris, 1588, (BL 8007 aaa 25) 44v–45r. See also C. Ventura, Tresor Politique (transl. N. du Fossé, Paris, 1611, BL C 80 a 6, ch. 5), and Matthieu's own Discours sur le sujet de ceste Tragedie (in La Guisiade, B r-v) for the topic of Francis I keeping his promise to Charles V.

Innocent Gentillet cites Francis I's attitude to promises with approval in his criticism of Machiavelli (Discours contre N. Machiavel, ed. cit., Part III, Maxime XXI). The author of Le bon François, ou de la Foy des Gaulois (Paris, 1589, BL 3900 aa (4) 47 (pp. 54–55)) sees Francis I's refusal to dissimulate as something typically French. The author of the pamphlet Les Causes qui ont contraint les Catholiques à prendre les armes (Paris, 1587) links the policy of breaking promises to one's subjects with breaking promises made to God.

Quiconque usera de la foy pour tromper son peuple, comme ont fait les petits enfans avec des osselets, selon le pernicieux conseil de Machiavel, il usera de la Religion selon qu'il verra plus expedient pour son estat, n'en ayant point d'affectionnée, sinon qu'elle est utile. Car ce sont deux preceptes sortis de mesme escole, deux regles generalles en matiere d'estat forgees en mesme boutique. Mais ... ce grand Roy François duquel il
[Henry III] est avorton, avoir un Apophthegme fort familier, bien contraire à ces deux maximes de Machiavel. Quand la foy seroit bannie du monde, disoit-il ordinairement, si se devroit elle trouver entre les Princes. Foy de Prince estoit son plus grand serment, pource qu'il connoissoit que la foy seule entre­tient la société civile: estant bannie, les Royaumes ne sont que brigandages.

(p. 8).

The only exception I have found to this picture of Francis I is in Gabriel Naudé's Considérations politiques sur les Coups d'Etat (1679) where he gives the example of Francis I allowing the Turks to enter Italy as an illustration of Machiavellianism in politics.

60. Lysander was often depicted by Renaissance writers as a Machiavellian figure 'avant la lettre*. They drew their knowledge of his life largely from Plutarch's Life of Lysander where he is described as approving of dissimulation in terms surprisingly similar to Il Principe ch. 18 -

Those who demanded that the descendants of Heracles should not wage war by deceit he held up to ridicule, saying that 'where the lion's skin will not reach, it must be patched out with the fox's'.


Lysander is quoting Hercules himself here - see Renault Dorleans, Les Observations de diverses choses (Vennes, 1597, BL 1058 h 2, p. 50). There was a French proverb derived from these words: 'Il faut coudre la peau du renard à celle du lion' (quoted in Remonstrance aux Seigneurs in Mémoires de l'Estat de France sous Charles IX, Middelbourg, 1578, attributed S. Goulart, BL 283 b 7-9, 51v).

Plutarch also mentions that Lysander feigned religious zeal and was indifferent to the obligations of promises -

There is a saying also, recorded by Androclides, which makes him guilty of great indifference to the obligations of an oath. His recommendation, according to this account, was to 'cheat boys with dice, and men with oaths', an imitation of Polycrates of Samos, not very honourable to a lawful commander, to take example, namely, from a tyrant, nor in character with Laconian usages, to treat gods as ill as enemies, or, indeed, even more injuriously; since he who overreaches by an oath admits that he fears his enemy while he despises his God.

(op. cit., para. VIII).

Not surprisingly, Renaissance writers chose Lysander as a ruler exemplifying Machiavellian traits. In Le Theatre de France, the Catholic Leaguer, Charles de Boss, says that loyal Catholics had expected Henry III to keep his promise to Guise at Blois -

Mais ils ont esté bien trompez: ils n'estoient pas instruits en l'escholle de Machiavel, qui enseigne un prince de promettre effrontement tout ce que luy sera demandé par ceux qui seront les plus forts, et au bout de la carrière n'en rien tenir. Ils ne sçavoient pas que la race de Lysander n'estoit faillie, qui disoit qu'il faalloit tromper les enfans avec des oiselets, et les hommes avec les sermens: et que quand la peau du lion ne peut suffire, il y faut coudre celle du renard.

(ed. cit., 7v-8r).
The link between Machiavelli and Plutarch's Lysander is clearly established in this passage.

See also François de Gravelle's Les Politiques Royales (Lyons, 1596, ch. 20, p. 229) where Lysander is cited as an example of a ruler who did not keep his promises and is linked with Machiavelli; Le Miroir des François (ed. cit., p. 160) where Lysander is described as a tyrant and dissimulator; and Princeps Christianus adversus Nicolaum Machiavellum caeteros; huius temporis Politicos (1603, B. II, ch. 4) where Ribadeneira says,

Deinde in medium proferunt dictum illud Lysandri Lacedaemoniorum Ducis, (qui etiam ex iis Politicis fuit, qui iustitiam utilitate metiuntur) 'Quòd leonis pellis attingere non potest, Principi assuendam vulpinam*. Quòd eius consilium iterat frequenter et valorè laudat Machiavellus.

(p. 287).

An exception is Osorio in L'Instruction et Nourriture des Princes (Paris, 1583, Book I) where Lysander's views on broken promises are approved of.

Most of the writers who knew Lysander's words about the fox and the lion were also familiar with Machiavelli's works, and they frequently appear to be using Lysander's name as a front for an attack on Machiavellian methods of governing as a way of avoiding naming the Italian author whose works were on the Papal Index. For example, A. Sorbin, Le Vray Resveille-Matin des Calvinistes (ed. cit., B. III, p. 68), La Noue, Discours Politiques et Militaires (ed. cit., 'Troisieme Discours', p. 98), and Montaigne, Essais (ed. cit., I, 5, p. 60).

61. Published at Lyons, 1594-95. I have used the 1597 edition also published at Lyons (BL 1059 b II). The 1604 edition (BL 1059 b 13) contains a fifth book but I have found no traces of Machiavelli's influence in this work.

62. He was to translate a work by Boccaccio and in his later histories he actually quotes from Machiavelli in Italian, along with other Italian authors such as Guicciardini, Tasso, Contarini and Aretino. His wife was, as we have seen, of Florentine extraction and Matthieu may have been able to speak, as well as read, Italian.

63. Discours contre N. Machiavel (ed. cit.) Part III, Maxime XXXIII. This popular interpretation of Machiavelli's views is found in Ventura's Tresor Politique (ed. cit.) ch. 7, p. 413. See however the Discours véritable (p. 6) where Matthieu accuses the Machiavellian Governor of Lyons of building fortresses to keep the inhabitants of Lyons under control. Here indeed, Matthieu appears to be exploiting the popular view of Machiavelli as a supporter of fortresses.

64. Published Paris, 1582, BL 1059 b 20 (2). N. Montand is possibly a pseudonym for N. Barnaud.

65. Discorsi III, 12 is entitled 'uno capitano prudente debbe imporre ogni necessità di combattere a' suoi soldati, e a quegli degli inimici tòrla'. See my chapter on La Jesse, pp. 195-6.

66. Quando o fame o altra naturale necessità o umana passione ha condotto il nimico tuo ad una ultima disperazione, e, cacciato da quella, venga a combattere teco, dei starti dentro a' tuoi alloggiamenti e, quanto è in tuo potere, fuggire la zuffa. (Dell' Arte Della Guerra, ed. P. Pieri, Rome, 1937, p. 163).
67. See also Il Principe ch. 21; Discorsi II, 15, 19, 22, 23; III, 40, for further warnings of the dangers of half measures in politics.

68. For a probable echo of Machiavelli in another French writer, see Saint Clouaud, tragédie by Jean Heudon (Rouen, 1606, BL 163 b 23) Act III where Childebert says,

Tout bon ou tout meschant doit estre un Prince sage.
(p. 38).

Gentillet had pointed out Machiavelli's avoidance of the middle way in Discours contre N. Machiavel (ed. cit.), Part III, Maxime XXVIII.


70. See Histoire de France (Paris, 1631), B. VIII where the same comment is repeated (p. 535) and the Histoire de Louys XI B. XI, p. 563 where the same idea is found though not attributed to any specific source.

71. See above note 60.

72. Italian commentaries on Tacitus were often disguised commentaries on Machiavelli — see Toffanin (G), Machiavelli e il 'Tacitismo' (Padua, 1921, passim). A seventeenth century author, Louis Machon, attempted to make Machiavelli 'respectable' by collating his views with those of classical and Biblical writers — see K. T. Butler, 'Louis Machon's "Apologie pour Machiavelle" 1643 and 1668', Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, III, (1940), pp. 208-227.

73. This comment is repeated word for word in the Histoire de France (1631) B. VIII, p. 593.

74. See also Discorsi III, 27 entitled

'Come e' si ha ad unire una città divisa, e come e' non è vera quella opinione che a tenere le città bisogni tenerle divise'.

75. See my chapter on D'Aubigné for a fuller discussion of this subject.

76. I have used the edition in the BL C 38 b 24.

77. Exactly the same passage is found in the Histoire de France, des choses memorables advenues aux provinces estranges durant sept annees de Paix (1608), p. 395.

In his preface To the Reader in the English translation of The Florentine History (London, 1595, (BL 592 h 20)), Thomas Bedingfield distinguishes between this book and Machiavelli's other works. He says that he was reluctant to do this translation

and loother it should be published, for that the Author (in some other his works) hath not (as is thought) written with due respect to pietie. Howsoever that be, in this Booke (being a meere relation of the Florentines fortune, when they were governed Aristocraticallie) appeareth not any thing unfit to be knowne, or that may receive evill construction. (unpaginated).

Similarly, Matthieu may have felt that the Istorie Fiorentine was worthy of exemption from the general prejudice against Machiavelli's works.

79. I have used the copy in the BL (1200 a 6 and 7).

80. Jean de La Taille also uses this passage from Machiavelli (see my chapter on that author p.45[1]).

81. This passage is borrowed also in the Histoire de France (1631), p. 645.

82. This passage is also found in the Histoire de France (1631), p. 656.

83. I have used the edition in the BL C 79 h 8.

84. He is described as the first King 'd'avoir mis les Rois de France hors de Page' (A v), that is, to make their position absolute.

85. The President of the Paris 'Parlement', Christofle de Thou, quoted these words of Louis XI in his praise of Charles IX after the Saint Bartholomew's Day Massacres - see Response de Zacharie Furestersus in Mémoires de l'Estat de France sous Charles IX (ed. cit., vol. II, 75r) and the Reveille Matin, op. cit., p. 194. See also Montaigne, Essais, II, 17. Matthieu cites De Thou's words in the Histoire de France (1631) B. VI, p. 346.


87. Published Orleans, 1576, (BL 285 e 11), p. 70.


90. See L'Atheisme de Henry de Valoys (Paris, 1589) where the author says that Henry III with the help of Machiavelli's theories, was able to surpass Louis XI in wickedness (cited above in note 17).

91. For more Machiavellianism 'avant la lettre' see Henri Estienne's Deux Dialogues du Nouveau Langage François Italianizé (first published Paris, 1578 and reprinted 1883) where he accuses Plotinus, the courtier who advised Ptolemy to have Pompey murdered, of acting in a Machiavellian way -

Si Machiavel eust vescu devant Plotin, je dirois que Plotin auroit esté Machiaveliste, quant aux maximes qu'il propose...

(p. 253).
92. In Book IX, p. 364, he says that Princes who are not Christians (that is, the Turks) cannot be expected to keep their promises. He frequently laments the fact that men cannot be relied upon to keep their promises (for example, B. III, p. 120 and B. V, p. 201).

93. This is found in Discorsi II, 10:

Dico pertanto non l’oro, come grida la comune opinione, essere il nervo della guerra, ma i buoni soldati.

(p. 304).

See also the Pompé Funebre (1589) for another echo of Machiavelli when Matthieu says of Guise,

Et sur tout je le prise d’avoir mené tant de memorables expeditions non par la force de l’or ains par le fer et la vaillance, contre ces pinsemailles, qui vont criant, que le nerf de la guerre est l’argent.

(p. 10).

Generally, however, Matthieu follows the traditional view on this subject - that 'les armes ne s’entretiennent sans argent', (Aelius Sehinus, p. 288, and see also the Remarques d’Estat et d’Histoire p. 363 and the Histoire des derniers troubles de France, B. IV, 24r). In La Guisiade Act III, Henry III tells the General Estates at Blois that

L’argent est l’instrument et le nerf de la guerre,
Il ne faut l’espargner pour deffendre sa terre:
On ne peut guerroyer sans armes, et sans argent,
Les armes ne sont rien, ny les gens sans argent.

(p. 46).

It is likely that Henry did say something like this since he needed money for the war against the Reformers he had just promised to undertake (see the Histoire des derniers troubles de France B. IV, 65r where he is reported as saying almost the same thing).

94. See the chapter on Jean de La Taille p.109 for his use of this theme.

95. See the chapter on La Jessee, pp.190-1.

96. From Discorsi II, 12. Montaigne deals with this topic in the Essais B. I, 47 where he is criticising Machiavelli for giving rigid solutions to every problem.

97. See the Histoire de France (1631), tome II, p. 165. I have used the edition in the BL published at Rouen in 1626 (BL 587 a 22).

98. For a much closer echo of Machiavelli’s views on this subject, see my chapter on Ronsard p.511.

99. It is probable that Villeroy was familiar with Machiavelli - certainly if he read Matthieu's histories, he could not have failed to pick up references to the Italian author in them, and as a statesman, it is likely that he would be interested in Machiavelli independently of Matthieu. In his correspondance with Villeroy, Henry III uses Machiavellian precepts, language and imagery, though without mentioning Machiavelli by name (see the article by E. H. Dickerman above, note 9).
100. It was published at Paris, 1631, BL 188 e 6 and 7.

101. Again, Matthieu displays a dual attitude to broken promises, for a little earlier he has said that 'les traitez de force et de contrainte n'obligerent point' (B. I, p. 12).

102. This is identical to the passage from the *Histoire des derniers troubles de France* quoted above, p. 70.

103. In *Les Considerations politiques sur les Coups d'Estat* (Paris, 1679, BL 522 a 20), Gabriel Maude uses many of Machiavelli's ideas. In particular he gives five ways of using religion to keep one's subjects under control. All five methods derive from Machiavelli's writings. The first one is that a ruler should pretend to be inspired by the gods and he cites the same passage from the *Discorsi* used by Matthieu —

   Le peuple de Florence n'est pas beste, auquel neanmoins F. Hierôme Savanarole a bien fait croire qu'il parloit à Dieu.  
   (p. 262).

104. See *Histoire de France* (1608), B. III, p. 534 where the same passage from Machiavelli is cited.

105. See the chapter on Pont-Aymery p. 372.

106. See the *Histoire de Louys XI* B. X, p. 437.

107. See the *Histoire de France* (1608), B. V, p. 226.

108. See the *Histoire de France* (1608), B. VII, p. 693.

109. See the *Histoire de France* (1608), B. VII, p. 777.
Any account of the life of Estienne Jodelle must be indebted to Enea Balmas's detailed biography, *Un poeta del Rinascimento francese.* Estienne Jodelle. La sua vita. Il suo tempo. My study aims merely to give a brief summary of the salient events and to sketch out the personality of Jodelle as revealed in his poetry. For a fuller account, I refer the reader to Balmas's work.¹

Jodelle was born around 1532 in Paris, the only one of the Pleiade poets to be actually born in the capital.² He belonged to a rich bourgeois family of lawyers and merchants, but the death of his father some time between 1532 and 1535 robbed the family of financial support with the result that Jodelle was to be beset by debts till the end of his life.

During the early period of his life, Jodelle seems to have had some sympathy for the Reformers. He wrote two poems to Theodore Beza: a sonnet in praise of Beza's translation of the Psalms which had been published in 1551 and an epigram on Beza's illness.³ But the extent of Jodelle's commitment to the Reformation has perhaps been exaggerated.⁴ His 'Protestant' poetry amounts only to the two poems to Beza (which may owe their existence to a friendship formed between the two before Beza left for Geneva in 1548), a satirical couplet, and a sonnet and a couplet criticising corruption at Rome in a style reminiscent of Catholic authors such as Joachim Du Bellay and Ronsard. It is true that at one point Jodelle mentions a visit to Geneva but he takes the opportunity to give a satirical portrait of the Genevans very much in the style of Du Bellay's *Regrets,* no. 136. Indeed, one is inclined to believe that Jodelle's sonnet (*Œuvres complètes ed. cit.,* tome I, no. xxix, p. 281) may have been inspired more by the wish to rival Du Bellay than by any actual event (though previous historians have
taken this poem at face value).⁵

So there are only a very few extant Protestant poems by Jodelle and these show little approval of the doctrines of the Reformers. Possibly, Jodelle never became a Reformer but was merely excited by their ideas for a while, as indeed were other Catholics in this early period.⁶ An intellectual interest in a new movement is not the same as actually adopting its doctrines and way of life, but Jodelle may have later emphasised the extent of his early involvement with the Reformation in order to set himself up as an authority on it, thereby adding more weight to his criticisms.⁷

Jodelle spent most of 1551 in Italy, probably visiting Turin, Rome and Venice.⁸ On his way back, he stayed for a while in Lyons where he made various literary acquaintances such as Guillaume Guérout, Guillaume Des Autelz and Claude Colet. He left Lyons for Paris in the first few months of 1552. By this time, he had already established a certain reputation as a writer for he is celebrated by Guérout in his long poem Au seigneur de Lymodin Parisien excellent Poëte, written in 1552.

During this period, Jodelle frequented the literary circles of the 'marotiques.'⁹ The prologue to his comedy, L'Eugène, written and performed in 1552, is a manifesto against the Pleiade conception of poetry and an affirmation of his desire for a national theatre, freed from imitation of the ancients.¹⁰ L'Eugène is interesting, not only because it is the first French comedy, but also because even in the midst of the laughter, the more sombre side of Jodelle's nature is revealed. In Act IV the main characters reach a depth of despair unfitting for comedy and the whole play paints a gloomy picture of a society where cynicism reigns in love and religion and the simple-minded are manipulated by the unscrupulous. Even in the young hero, Florimond, we find little to admire. L'Eugène
seems to substantiate Jodelle's view that,

... le monde entier aujourd'hui ne vaut rien.  

In February and March 1553, Jodelle created a landmark in the history of French literature with the two performances of his tragedy Cléopâtre Captive. The first performance took place at the Hôtel de Rheims in the presence of the King to mark the celebration of the capture of Metz by Francis of Guise. The second took place in Boncourt college. Jodelle received five hundred crowns from the King for his play and now stepped on board the Pleïade's ship, having accomplished one of the items on the Pleïade programme for reviving French literature, namely the creation of a French tragedy.

Some days after the performance of Cléopâtre Captive, Ronsard and other poets held the famous 'fête d'Arcueil' during which, for amusement, a ram was offered to Jodelle as the new Sophocles. From this date until 1558 was the period when Jodelle's reputation was at its height. Scévole de Sainte-Marthe, probably a personal friend of Jodelle, explains why in his Eloge des Hommes Illustres,

Estienne Jodelle, Esprit ardent et vigoureux, fut le premier des Français qui commença d'enrichir nostre langue du Poëme Tragique. Et quoy que son stile fust un peu rude, et qu'il n'eust pas toutes les graces et toutes les clartez que l'on eust peu desirer; si est-ce que la nouveauté de l'ouvrage pleût infiniment au monde ... toute la France fut bien-tost remplie du bruict de son nom.

This early success put Jodelle in the unfortunate position of feeling obliged to live up to his reputation for the rest of his life. Encouraged by his triumph, Jodelle's ambitions became overweening: he thought he could be a great poet, a great soldier, an architect. Contemporaries frequently remarked on his pride. Even his sixteenth century editor, Charles de La Mothe, who lavishes such high praise on his works, leaves us an impression of Jodelle's aloof and complex character,

Mais mesprisant philosophiquement toutes choses externes,
ne fut cognu, recherché, ny ainsé que maugré luy, et se fia trop en sa disposition et en sa jeunesse.\textsuperscript{15}

La Mothe's picture of Jodelle as a careless poet, extremely talented but disdainful of popularity even to the extent of not troubling to revise his work for publication was generally accepted by historians till recently.\textsuperscript{16} However, although Jodelle did not publish much of his work, the recent edition by Balsas reveals that Jodelle reworked and polished several of his poems, which rather destroys the image of Jodelle as a careless or negligent writer.\textsuperscript{17} His refusal to submit to the masses' tastes in literature (see \textit{Ode à M. le Comte de Dammartin}, \textit{Oeuvres complètes} \textit{ed. cit.}, tome I, p. 134) discouraged Jodelle from publishing his poetry but not from polishing it and perfecting it in secret. His literary ideals (or pride, as it was seen by his contemporaries) left him constantly short of money. In the \textit{Gavetêz} (1554), Olivier de Magny urges Jodelle to publish some of his poems.\textsuperscript{18} By 1555, he was heavily in debt and Jean-Antoine de Baïf in \textit{Les Muses} deplores the fact that Jodelle no longer had a patron. His debts were so great at the end of his life that the family property at Liroodin had to be sold to cover them.

In February 1558, Jodelle was called upon to organise a theatrical spectacle to be performed in the presence of the King and the Duke of Guise to celebrate the latter's recapture of Calais. The celebrations were to take place on the 17th of February but, Jodelle says, he was given only four days' notice. There is indeed an impression of haste in the description of the preparations he has left us, entitled \textit{Le Recueil des Inscriptions, Figures, Devises et Masquarades ordonnées en l'hostel de ville à Paris le jeudi 17 de février 1558}. In this work, he complains that the Parisian municipality was unwilling to spend the necessary amount of money and that he had to undertake more than he had expected (\textit{Oeuvres}...
Due to lack of preparation, the two mascarades organised by Jodelle were an absolute fiasco: the actors forgot their lines and the scenery was inadequate. He had hoped to consolidate his reputation through organising this festivity; instead, he found himself ridiculed. He was even threatened with imprisonment arising indirectly out of the episode. He was obliged to leave court and take refuge with his patron Philippe de Boulainvilliers, Comte de Dammartin. His Ode (mentioned above, p.103) probably reflects his feelings at this time, revealing as it does his gratitude to his protector and asserting his refusal to compromise in order to please the masses.

Later in the year, he published Le Recueil des Inscriptions in order to justify himself. This work reveals his hurt pride and sensitivity over the affair which turned into bitterness against his contemporaries whom he accuses of ingratitude. His artistic temperament exaggerates the episode as the disaster takes on greater dimensions in his imagination. He talks of burning his works (Oeuvres complètes ed. cit., pp. 65-66) and from time to time he breaks out into self-pity (op. cit., pp. 75-76, 101-102). It is the same oversensitivity which led Jodelle to accuse his critics of jealousy (op. cit., pp. 63-64, p. 76). There is a sense of frustration in this work and a feeling that anything he turns his hand to, fails. The Recueil also reveals his vanity which in the end is perhaps only consciousness of his worth as an artist. He speaks of the many works he has written and which have remained unpublished,

lesquels si je ne pensois avoir bien faits, et si je ne pensois qu'ils fussent aucunement dignes de la lecture des grands seigneurs je les brulerois et eus et mes livres.

It was perhaps his over-ambitious plans for the entertainment which led to disaster: a more moderate spectacle may have had a greater chance of success.
In this most revealing of works, the Recueil, it is Jodelle's artistic temperament which strikes us: in Jodelle's case this is characterised by his sensitivity (which leads him into unwarranted depths of despair), his self-absorption (so that he is unable to place the Hôtel de Ville episode in its proper context), his self-pity, his vanity, his inability to laugh at himself and his vague aspirations for success coupled with his impatience over the practical details of the festivities.

During his exile from court, Jodelle nevertheless managed to sustain his literary friendships: Jacques Grévin, Guillaume Des Autelz and Ronsard all dedicated poems to him in the period 1559-1563. In 1563, Jodelle celebrated in poetry the peace of Amboise and the conquest of Le Havre, and praised Catherine de' Medici's policy of reconciliation. Around the beginning of 1564, he was condemned to death, for what reason we do not know. The threat of death may possibly account for Jodelle's sudden reversal from praise for a tolerant royal policy in 1563 to hostile criticism of the Reformers in 1567. The necessity of ingratiating himself with the King in order to secure a reprieve could explain his apparent change in attitude towards the Reformers. Thus in the series of sonnets Contre les Ministres de la Nouvelle Opinion, he accuses the Reformers of rebellion and treason, and laments that he is unable to fight for the King being a 'prisonnier dans un lict.'

In 1568, he wrote two distasteful poems criticising Michel de L'Hospital's tolerant policy (Satire contre le Chancelier de l'Hôpital and In Michaelem Hospitalium Franciae Cnuncellarium) and a series of poems urging the King to use force against the Reformers and praising the harsh measures of the edict of Longjumeau (28 September, 1568). Rather than deducing that Jodelle had become a militant Catholic by this time, these poems may be explained by Jodelle's urgent need of the King's protection. Defence of an opinion is not, after all, the same as sincere religious
belief. E. Balmas divides Jodelle's religious attitudes into three main phases: the early period of his life during which Balmas believes Jodelle went so far as to adopt the Reformed faith for a time, an anti-religious period which according to Balmas lasted till the outbreak of the civil wars in 1562 whereupon Balmas believes that Jodelle became a militant Catholic. In view of the sceptical attitude towards religion displayed in Didon se sacrifiant, Balmas dates the composition of that tragedy around 1560 (Un poeta ed. cit., pp. 345-346). However, a close examination of Jodelle's work leads one to doubt whether he did in fact possess any genuine faith and to conclude that the sceptical attitude in Didon could fit in with any period of Jodelle's life. We have seen (p.101, above) that he may never actually have adopted the Reformed faith: his emphasis on the necessity of removing corruption within the Catholic Church was endorsed by many writers in the sixteenth century, including the Catholics themselves. Fanaticism is often closer to scepticism than to genuine faith. The extremity and exaggeration of his later polemic against the Reformers appear to arise less out of personal conviction than out of a need to ingratiate himself at court.

Indeed, several of Jodelle's own contemporaries remark on his lack of religious belief. In the Discours contre N. Machiavel Part II, Maxime i, Gentillet discusses Il Principe chapter 18 under the heading, 'Un Prince sur toutes choses doit appeter d'estre estimé devot, bien qu'il ne le soit pas.' Gentillet speaks of 'ceste Atheiste Machiavel' and gives examples of impiety which has been punished by God,

L'on pourroit alleguer infinis exemples des jugemens et vengeances de Dieu exercées contre les Atheistes, contempleurs de Dieu, et de toute Religion, voire mesmes de nostre temps, comme du Poëte tragique Jodelle, qui fit une fin vrayement tragique: car ayant gourmandé et mangé son patrimoine, comme un Epicurien, il mourut de faim miserablement.28

Other references to Jodelle's irreligion in the sixteenth century include the passage in Memoires de l'Estat de France sous Charles IX
where the author, possibly Simon Goulart, describes Jodelle as a
Poète François, homme sans religion, et qui n'eut onc autre
Dieu que le ventre.29

Pierre de L'Estoile remarks,

Le proverbe qui dit: telle vie, telle fin, fut vérifié dans
Estienne Jodelle, poëte parisien, qui mourut ceste année, à Paris,
comme il avoit vescu, duquel la vie ayant esté sans .Dieu, la fin
fut aussy sans luy, c'est à dire très miserable et espouvantable,
car il mourut sans donner aucun signe de recognoistre .Dieu ...
despitant et maugreant son créateur avec blasphème et hurlemens
epouvantables.30

One could compare these descriptions with the legends of Machiavelli's
godless end.31

Whatever his motives, Jodelle's praise of Charles IX's actions
against the Reformers brought him some worldly success and increasingly
he was given the task of composing work to commemorate public events.
For example, he presented five sonnets to Catherine on the death of her
daughter, Elizabeth of Valois, Queen of Spain (October 1568) and composed
a series of sonnets marking the departure of Anjou to join the King's
army at Poitou (November 1568), for which Jodelle may have received money.
In 1569, he wrote the Desseinspour la Croix de Gastines, commemorating the
execution of some Protestant merchants. These were presented to Charles IX,
suggesting that Jodelle had worked his way back into favour at court by
this time.32 In 1571, he wrote poems to celebrate the marriage of
Charles IX with Elizabeth of Austria and, a sign of great favour, he
organised the palace celebrations.

In 1572 comes the largest black mark in Jodelle's career: he
composed three sonnets approving of the Saint Bartholomew's Day Massacres.
Since it was precisely at this time that Jodelle was informed that his
possessions were about to be seized to settle debts he had contracted,
one is inclined to believe that these poems do not represent his personal
views but owe their existence to a pressing need for money. Indeed,
Pierre de L'Estoile says that he was bribed to write the poems (see above, note 30). That Jodelle was not as militant a Catholic as these poems suggest is perhaps substantiated by the fact that one of the few writers to commemorate his death was a Reformer, Agrippa D'Aubigné.33

In an earlier poem to Charles IX, Jodelle had declared himself ready to

... orner ta Paix, ou ton discord,
Ton sceptre, ton conseil, tes ans, tes faits, ta gloire.

This he had proceeded to do during the period after 1568, following royal policy through all its twists and turns and contradictions in a way which precludes his sincerity. The last fifteen years of Jodelle's life were overshadowed by hostility, poverty, illness and at least two threats of death:34 it is easy to see why he felt obliged to follow royal policy at all costs. Not surprisingly though, this behaviour earned him the reputation of an obsequious courtier in the eyes of his contemporaries, a reputation which has come down to posterity.35

Although Jodelle protests loyalty to his King and to France36 it is difficult to argue that he was sincerely concerned to uphold the authority of the French monarchy. His support of Henry II, for example, occurs in those genres where it was usual to flatter the monarch. In Recueil des Inscriptions he frequently refers to Henry II's aspirations to become ruler of a universal Christian Empire and his device, 'donec totum impleat orbem' (Oeuvres complètes ed. cit., p. 83, 97, 112-114).37 But these references to the imperial theme were usual in court poems.38

Cléopâtre Captive is prefaced by a prologue flattering Henry II and thus the whole play could be seen as the offering of a courtier. Yet the message of the play contains some unpalatable truths for the ruler. Jodelle believed that the aim of drama was to teach,

J'empruntay le Cothurne, et le Soc, à la Grece
Pour aux Roys, pour au peuple, avecques la hautesse,
Avecques la basseur, du vers Aeschylien,
Et du vers de Menandre, apporter l'ancien
Miroir Tragic, Comic, qui Rois et peuple dresse.
Cleopâtre reminds Henry II that the glory of a ruler is ephemeral; that happiness can never be found on earth and that the acquisition of power does not bring contentment. One feels his personal situation obliged Jodelle to play the courtier but that his real feelings are expressed in the line

... le monde entier aujourd'hui ne vaut rien,

and that this included rulers. 39

Jodelle died in July 1573 and in 1574, Charles de La Mothe, together with a group of friends, published some of Jodelle's work. In the preface, La Mothe expresses the hope that he will be able to publish four or five more volumes and laments the fact that much of Jodelle's work has already been lost. But in 1574, Ronsard wrote a prefatory sonnet to Robert Garnier's Cornélie in which he takes from Jodelle the honour of being France's first tragic poet and gives it to Garnier. Jodelle's reputation was finished and no more of his works were published. Estienne Pasquier expressed the general disillusionment over Jodelle's work when it finally appeared,

Et toutesfois pour avoir desdaigne de mettre en lumiere ses Poësies de son vivant, ce que le Seigneur de la Motte Conseiller au Grand Conseil en recueillit apres son decés, et dont il nous a fait part, est si esloigné de l'opinion qu'on avoit de luy, que je le mescognois.

(Recherches de la France ed. cit., chapter 7, p. 621).

The quality of Jodelle's work was affected by his ideals in refusing to publish the long poems he insisted on writing. These were not in fashion and by concentrating on them, Jodelle was condemning his work to obscurity. His style probably suffered as a result of not writing with a public in mind. He was not obliged to make his poems attractive to the general reader, hence the obscurity of the language in the Ode de la Chasse and the eccentricity of attempting to rewrite Homer in the Discours de Jules César. Chamard (op. cit., tome III, p. 249) lists the long poems left
unfinished by Jodelle. These poems were a regrettable expenditure of Jodelle's talents which were better suited to shorter pieces. It is a very rare case of a poet's literary ideals militating against his own work.


4. Balmas goes so far as to state that Jodelle adopted the faith of the French Reformed Church for a time.


9. Jodelle's first published work was in fact an epitaph for Clement Marot which appeared in the 1546 edition of Marot's *Oeuvres* (published at Lyons).

10. In the *Recherches de la France*, Paris, 1607, EL 596 g 3, Book VI, chapter 7, p. 870, Estienne Pasquier refers to two comedies by Jodelle: *L'Eugène* and *La Rencontre*. There has been some confusion as to whether these were actually one play or two, *La Rencontre* now being lost (as with so much of Jodelle's work). V. E. Graham suggests that *La Rencontre* was perhaps an earlier version of *L'Eugène*, 'Jodelle's "Eugène, ou La Rencontre" Again', Renaissance News, XIV, pp. 161-164.


14. Translated by Guillaume Colletet, Paris, 1644, BL 1450 k 1, p. 380. See also Louis Le Caron's Fourth Dialogue (published in 1556) where he speaks of 'les deux qui sont au jourd'hui à bon droit reputez les premiers poètes de nostres tems Ronsard et Jodelle'. Du Bellay dedicated no less than three of his sonnets in Les Regrets to Jodelle (see Les Regrets et autres oeuvres poétiques, ed. Jolliffe and Screech, Geneva, 1966, nos. 153, 156, 180). Pasquier, in words similar to Du Bellay's sonnet no. 156, says,

... ceux qui de ce temps là jugeoient des coups, disoient que Ronsard estoit le premier des Poëtes, mais que Jodelle en estoit le Daimon. Rien ne sembloit luy estre impossible, où il employoit son esprit.


17. Oeuvres complètes, ed. cit., tome I, pp. 161-162, pp. 243-244. He also made additions to the Recueil des Inscriptions.


19. Guillaume Colletet (ed. cit.) says

la plupart des courtisans ... commencèrent là dessus à railler Jodelle et à faire des contes de lui; ses envieux ne manquèrent pas de mal parler de lui; et d'examiner ses vers et ses pensées avec toute la sévérité de la plus rigoureuse critique ...

(p. 26).

20. He was charged with having misappropriated some of the costumes, see Oeuvres complètes, ed. cit., tome II, pp. 467-8.

21. See two other poems written around this time, A Sa Muse (Oeuvres complètes, ed. cit., tome II, pp. 287-9) and Chanson (Oeuvres complètes, ed. cit., tome II, pp. 289-293). In these, Jodelle declares that he will give up the ephemeral popularity earned by writing poetry for court and for the King, and concentrate on serious subjects.

22. This characteristic self-pity of Jodelle is highlighted by Du Bellay in sonnet 153 of Les Regrets (ed. cit.). Jodelle's inability to laugh at himself, contrasts with the ironic attitude Du Bellay adopts towards himself and his troubles in Les Regrets.

23. Speaking of one of the devices he invented, Jodelle says, 'je trouve ceste devise inventée par moy assës digne d'estre gardée pour devise de la ville éternellement', (Recueil des Inscriptions, ed. cit., p. 87).
24. Other examples of this mixture of pride and self-confidence as an artist can be found in the Recueil des Inscriptions, ed. cit., p. 75, pp. 79-80 and p. 88 where he implies that the mascarades would have been a success if the craftsmen had been capable of following his instructions.

25. Des Autelz dedicated the Eloge de la Guerre (in Remonstrance au peuple français de son devoir en ce temps, envers la majesté du Roy, Paris, 1559, BN Rés Ye 982) to Jodelle. The other two 'Eloges' are dedicated to Ronsard and Du Bellay, which shows the high esteem in which Jodelle was still held. Crévin dedicated his Pastorale (1559) and a sonnet in Olimpe (1560) to Jodelle. In 1559, Ronsard boldly went so far as to urge the King to show his generosity to Jodelle (Oeuvres complètes, ed. cit., vol. 10, pp. 80-81, sonnet xv).


27. Even when writing his anti-Protestant sonnets, Jodelle was prepared to admit that the Catholic Church needed reforming (Oeuvres complètes, ed. cit., tome I, sonnet xxI, p. 277).


30. See also L’Estoile's Registre-Journal de Henri III, in Nouvelle collection des mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de France, ed. Michaud (J.F.) and Poujoulat (JJF), Paris, 1836, 2e série, tome I, p. 129.

A la Saint-Barthelemy, il fut corrompu par argent pour escrire contre le feu admiral et ceux de la religion: en quoy il se comporta en homme qui n'en avait point, deschirant la memoire de ces pauvres morts de toutes sortes d'injures et menteries.


33. Popular Protestant writings however, portray Jodelle as intolerant, see E. Tricotel, 'Vers inédits de Jodelle', Bulletin du Bibliophile (1870-1), pp. 424-431 where various Protestant pamphlets against Jodelle are cited. Modern historians have also stressed Jodelle's intolerance, see F. Charbonnier, La poésie française et les guerres de la religion (1560-1574), Paris, 1919, p. 272. But it seems to me that Jodelle's harshness towards the Reformers can be explained, though not of course excused, by his personal circumstances.
34. And this was in spite of the fact that he had some powerful protectors at this time, including Claude d'Espence, Gilles Boudin, Henry Simon and the Comte de Dammartin (see E. Balmas, Un poeta del Rinascimento francese, ed. cit., chapter 9, p. 719).


36. For example, in sonnet x of Contre les Ministres de la Nouvelle Opinion (Oeuvres complètes, ed. cit., tome I, p. 272). In a sonnet on the Treaty of Saint-Germain (1570), Jodelle tells the Reformers that a treaty made with a King is not a treaty but the gracious forgiveness of the monarch (Oeuvres complètes, ed. cit., tome I, p. 291). He may be sincerely expressing his belief in the absolute authority of the King or, more likely, he may be pandering to Charles IX.

37. And see the collection of icons dedicated to the leading figures at court where Henry II occupies the central place with no less than seven icons dedicated to him. Henry's dynastic ambitions are again mentioned (Oeuvres complètes, ed. cit., p. 150, pp. 156-7), but this was expected in a work of this type.


39. Earlier, Jodelle had written a poem in Latin critical of Henry II and of those around him - Montmorency, Diane, the Guises - in which he correctly depicts Henry's weakness and dependence on his advisers (Oeuvres complètes, ed. cit., tome I, pp. 162-3).
THE INFLUENCE OF MACHIAVELLI ON JODELLE

Capel's translation

Early in 1553, Estienne Jodelle wrote three Latin couplets and a French sonnet to celebrate Guillaume Capel's French translation of Il Principe. These were placed at the end of Capel's translation, together with a French sonnet by Marc-Antoine Muret and Latin verses by Rémy Belleau. In the Latin couplets, Jodelle expressed his feeling of rivalry, as a French writer, with Italian literature and he praises Capel's translation above the original Italian work,

Steph. Jodellus Parisinus
Principibus res digna, suo sed dignior author,
Principe, qui princeps dignus ut esses erat:
Sed qui tam docto sub Principe principis ornas
Imperium, Italicis invidiose opibus
Dignior hoc Italo diceris princeps
Quo magis incumbit Gallia principibus.
(Œuvres complètes ed. cit., tome I, p. 88)

Jodelle is here adhering to the Pleiade's belief in the potential of the French language to surpass Italian literary productions. ¹ His French sonnet accompanies these couplets,

Combien de fois se devroient repentir
Ceux qui fondant un discours sur les nues,
De motz fardez, de fables inconües
Taschent noz yeux par songes allentir.
Mais combien nous qui faisons retentir
Les fictions des deux cimes cornués,
D'une fureur antique retenües,
Lors que l'on voit un tel Prince sortir?
Prince qui brave à noz François commande
De mépriser de noz resveurs la bande
Pour moissonner en un plus brave object.
Prince qu'ainsi Capel ameine en France
Que l'on dira, veu la riche abondance
Capel luy estre un fidele subject.
(Œuvres complètes ed. cit., tome I, p. 88)

There are several points to be made about this sonnet,

1) There is an echo of Machiavelli's dislike of utopian descriptions as expressed in Il Principe, chapter 15,
Many times in *Il Principe*, Machiavelli says that he is dealing with things as they are, not with how one would wish them to be. Capel himself in his preface contrasts fictional accounts of government unfavourably with Machiavelli's work. Jodelle is echoing Capel here but his dislike of historical romances and other types of fantasy literature is genuine and repeated several times in his work: for example, in his preface to Claude Colet's *L'Histoire Palladienne* published in 1555.

Jodelle may also be imitating Machiavelli when he expresses his dislike of poetic ornamentation. In his prefatory letter to Lorenzo de' Medici, Machiavelli states that he has sought a simple style:

> La quale opera io non ho ornata né ripiena di clausule ample, o di parole ampullose e magnifiche, o di qualunque altro lenocino o ornamento estrinesco, con li quali molti sogliono le loro cose descrivere et ornare. (ed. cit., pp. 13-14).

The fact that Jodelle wrote some lines for a translation of Machiavelli, does not necessarily mean that he had a particular interest in Machiavelli prior to this since it is likely that Guillaume Capel was a personal friend of Jodelle. Jodelle was in the habit of prefacing literary works with friends. Moreover, it is not the first time we find Jodelle's name associated with that of Muret and Belleau. It is likely therefore, that Jodelle prefaced Capel's translation for his friend's sake, rather than because of prior knowledge of Machiavelli's work.

It is not surprising to find Jodelle prefacing such a translation, since his interest in French translations of Italian authors is striking. In 1556, he prefaced Jean Regnard's translation of Aemilius's history. In 1557, he wrote a prefatory poem for Claude des Rosiers's translation of Matteo Palmieri's *La Vita Civile* (first
published in 1529). The person responsible for publishing this
translation was Jodelle's friend, Claude Gruget, and in the same year,
Jodelle wrote some verses for Gruget's translation of J. B. Possevino's
Dialogo dell'Onore.

Further substantiation of the view that Jodelle may have
prefaced these works out of friendship rather than because he approved
of the ideas expressed in them, is provided by Jodelle's prefatory
epistle to Claude Colet's Histoire Palladienne. In 1555, Jodelle wrote
some French and Latin poems to celebrate the posthumous publication of
Colet's history. In his prefatory epistle, Jodelle expressly states
that he does not approve of this kind of historical romance but that he
was persuaded by Colet before his death to defend the fable,

un homme de bon esprit pourra toujours cognoistre que l'amytié
que je portois à COLET, forçoit beaucoup plus mes opinions, que
la raison.®

The fact that he praised Capel's translation, does not therefore imply
that Jodelle was familiar with Machiavelli before the translation appeared.

However, if Jodelle's work before 1553 does not reveal any special
interest in the political theories of Machiavelli, after this date,
Jodelle's interest in politics becomes more marked.

Cléopâtre Captive

Cléopâtre Captive, written in the same year as the prefatory lines to
Capel's translation, reveals Jodelle's growing interest in the problems
of rule, for the real subject of this tragedy is not Cleopatra's fate,
but a meditation on the condition of princes. The play is prefaced by a
prologue flattering Henry II on his defeat of Charles V at Metz, but
warning that the play will contain lessons for rulers. In the tragedy,
the analysis of the victorious prince, Octavian, holds equal importance
with the story of Cleopatra's downfall, and in the end the two themes
are inextricably linked since Cleopatra's death robs Octavian of the glory
of leading her back captive to Rome and teaches him moderation and
humility after his victory.\(^9\)

In _Cleopâtre Captive_ there is the theme of fortune which makes rulers
prosper for a time and then unaccountably leads them to ruin (Balmas sees
a parallel between Marc-Antoine and Charles V who fell from greatness
when defeated at Metz). Octavian first appears in Act II where he is
possessed of an insatiable ambition; now that he has defeated Anthony,
he even aspires to immortality. But he learns during the course of the
play that power is ephemeral and in any case never brings contentment.
The (unpalatable) lesson for Henry II was the necessity of learning
moderation during times of good fortune. After Cleopatra's death,
Proculus says,

\begin{quote}
Le Ciel ne veut permettre toute chose
Que bien souvent le courageux propose.
Cesar verra, perdant ce qu'il attent,
Que nul ne peut au monde estre contant.
(Oeuvres complètes ed. cit., tome I p. 146).
\end{quote}

But if this tragedy contains an analysis of rule, there are very few
traces of any Machiavellian attitudes to government. Both Octavian and
Cleopatra use ruse: in Act II, Octavian has the 'Machiavellian' idea of
pretending to treat Cleopatra kindly in order to persuade her to stay
alive so that he can celebrate his triumph in Rome,

\begin{quote}
Quant à la Roine, appaiser la faudra
Si doucement que sa main se tiendra
De forbannir l'ame séditieuse
Outre les eaux de la rive oubliuse ...
Souvent l'effort est forcé par la ruse.
(ed. cit., p. 114).
\end{quote}

In Act III, Octavian accuses Cleopatra of faking the extent of her
love for Anthony, and indeed she is using it for a political motive —
to gain a pardon from Octavian. Later in the Act, she employs ruse as
she pretends to hand over all her wealth to Octavian but is betrayed in
the end by Seleuque. Octavian himself in this Act puts into operation
his plan to feign leniency. Thus both Cleopatra and Octavian are
portrayed as cunning, but this, I believe, owes little to Machiavelli's influence since their mutual deception is described in similar terms in Plutarch's Life of Anthony, the main source for Jodelle's play.

In Act II, there are vaguely Machiavellian overtones as Octavian is persuaded by his advisers to pursue his revenge and destroy his enemies completely. Cleopatra later warns Octavian against this policy,

Celuy souvent trop tost borne sa gloire
Qui jusqu'au bout se vange en sa victoire.

(ed. cit., p. 124).

The scene in Act II where Octavian summons his generals and points out Anthony's failings is found in Plutarch but the theme in this scene of destroying one's enemies completely is not mentioned by Plutarch and may owe something to Jodelle's reading of Machiavelli. Octavian's scheme for revenge fails in the end, as Cleopatra warns him it will; the lesson appears to be that the victorious prince (Henry II) should show clemency to the vanquished. Jodelle has accomplished his aim of giving moral teaching to his ruler.

Cléopâtre Captive reveals Jodelle's developing interest in the problems of rule and perhaps the beginning of his acquaintance with Machiavelli. Capel's translation of Il Principe appeared in the same year as Cléopâtre Captive and it is possible that Jodelle read Machiavelli before he composed his play, though his knowledge of the Italian author seems to be slight at this stage.

Didon se sacrifiant

Jodelle's second tragedy, Didon se sacrifiant, is probably a product of his maturity. It was performed at least once during his lifetime (Oeuvres complètes ed. cit., tome II, p. 454). The date of its composition is unknown, but from internal evidence, Balmas puts it around 1560 (Un poeta del Rinascimento francese, ed. cit., pp. 345-346 and see above, p.106).
If *Cléopâtre Captive* reveals the beginning of a wish to exploit popular legends about Machiavelli by portraying a Machiavellian ruler (Octavian) on stage, *Didon* goes very much further. Jodelle's Aeneas possesses several Machiavellian traits. In particular, he is frequently accused by the Choruses in the play of using religion to veil his political ambitions.

This theme first appears towards the end of Act II when, after the meeting between Aeneas and Dido, the Chorus of Phoenicians reproaches the former for abandoning Carthage and the Queen. In reply, Aeneas invokes his destiny, planned by the gods,

\[J'ay non pas au pays, ains au Ciel ma fiance.\]

The Chorus implies that his political ambitions are more important to him than the desire to obey the gods and retorts,

\[Que la Religion est souvent un grant fard!\]

(\textit{Oeuvres complètes ed. cit., tome II, p. 177})

This reproach is not found in Jodelle's source, the Aeneid Book IV, and may be a deliberate addition of a Machiavellian trait to the portrayal of Aeneas.

This Machiavellian theme is continued in Act III as Dido accuses Aeneas of faking an oracle to cover up his real reasons for departure,

\[Mais il feint un oracle à fin de m'abuser.\]

(\textit{ed. cit., p. 183}).

In the *Aeneid* Book IV, Dido's disbelief in Aeneas's divine mission is
hinted at in her sarcastic reference to the work of the gods (1. 376-380) but it is not dwelt upon. Virgil's Aeneas is clearly under orders from the gods; Jodelle's Aeneas is motivated more by political necessity and his continual insistence on the will of the gods seems, in the end, insincere (see his speech to Anna in Act III, p. 188).

Aeneas's invocation of the gods on his side appears especially shaky when it is questioned by other characters, such as Anna and Barca in Act IV. Anna calls Aeneas

\[
\text{Ce desloyal trompeur, qui ne craint de blesser} \\
\text{Ny les Dieux, ny sa foy, ny l'amante embrassée ...} \\
\text{(ed. cit., p. 200).}
\]

She sees Aeneas as having offended the gods by his desertion of Dido. Addressing god, Anna says,

\[
\text{Toy donc qui vois Enee} \\
\text{(O grand Ciel!) opposer à tes loix sa malice,} \\
\text{Sois pour nous, et prospéré en tout ce sacrifice.} \\
\text{(ed. cit., p. 205).}
\]

The Chorus to Act IV appears to be neither Phoenician nor Trojan but made up of impartial observers (see the first four lines on p. 206) and as such, their words have perhaps an added significance. They too accuse Aeneas of hiding his political ambitions beneath the pretext of religion,

\[
\text{Tu sçais bien (5 Enee!),} \\
\text{Peste des grandes maisons,} \\
\text{Qui d'une destinée} \\
\text{Farde tes trahisons; ...} \\
\text{Que ce tour detestable} \\
\text{N'est des tiens le premier.} \\
\text{(ed. cit., p. 208).}
\]

It seems that this Machiavellian trait in Aeneas is something that Jodelle wished to bring into prominence by insisting on the fact that Aeneas is veiling his political ambitions with religious pretexts. The French writer turns Virgil's 'pius Aeneas' into a Machiavellian type of hypocrite who uses religion as a pretext for his political ambitions; despite his insistence on the will of the gods, as a character, Aeneas never really
recovers from the questioning of his motives by Dido, Anna and the Phoenicians.

It is difficult to establish for certain whether Jodelle was aware that he was making Aeneas appear slightly Machiavellian, but it is probable that this was indeed a conscious decision in view of the fact that Aeneas possesses several other traits which also carry Machiavellian overtones. For example, there is much stress on his broken promise to Dido and on his dissimulation. In Act II, before Aeneas appears, Dido accuses him of breaking his promise and of dissimulating his departure (p. 163). When Aeneas appears, it is precisely these two charges against which he has to defend himself. In the Aeneid Book IV, Aeneas's dissimulation is mentioned (l. 305-8) as well as his broken promise (l. 597-8) but they are not dwelt upon. Moreover, in the play, Jodelle divides up the two Machiavellian themes neatly into two speeches. In the first, Aeneas replies to the accusation of dissimulation (pp. 168-170) and in the second, to the accusation of having broken his promise (pp. 170-172).

At the end of Act II, as we have seen (above, p.120), the Chorus accuses Aeneas of using religion as a pretext and, in a more general way, they accuse him of dissimulation,

Quelle orde peste recelee,
D'une feinte dissimulee,
Seul masque de nos trahissons,
Qui, dessous un serain visage,
Couve dans le traistre courage
Mille renaissantes poisons,
Et tant de mal aux autres donne
Qu'en fin son maistre elle empoisonne?

This is strong language and our view of Aeneas cannot help but be affected by it.

The theme of broken promises continues in the scene between Anna and
Aeneas, not found in Virgil. Anna accuses Aeneas of breaking his promise (p. 190) and in the end, Aeneas is horrified at what he has done and describes the punishment for those who break faith (pp. 193-194). It seems certain that Jodelle wished to depict Aeneas as a perjurer since he adds so much new material on this theme to his source in Virgil, but whether he was deliberately depicting Aeneas as a Machiavel can only be left to conjecture, though the case becomes stronger when we examine another facet of Aeneas's character which is emphasised in the play - his foreignness.

Unlike Virgil, Jodelle stresses the fact that Aeneas and the Trojans are foreigners in Carthage and that Dido has given power to a foreigner who has betrayed her. The Chorus of Trojans at the end of Act III says,

Malheureuse cent fois qui abandonne
A l'étranger son coeur, son lict, et sa couronne!

This may be a veiled reference to Italian favourites at the French court.

Jodelle's anti-Italian attitude is frequently revealed in his poetry, for example in his little manifesto, Estienne Jodelle Parisien au Peuple Français (Œuvres complètes ed. cit., tome I, pp. 113-121). He first describes how the ancient Roman Republic was destroyed through civil wars and then continues with a description of modern Italians,

Mais que diray-je de leur race,
Qui encore aujourd'hui poursuivre
De se faire nommer de nous,
Le peuple le mieux né de tous?
(ed. cit., p. 116).

He describes the mixture of flattery and hypocrisy in their behaviour (p. 117). He warns his countrymen not to submit to their influence,

Mais toy, mais toy, peuple François,
Qui, vaillant, jamais sous les lois
D'un peuple étranger ne te ranges,
Quel autre plus grand vice as tu
Qui obscurcisse ta vertu,
Sinon le mépris de ta gloire?
(ed. cit., p. 117).
It is reasonable to suppose that Jodelle saw a parallel between the Carthaginians welcoming the Trojans into their city and the number of Italians at the French court. He uses the parallel to give a veiled warning that the Italians might betray the French as their legendary ancestors, the Trojans, betrayed Carthage's hospitality. In this way, Aeneas and his followers become representatives of contemporary Italians.

The anti-Italian propaganda is developed in Dido's speech before her death in Act V. In the parallel speech in Virgil, Dido curses Rome and prays for an avenger (Hannibal) to arise out of Carthage (l. 622-629). This gives Jodelle an opportunity to elaborate on his source by including a description of the characteristics of the Roman people, characteristics which were probably intended to be applied by the reader to their modern day descendants. Dido says,

... Quant à sa race fière,
Qui sera ...
... ainsi que luy /Aeneas/ traitresse,
Qui par dol se fera de ce monde maistresse,
Qui de cent pietez, ainsi que fait Enée,
Abusera la terre en ses loix obstinée,
Et qui toujours feindra, pour croistre sa puissance,
Avec les plus grands Dieux avoir fait alliance,
S'en forgeant bien souvent de nouveaux et d'estranges,
Pour croistre avec ses Dieux ses biens et ses louanges,
Qu'on ne la voye au moins en aucun temps paisible ...

(ed. cit., p. 211)

This description is remarkably similar to Machiavelli's analysis of the foundation of Rome in the Discorsi Book I, 11-14, except that the characteristics of Rome which are praised by Machiavelli, are here presented by Dido in a bad light. Machiavelli approves of Rome's use of religion for political ends and Numa's pretence of talking with a nymph is seen as a successful way of inventing a new religion. It seems that Jodelle is deliberately using Machiavelli's Discorsi for his description of the Roman nation. Jodelle suggests that all these traits of the Roman nation have already been foreshadowed in the character of
its founder, Aeneas. According to Jodelle, Aeneas, like Machiavelli's Numa, pretended to have a special relationship with the gods in order to set himself free to pursue his political ambitions.

The parallel between the Trojans and sixteenth century Italians in France, and the use of Machiavelli in this speech by Dido for anti-Italian propaganda, seem to indicate that the other characteristics of Aeneas we have pointed out - his use of religion for political motives, his dissimulation and his perjury - are being deliberately built up by Jodelle as Italian and, more specifically, Machiavellian traits. It would be typical of what we know of Jodelle's boldness that he uses an Italian author's ideas to make a hostile portrayal of the legendary founder of the Italian nation. In Dido's speech, just quoted above, he turns Machiavelli's analysis of the foundation of Rome into a criticism of the Italian's own countryman.

The extent to which Didon se sacrifiant appears to be permeated with anti-Italian feeling makes this play into surely one of the most devastating attacks on the Italian nation that we have come across in this thesis: to suggest that Aeneas, the prestigious founder of Rome, was nothing more than a dissimulator, a traitor and a religious hypocrite, characteristics which, according to Dido, were to mark the Italian nation ever after, shows the extent of Jodelle's hostility towards Italy. It is also a very bold reworking of Virgil's description of Aeneas in Book IV and in Les Discours de Jules Cesar, Jodelle was to show a similar boldness in wishing to rewrite Homer's account of the battle between Achilles and Hector. The echo of Machiavelli's Discorsi in Dido's speech (see p.124, above) encourages us to believe that Jodelle now possessed a certain familiarity with Machiavelli's works and leads us on to examine his poetry for evidence of Machiavelli's influence.
Les Discours de Jules César avant le passage du Rubicon

This poem has had a bad press from historians - Guillaume Colletet called it 'une des plus ennuyeuses pieces qui se soient jamais lues.'

It is incomplete as it stands, containing 2,266 lines (Charles de La Mothe said that the final version was to have contained at least 10,000 lines) and therefore it is rather difficult to ascertain exactly Jodelle's aims in writing it, especially as he never reaches Caesar's speech in the poem as we know it. Yet in some ways, it is one of the most revealing of Jodelle's poems for it gives us an insight into his aims as a poet and his ideas on ruling.

It is addressed to Charles IX. The date of composition is unknown, though it seems reasonable to follow Balmas's suggestion (Oeuvres complètes ed. cit., tome II, p. 479) that it was probably written between January 1561 (when Charles IX succeeded to the throne) and March 1562 (the beginning of the civil wars). Jodelle was still in exile after the Hôtel de Ville affair of 1558 and he appears to be using the opportunity of the accession of a new King to regain favour at court.

He describes his situation as a poet in exile and says that, like Caesar before he crossed the Rubicon, he has had to think hard about his decision to emerge from exile into political involvement (p. 297). In view of the number of flattering courtiers who surround the young King and prevent him from hearing the truth, Jodelle has decided to write this poem giving political advice on the situation in France,

Or tout ceci m'avient, qui hors de ta presence
T'ay choisi pour mon but, te servant en absence:
Et quand (ô SIRE) encor mon Roy tu ne serois,
Si t'auroit-je pourtant choisi plus que tous Rois:
Car ce que j'ay conceu dedans moy d'esperance,
Des traits que j'ay marquez dès ta premiere enfance,
M'ont fait, sans à ta suite autrement m'asservir,
Comme il t'apparoistra, d'un grand coeur te servir. (ed. cit., p. 279).

Jodelle's position at this time (in exile and impoverished) forms
a curious parallel with Machiavelli's exile on his farm at San Casciano. The wish to become involved again as quickly as possible in affairs of State induced Machiavelli to write *Il Principe* which he dedicated to Lorenzo de' Medici in the hope of employment and which has been interpreted by some historians as mere flattery. Similarly, in this poem, Jodelle is attempting to regain the favour of Charles IX. In *Les Discours*, Jodelle describes himself thus,

\[ \text{Moy pauvre, et qui pis est, desastreux gentilhomme.} \]  
\[ \text{(ed. cit., p. 297).} \]

In his prefatory epistle to Lorenzo de' Medici, Machiavelli calls himself, 'uno uomo di basso et infirmo stato.' For neither writer are these terms merely the conventional expression of humility on the part of an author of a preface: they really are in a desperate situation, poor and in exile. 16

There are several similarities also between Machiavelli's dedicatory letter in the *Discorsi* and Jodelle's introduction to the *Discours de Jules Cesar*. Jodelle complains of the flattering courtiers who surround Charles IX and declares that he, Jodelle, is about to tell Charles IX the truth. In his dedicatory letter, Machiavelli says that he is not dedicating the *Discorsi* to Zanobi Buondelmonti and Cosimo Rucellai out of flattery, but because of their personal qualities which befit them to be rulers. He criticises those flatterers who praise unworthy rulers in their books. Like Jodelle, Machiavelli is offering his work with the promise of more to come if it finds favour. These similarities between Machiavelli's dedicatory letter and Jodelle's prologue to *Les Discours* may be merely coincidental, arising out of the demands of writing a preface (there is no verbal echo as in the case of Jean de La Taille, see chapter 3, p. 474 of this thesis). Nevertheless, they reveal a certain kinship between the two authors' views and position, and encourage us to
examine Les Discours for possible echoes of Machiavelli's ideas.

In Les Discours, it is not only Jodelle who has a Rubicon to traverse: Charles IX is also approaching a crisis in his reign as tensions mount in France (ed. cit., p. 298). Therefore, Jodelle says, it will be useful, both for himself and for the King, to describe the speech and thoughts of Caesar before he crossed the Rubicon, an event which led to the civil wars in Rome. Jodelle's judgement on this period of Roman history is similar to that of Machiavelli - the Roman Republic had lost her freedom and had become an easy prey for someone like Caesar who wanted to satisfy his personal ambitions (ed. cit., pp. 298-301).

Similarly, in the Discorsi Book I, 10, Machiavelli accuses Caesar of taking advantage of Rome's corruption to put an end to her freedom (and see Book I, chapter 37 where he calls Caesar Rome's first tyrant). Both writers see Caesar as ambitious but both also blame the Roman citizens for allowing Republican traditions of liberty to fall into decay.

Les Discours continues with a discussion of the best type of government. This section of the poem is a minor 'speculum principum' and it is interesting that in this, the most explicit account we possess of Jodelle's ideas on rule, we find several echoes of Machiavelli. From observing the stars which influence men's lives, Jodelle concludes that the natural type of government is rule by one man,

\[
\text{Mesme tousjours faut-il (mais chacun au rebours Confesse nécessaire et louable tousjours Telle inégalité) que les uns tous seuls guident, Et qu'entre les plus hauts les uns sur tous président ...} \\
\text{(ed. cit., p. 303).}
\]

He believes in a monarch who will have absolute power, unlimited even by laws,

\[
\text{Celuy qui Monarque entre les siens est né,} \\
\text{De rien que de sa mort n'a son pouvoir borné} \\
\text{(ed. cit., p. 304).}
\]

In effect, Jodelle is here freeing the King from the restraints of
morality, a freedom Machiavelli likewise gives to his prince in
Il Principe. One can understand how the legend of Jodelle the
flattering courtier grew up. He almost seems here to fall into the
category of the Machiavels who were accused of giving the King evil
advice on how to rule his country (see my chapter on Louis Des Masures,
pp. 224). Jodelle continues by describing the balance of power between nobles
and the populace in a state. The aristocracy, he says,

Ne pouvans toutesfois, ou ne devans rien faire
Sans un accord de tous, fust-ce du populaire,
Qui puissant en l'estat (bien qu'il soit le plus bas)
Ha pour cela ses voix, et propres magistrats,
Dont l'autorité mesme à toute autre s'oppose,
Tirant souvent à soy pour la publique chose
Tout veuil, et tout pouvoir des armes, et des loix,
Tant il craint que les grands facent sur luy les Rois
Mais deslors que l'on voit ses fureurs moderees,
Ou bien de ses soupçons les causes retirees,
Il se raccorde et met ce qu'il avoit repris,
Aux mains de ceux qui sont à regir mieux appris,
Devers soy retenant toutefois sa puissance,
Qui contre les grandeurs, toujours contrebalance,
Si bien qu'il n'a pas moins entre eux d'autorité.

(ed. cit., p. 304).

The theme of the balance of power between nobles and populace is very
prevalent in Machiavelli's work. Discorsi Book I, 58, gives us a
similar description of the populace's exertion of power when necessary to
prevent domination by the nobles, and its willingness to relinquish power
when the danger had passed. Machiavelli is speaking particularly of
the Roman Republic,

come era il popolo romano, il quale, mentre durà la Republica
incorrotta, non servì mai umilmente, né mai domino superbamente;
anzi con li suoi ordini e magistrati tenne il suo grado
onorevolmente. E quando era necessario commuoversi contro a
un potente, lo faceva; come si vide in Manlio, ne' Dieci ed in
altri che cercorano opprimerla: e quando era necessario
ubbidire a' Dittatori ed a Consoli per la salute pubblica,
lo faceva.


Jodelle describes the populace as possessing 'ses voix, et propres
magistrates,' Machiavelli says they had 'il suoi ordini e magistrati.'

Later in the same chapter of the Discorsi, Machiavelli mentions the populace's hatred of the name of King,

\[ E \text{ chi considererà il popolo romano lo vedrà essere stato per quattrocento anni inimico del nome regio} \ldots \]

(ed. cit., p. 264).

Jodelle also says that the populace fears Kings.

It is probable, therefore, that Jodelle had in mind this particular passage from Machiavelli (it may have caught his attention because of the praise of France which precedes it). There are, however, many other places where Machiavelli explains how conflict between nobles and populace can help a state by maintaining a balance of power, such as is described by Jodelle. In Il Principe chapter 9, he says,

\[ ... \text{in ogni città si trovano questi due umori diversi; e nasce da questo, che il popolo desidera non essere comandato né oppresso da' grandi, e li grandi desiderano comandare et opprimere el popolo} \ldots \]

(p. 45).

In Discorsi Book I, 4 entitled 'Che la disunione della Plebe e del Senato romano fece libera e potente quella repubblica,' Machiavelli says,

\[ \text{Io dico che coloro che dannano i tumulti intra i Nobili e la Plebe mi pare che biasimino quelle cose che furono prima causa del tenere libera Roma} \ldots \text{e che e' non considerino, come e' sono in ogni repubblica due umori diversi, quello del popolo e quello de' grandi; e come tutte le leggi che si fanno in favore della libertà, nascano dalla disunione loro} \ldots \]

(p. 137).

In the preceding chapter (3), Machiavelli explains how the tribunes of the plebs were instituted at Rome to check the power of the nobles, and in the following chapters (5 and 6), he elaborates on the relations between the nobles and the populace.

Jodelle then discusses a democratic form of government where there are no leaders,

\[ \text{Aussi croire il nous faut que d'une multitude,} \]
\[ \text{Sans quelques nobles chefs l'estat est vil, et rude,} \]
Incertains, confus, lasche, ignoble, et qui ne peut
Avoir l'honneur en soy ...
(ed. cit., pp. 304-5).

These lines contain an apparent verbal echo of the Discorsi Book I, 44 entitled 'Una moltitudine sanzo capo è inutile.' In other places in the Discorsi, Machiavelli describes the tendency of the populace to be 'incertain et confus.' For example, in the Discorsi Book I, 53 entitled 'Il popolo molte volte disidera la rovina sua ingannato da una falsa spezie di beni; e come le grandi speranze e gagliarde promesse facilmente lo muovono,' he describes how the populace can easily be deceived and confused as to where its best interests lie. He also mentions their fickleness and lack of staying-power, see Il Principe chapter 6.

However, Jodelle is severer on the populace than Machiavelli who in other passages in the Discorsi defends it, see for example, Discorsi Book I, 58, 59. Jodelle paints a gloomy picture of what life would be like in a democracy. Without the nobility, he says, there would be no court festivities or cultural activities (pp. 306-7). Yet, he says, such democracies do exist and he lists a number of reasons for this (p. 305). One of the reasons he gives is,

... la difficulté que l'on trouve à vouloir
Asservir ceux qui sont sous leur propre pouvoir,
D'autant que la franchise estant long temps goustee
Bien que lourde elle soit, ne peut estre domtee,
Qu' à toute extrémité de travail et pouvoir,
Qui mesure en fiin trompé bien souvent se peut voir ...
(ed. cit., p. 305).

Machiavelli also speaks of the difficulty of conquering a state used to freedom. In Il Principe chapter 5 he says,

... in verità, non ci è modo sicuro a possiderle, altro che la città/ ruina. E chi diviene patrone di una città consueta a vivere libera, e non la disfaccia, aspetti di essere disfatto da quella; perché sempre ha per refugio, nella rebellione, el nome della libertà e li ordini antíquí sua, li quali né per la lungheza de' tempi né per benefici mai si dimentican. E per cosa che si faccia o si provegga, se non si disuniscano o dissipano li abitatori, non sdimentican quel nome né quelli ordini, e subito in ogni accidente vi ricorrano ...

(p. 29).
The idea is the same in both authors: a nation used to freedom will never forget her former type of government, even if a conqueror believes he has subjugated it.

Jodelle continues with his praise of the nobility, describing how God has given gifts only to a few in each nation to show that it is part of the natural order of things that some are born to rule, others to be ruled,

Ceux là serfs, ou sujets, ou sousmis à ceux-ci,
De l'amour, de la crainte ...
(ed. cit., p. 310).

This is perhaps an echo of Il Principe chapter 17 where Machiavelli says that a prince must be both loved and feared (traditional prince literature mentioned only the love of one's subjects).

Another echo of Il Principe chapter 17 is found later in Jodelle's poem where he says that a ruler should never touch his subjects' possessions,

Tout noble et digne chef doit mettre ordre sans cesse ...
Sans souffrir que de charge indigne l'on le peuple/foule
Tant, que par trop de faix hors de ses mains s'écoule
Tout moyen d'enrichir, sans le voir devestir
De champs et de maisons ...
Voler ou violer, souvent oster pour rien
La vie aux uns, à fin d'oster aux leurs le bien: 
Tout crime amende doit, mais sont-ce legitimes
Façons de s'enrichir, que de laisser aux crimes
Les chemins pour remplir un fisque? ...
(ed. cit., pp. 311-312).

This idea has more ancient sources but Jodelle links it here with rape, a connection also made by Machiavelli in Il Principe chapter 17,

perché può molto bene stare insieme esser temuto e non odiato;
il che farà sempre, quando si astenga dalla roba de' suoi
cittadini e de' suoi sudditi, e dalle donne loro ... ma, sopra
a tutto, ostenersi dalla roba d'altri; perché li uomini
sdimentican più presto la morte del padre che la perdita del
patrimonio.
(p. 70). 23

Jodelle's poem now continues along different lines as he describes his ambitions to be a satirical poet and discusses the importance of
Kings leaving behind a favourable reputation for posterity, as reflected in the works of their poets. Jodelle says that writers often give a wrong impression of a King and cites the example of Homer's descriptions of Priam and Hector. He accuses Homer of national bias in making Achilles great at the expense of Hector in his account of the battle between the two. He wants to rewrite the combat between Achilles and Hector being fair to both sides! His description remained unfinished, however ...

This discussion on government and the art of ruling, the longest we possess by Jodelle, is very useful for our knowledge of Machiavelli's influence on the French writer. From exploiting popular hostility towards Italians, and in particular towards Machiavelli, in his drama Jodelle appears to have moved towards a greater understanding of Machiavelli's ideas. Like Machiavelli, he discusses political issues in purely practical terms without much reference to theological or moral principles, a trait which can be discerned in some later poems by Jodelle which will be examined in the next section.

The poems of Jodelle's 'militant' period.

After the death sentence passed against him in 1566, Jodelle endeavoured to secure the King's favour by writing sycophantic verse in praise of royal policies (see above, pp.105-2 of this chapter). As Charles IX inclined towards the use of force against the Reformers, so Jodelle's poetry becomes increasingly militant in tone. The Sonnet de la Chasse (Oeuvres complètes ed. cit., tome I, p. 242) which has been attributed to Jodelle, uses a description of a hunt as a metaphor for a political message: Jodelle urges the King to use force against his enemies.24 Similarly, in the sonnet Pour le Jour que tout le camp partir pour aller trouver l'ennemy written in 1568 during the third civil
war, Jodelle advises the King to use force in order to prevent the country from being weakened further by dissension. This idea of the necessity of a firm leadership in times of trouble, has something in common with the spirit of Machiavelli's writings. In Il Principe, Machiavelli repeatedly calls for a strong ruler to unite Italy.

In another poem written during the troubles of 1568, Le Jour que l'auteur a lu le dernier edict, Jodelle urges force as the only practical way of resolving the crisis. This edict of 28 September 1568 ordered Protestant ministers to leave the country within a fortnight and forbade Reformers to be employed in the universities and in the 'Parlemens.' The edict would obviously (and did in fact) lead to war, and many moderate Catholics disapproved of its stringency. Jodelle, the obsequious courtier, dismisses the scruples of these 'lukewarm' Catholics,

O vain debat, tachons par armes faire mieux
Que devant, et la loy prendra des armes force.
(ed. cit., p. 289).

The reliance on arms permeates Il Principe for example, in chapter 12, Machiavelli says,

E' i principali fondamenti che abbino tutti li stati, così nuovi, come vecchi o misti, sono le buone legge e le buone arme. E, ...
non può essere buone legge dove non sono buone arme, e dove sono buone arme conviene sieno buone legge ...
(p. 53).

In the Discorsi III, 31, Machiavelli says that the strength of laws depends on arms,

E benché altra volta si sia detto come il fondamento di tutti gli stati è la buona milizia, e come dove non è questa non possono essere né leggi buone né alcuna altra cosa buona, non mi pare superfluo riplicarlo ...
(p. 472).

The lines by Jodelle quoted above seem very much in the spirit of Machiavelli and in view of Jodelle's knowledge of Machiavelli's works, it is probable that he realised the relevance of the Italian's ideas to
the realities of the French situation and may even have turned to him for practical remedies. Significantly, there is no suggestion that the King should carry out this policy because it is virtuous or God's will; it is presented simply as the most efficient course of action. Jodelle appears to be moving away from the traditional theological view of men's actions to the modern, secular and political world (possibly more evidence for doubting the sincerity of his militant Catholic stance).

In 1572, Jodelle wrote three sonnets justifying the Saint Bartholomew's Day Massacres. The massacres were frequently attributed to the influence of Machiavelli's ideas on French rulers, and defenders of the massacres were often indicted as followers of Machiavelli. It is in keeping with his later kinship with Machiavelli's ideas that Jodelle stresses the temerity of the Reformers in rebelling against the absolute authority of their King and the massacres are approved of because they will unite France under one religion. According to Jodelle, Charles IX had to act as he did out of self-preservation since the Reformers were trying to usurp his throne. Jodelle continues to move in a secular political world where the end justifies the means.

During this period of apparent religious militancy, Jodelle's Catholicism emerges in his poems as less important than his advocacy of force against the Reformers and it is in this that he approaches the spirit of Machiavelli, judging political actions in terms of their practical effects rather than arguing within a theological context. The poems of Jodelle's militant period do not impress us so much by their religious inspiration, as by their aggression and their bitter derision of all opponents. The distasteful way in which Jodelle derides the honourable and just L'Hospital and even the cross of Christ shows the narrow dividing line between the poetry of a religious fanatic and that of an atheist.
Conclusion.

There are several conclusions which can be drawn from this survey of Machiavelli's influence on Jodelle. Firstly, we have traced a development in Jodelle's work from his anti-Italian attitude in Didon which leads him to supply Aeneas, the founder of the Italian nation, with traits normally reserved for descriptions of Machiavellian courtiers, to his use of Machiavelli in giving advice to Charles IX in Les Discours de Jules Cesar. He appears to have had no knowledge of Machiavelli's works before he wrote prefatory verses for Capel's translation and his first reaction to the Italian author, is to exploit the popular legends about him. Later, he seems to have become more familiar with the real Machiavelli: perhaps he was conscious of the similarity of their positions as impoverished writers in exile, or perhaps it was merely that during his exile from court, Jodelle had time to increase his knowledge of many authors, including Machiavelli. When the time came to attempt to regain the King's favour, Jodelle was able to put his reading to good use in Les Discours. Les Discours and the poems of Jodelle's militant period, appear to substantiate contemporaries' descriptions of the poet as a flattering courtier. It is however ironic that Jodelle, the obsequious courtier who gives advice on rule based upon Machiavelli's works, was also curiously adept at portraying a Machiavellian figure (Aeneas) on stage.

Secondly, during his period of exile, Jodelle began to rebel even against religion itself and to discuss political actions in secular terms. Jodelle is thus important in the study of Machiavelli's influence in France, because unlike many other sixteenth century writers, Jodelle did not need to reconcile Machiavelli's ideas with his religious beliefs, but could take the Italian author on his own terms. Jodelle is one of the few sixteenth century writers to be on the same plane as Machiavelli, judging political actions by their practical results rather than arguing from theological principles. He does not therefore face the moral dilemma
of a writer like for example, Jean de La Taille, who welcomed
Machiavelli's advice on practical details, but needed to feel also that
his King was virtuous and acting according to God's will.

A third conclusion which can be drawn from a study of Machiavelli's
influence on Jodelle, is the relevance of Machiavelli's writings to the
French situation just before and during the civil wars. _Il Principe_ is
concerned with crisis and times of acute political instability and many
sixteenth century authors, including Jodelle, were influenced by
Machiavelli's advice on how to deal with such a situation. With changes
in the French situation, men became aware of new elements in Machiavelli's
work which could apply to France: at one period, Jodelle is aware of one
lesson in Machiavelli, at another period, of a different lesson. Before
the outbreak of the civil wars, Jodelle uses Machiavelli's analysis of
government in a slightly theoretical way in _Les Discours_: he speaks of the
balance of power between nobles and populace, the disadvantages of a
democracy and the difficulty of conquering a nation used to freedom – all
themes with no direct bearing on the French situation. Later when he
becomes involved in supporting royal policy, Jodelle does not abandon
Machiavelli; rather he becomes aware of new facets in his work such as
his advocacy of the use of force and his desire for an absolute ruler in
times of crisis.

One final remark to be made about Jodelle's writings is the fact that
he seems, at least in those of his works which have survived, to have
none of the traditional humanist interest in such speculative topics as the
character of a King, his physical appearance, his education or even the
origin of monarchy. He occasionally mentions the King deriving his power
from God, but for practical purposes, this is not a restraint since Jodelle
admits of no limits on the monarch's power. Jodelle and Machiavelli
stand apart from the mainstream of sixteenth century writings on politics in being concerned with purely practical matters without troubling to elaborate a whole philosophy to justify the actions, other than that the ruler should have absolute power and work to unite the nation: \(^{31}\) perhaps Innocent Gentillet was right for more reasons than he realised when he linked Jodelle with Machiavelli ...
FOOTNOTES

1. Compare Jodelle's prefatory lines to Jean Regnard's translation of the first five books of Paulus Aemilius's history, *De rebus gestis Francorum libri decem*. In this poem, written in 1556 and entitled *Etienne Jodelle Parisien au peuple français*, he emphasises his wish for a purely national literature unadulterated by Italian influence and praises the French translation above the Italian original (*Oeuvres complètes*, ed. cit., tome I, pp. 113-121).

2. See chapter 9 of this thesis (pp. 51-55) for Ronsard's echo of this passage in Machiavelli and a discussion on other sixteenth century French writers' views of fictional republics.

3. It seems more reasonable to conclude that Jodelle is imitating Machiavelli and Capel here, than that, as Balmas suggests, he is attacking Pleiade poetry based on imitation of the ancients, see E. Balmas, *Un poeta del Rinascimento francese*, ed. cit., p. 128.

4. Capel was part of the early Pleiade group known as the 'Brigade' and, as such, he took part in the festival of Arcueil, see Ronsard, *Les Bacchanales ou le folastrissime voyage d'Hercueil pres Paris dedié à la joyeuse troupe de ses compagnons, fait l'an 1549*, in Pierre de Ronsard, *Oeuvres complètes*, ed. cit., vol. III, p. 192, 1. 130-132. See chapter 9 of this thesis (p. 51) where this passage is quoted.

5. In the *Ode* prefacing Des Rosiers's translation of *La Vita Civile*, Jodelle has a wry laugh at himself (perhaps the only time he manages to do so throughout his writing) for prefacing so many works and yet not publishing his own,

   Ayant naguère tant d'entrées
   En tant de livres rencontrées
   Qui de mon nom s'orgueillississent,
   J'eus peur qu'on pensast mon office
   N'estre que faire un Frontispice
   A tous les oeuvres qui naissoient.

6. Both Muret and Belleau were present at the festival of Arcueil to hail Jodelle as the new tragic poet. Belleau acted in *Cléopâtre captive*. In 1552, Jodelle wrote an epigram and a Latin couplet for the *Juvenilia* of Muret. All three poets had already been associated in prefacing Nicolas Denisot's *Cantiques du premier advenement de Jésus Christ* (published in 1552). See E. Balmas, *Un poeta del Rinascimento francese*, ed. cit., pp. 245-259 for the relations between Jodelle and Muret, and pp. 265-267 for his friendship with Belleau.

7. Interestingly, Jodelle seems later to have made the acquaintance of another translator of Machiavelli's works, Jacques Gohory, for they both wrote verses in honour of the musician Roland de Lassus (published in 1570). The work is dedicated by Gohory to Margaret of France, Jodelle's patron, see *Oeuvres complètes*, ed. cit., tome I, p. 457 and note to p. 146.


9. E. Balmas was the first to point to this interpretation of *Cléopâtre Captive*, see *Un poeta del Rinascimento francese*, ed. cit., pp. 294-314.


12. Jodelle mentions his personal belief in keeping promises in the prefatory epistle to Claude Colet's *L'Histoire Palladienne*,

Car qui est celuy si peu religieux envers la foy qu'il a donnée, qui pour le changement de la fortune, vueille changer sa promesse?

(ed. cit., à iii v).


16. In common with most other sixteenth century French writers, Jodelle probably knew very few details about Machiavelli's life (see p.20 of the introduction to this thesis) but certain facts, such as Machiavelli's political exile, can be gleaned from reading *Il Principe* itself.

17. One of the very few sixteenth century French writers besides Jodelle to give a leader such unlimited power was Guillaume Budé, see Claude Bontems, *Le Prince dans la France des XVIe et XVIIe siècles* in *Travaux et recherches de la Faculté de Droit et des Sciences Economiques de Paris*, série 'Sciences Historiques', no. 7, 1965, chapter I.

18. Jodelle fits the anonymous French author's description of

quelques rusez disciples du secrétaire Florentin qui ... se sont parforcez de faire à croire au monde qu'un Roy peut tout en son Royaume,

*Le dispositif, avec advertissement et avis à Messieurs les députez des estats généraux, pour l'année 1588*, s.l., 1588, EN LB34 528, p. 9.


20. And see *Discorsi* I, 2. This is also found in Livy, Book II.

21. See *Discorsi* II, 23 on the same subject.
22. It is found, for instance, in Aristotle's Politics, Book V; and see Jean Bodin, Les Six Livres de la République, Lyons, 1579, BL 1476 dd 19, Book I, chapter 8.

23. See also II Principe, chapter 19 and Discorsi III, 6 for the idea of rulers not touching either the property or the wives of their subjects.

24. It is quite usual in the sixteenth century to find hunting descriptions used as a metaphor for political events, see for example, my discussion of Jean de La Taille's allegory, Le Festin du Lion (pp.467-8 of this thesis) and P. Gringoire, La Chasse du Cerf des Cerfs (first published in 1510) in Oeuvres complètes de Gringoire, ed. D. Hericault and De Montaiglon, Paris, 1858. For the hunting theme as a political allegory see F. A. Yates, The Valois Tapestries, London, 1959, p. 65. For another use of the hunting theme, see Jodelle's Ode de La Chasse, Au Roy (Oeuvres complètes, ed. cit., tome I). This poem is, in my opinion, an allegory of events during the first civil war. The latter part of the poem (pp. 236-241) consists of explicit advice to Charles IX on the French situation and the long description of the hunt which precedes this advice appears to be intended as a veiled message to the King to continue the attacks on the Reformers which he had begun during the first civil war. At one point, Jodelle tells Charles IX,

Or je voy qu'en ce temps divers
Ta principale Chasse (SIRE)
Doit estre des Discords pervers,
Renverseurs de tout grand Empire,
Pour en les pourchassant chasser
La ruine qui nous menace.
(p. 236).

25. Compare the Machiavellian figure 'Le Curial' in Estienne Pasquier's Le Pourparlar du Prince. He also stresses the importance of arms above laws. It was traditional in medieval 'specula principum' to stress the link between good laws and strong armies, but none made good laws depend on strong arms as much as Machiavelli, see A. H. Gilbert, 'The Prince' and its forerunners. The Prince as a typical book de regimine principum, Durham, 1938, chapter 12.

26. For French writers' recognition that Machiavelli's writings applied very well to their own times, see the introduction to this thesis, pp.11-12.

27. Jean-Antoine de BaIf was forced into this kind of utilitarian argument in his poem exonerating Charles IX for his part in the Saint Bartholomew's Day Massacres, Sur Le Trespas du Feu Charles IX (see chapter 10 of this thesis, pp.535-6).

28. Satire contre le Chancelier de l'Hôpital (Oeuvres complètes, tome I, pp. 299-300) and In Michelem Hospitalium Franciae Cancellarium (op. cit., p. 301).


30. It is Jodelle perhaps more than any other French writer examined in this thesis who, by his flattery of Charles IX, best fits Machiavelli's own description of the French subjects' attitude towards their King. In Discorsi III, 41 Machiavelli says,
... dove si delibera al tutto della salute della patria, non vi debbe cadere alcuna considerazione né di giusto né d'ingiusto, né di piacevole né di crudele, né di laudabile né d'ignominioso; anzi, posposto ogni altro rispetto, seguire al tutto quel partito che le salvi la vita e mantenghile la libertà. La quale cosa è imitata con i detti e con i fatti dai Franciosi per difendere la maestà del loro re e la potenza del loro regno: perché nessuna voce odono più impazientemente che quella che dicesse 'Il tale partito è ignominioso per il ré;' perché dicono che il loro re non può patire vergogna in qualunque sua deliberazione ...

31. I am referring of course to the Machiavelli of Il Principe.
Since very little was known, even in the sixteenth century about the life of Jean de La Jessee and there is no modern biography, what follows is an attempt to reconstruct the facts using data from his poetry and from what is known of his patron, Alençon's life.

Jean de La Jessee was born at Mauvesin in 1551. He often stresses his Gascon birth in his poems for example, in Le Temple de Navarre,

Dessous le Ciel Gascon le Destin m'a fait naistre,
Où le Roy Navarrois est mon Seigneur, et Maistre.

In Les Soupirs de La France, sur le Depart du Roi de Poloigne..., he tells Margaret of Valois,

Dans ce pays /Gascon/ les Astres m'ont fait naistre
Qui pour Seigneur a votre Epous, mon Maistre:
Et m'a l'on veu de sa noble maison.

When in Paris, he frequently expressed a feeling of exile from his native land for example, in Les Jeunesses.

Before the age of fourteen, he was writing poetry and had begun his studies at Bordeaux University. Later, he was taken into the service of Jeanne d'Albret in Navarre. He was still in her employment at the time of her death (June 4, 1572) which means that in April 1572 he had probably accompanied her to the French court where she had negotiated the marriage of Henry of Navarre with Margaret of Valois. He laments Jeanne's death in his poem L'Esperance and with good reason since her death deprived Reformers in general of support at the French court and La Jessee in particular of a protector.

He did however survive the Saint Bartholomew's Day Massacres but at the end of 1572 we hear of him visiting Geneva. His journey is described in L'Amoureus Errant where La Jessee says that he left France because of
misfortune in love. He wandered through Lyons, Savoy and Germany trying, he says, to forget his love, until he reached Geneva. At least one modern historian has taken this poem at face value as a literal description of La Jessee escaping from an unfortunate love affair. However, in view of the date of the journey and the fact that La Jessee was a former member of Jeanne d'Albret's entourage and a Reformer, it is more likely that he fled to Lyons and then to Geneva to escape the aftermath of the Saint Bartholomew's Day persecutions. Around this real journey, he wove a fictitious love story, most probably to disguise the fact that his escape was for religious reasons. Moreover, La Jessee does not hide the fact that he was well received at Geneva and that the Genevans approved of his sincere confession of Calvinist beliefs as set out in L'Amoureus Errant. There is perhaps an attack on the perpetrators of the Saint Bartholomew's Day Massacres in a passage in L'Amoureus Errant describing how Fortune can overthrow even the might of Kings. In lines echoing the Apocryphal Wisdom VI: 2-4, he warns rulers,

Aprenez donc icy vous Roys, et Potentatz,
A ne vous orgueillir en voz braves Estatz,
N'enjambant l'un sur l'autre, ou vous armant de sorte
Que vous persecuteiez la partie moins forte!
(\textit{ed. cit.}, p. 1483).

The last line may be a reference to Charles IX's persecution of the Reformers.

La Jessee returned to France towards the end of 1572. He continued to write vast amounts of poetry which was largely ignored at court. His first published work was the \textit{Execration sur les Infracteurs de la Paix} published in 1572 but written before the Saint Bartholomew's Day Massacres (the 'privilège' is dated 19 June 1572). In this treatise he tells us that he has written other works which he has had difficulty in getting published due to his lack of a patron. But he says that when he has freed himself
Despite his facility in writing and his prolific output, La Jessee was not a popular poet at court. Marcel Raymond has analysed some of the reasons for this. One of the reasons he gives, is that La Jessee's poetry was provincial and outdated. At a time when the court was enjoying the elegance and 'préciosité' of Desportes's love poetry, that of La Jessee seemed clumsy, belonging to an earlier, more 'barbaric' age. La Jessee's reaction to this lack of popular acclaim was to imitate Ronsard by emphasising that he was a divinely inspired poet writing only for an élite.

La Jessee very often imitates Joachim Du Bellay and Ronsard, particularly their complaints about life at court where the serious poet is not appreciated. For example, in the Discours Poétiques, in L'Esperance, La Jessee laments that poetry has not brought him much financial reward and that to be successful at court one must know how to dissimulate and to scheme. La Jessee is here imitating Ronsard's poem Le Proces (1565). In Le Poëte Courtisan, La Jessee's complaints of the philistinism of the courtiers echo those of Du Bellay in his own Poëte Courtisan. La Jessee even addressed a poem to Ronsard entitled La Franciade in which he urges Ronsard to abandon writing satire which will only make him enemies (La Jessee is perhaps thinking of his own experience) and to continue instead with his epic La Franciade. La Jessee appears to have frequented the salon of Jean Morel, friend of Du Bellay, Ronsard, Dorat and other literary men. However, there is no evidence that Ronsard ever acknowledged La Jessee as a follower and fellow-poet, and indeed he may have been rather embarrassed by this Reformer who insisted on imitating the early, loftier style of poetry which Ronsard had by now abandoned.
Whatever the reason for his unpopularity, La Jessee constantly complains in his poems of personal enemies at court and says that he feels out of place amongst the dissimulating and corrupt courtiers. He laments that

\[
\text{Quand je resonne à l'escart mes ennuis,} \\
\text{Nul fors la Muse escouter ne me daigne:...}
\]

(Les Jeunesse, Book II, p. 81).

He often depicts himself as solitary and studious amidst the bustle of court life,

\[
\text{D'une palle front, l'oeil collé sur le Livre,} \\
\text{Et solitaire, et triste, et studieus,} \\
\text{Icy je pense à mes maus odieus:} \\
\text{Vivant mi-mort, et mourant pour revivre.}
\]

(Les Jeunesse, Book VI, p. 216).

In 1573, La Jessee took part in the siege of La Rochelle. The fact that he was thus fighting against his fellow Reformers is not entirely inconsistent with his Protestant faith. Political pressures may have obliged him to take part in the fighting; nor was he the only Reformer to oppose the besieged of La Rochelle, for the army of his future patron, Alençon, was comprised of about four hundred Reformers, newly converted Catholics and 'politiques'. Alençon thus became a rallying point in the royalist camp for all the 'malcontents' and there were divisions between his followers and the more extreme Catholic supporters of his brother, Anjou. It is likely that La Jessee would have belonged to the circle around Alençon even though the latter had not yet become his patron. Henry of Navarre and Henry of Condé also fought alongside Alençon and there were numerous Protestant plots to get Alençon to escape from the royal camp to join Ludovic Nassau and recruit a Protestant army with the support of Elizabeth I. During the fighting La Jessee wrote an ode reproaching the people of La Rochelle for their obstinacy, as well as a funerary oration for Claude of Lorraine who died in battle there.

The siege of La Rochelle was officially ended in July 1573 as part of the policy to conciliate Poland which was about to elect Anjou King on condition
that he showed more tolerance towards Reformers in France. The siege against the Reformers at Sancerre was likewise ended on 19 August 1573 at the insistence of the Polish ambassadors. La Jessee wrote a prose work about this siege.\textsuperscript{21}

The Mazarine library at Paris possesses two collections of poems by La Jessee which are rarely mentioned today. Both were published in 1573. The first is entitled \textit{Discours en diverses poesies sur l'entiere Pacification des Troubles avenus en ce Roiaume de France} and contains poems celebrating the end of discord in France and dedicated to various political leaders such as Charles IX, Anjou, Catherine, Alençon and Navarre. It was written just after the end of the siege of La Rochelle.\textsuperscript{22}

The second collection of poems commemorates the departure of Anjou for Poland.\textsuperscript{23} Again, it consists of poems addressed to various members of the royal family and in a sonnet to Charles IX's wife, La Jessee dedicates himself and his poetry to the service of the Valois (2v). In these poems he reveals that he has already achieved some measure of fame; he tells the Cardinal d'Esté,

\begin{quote}
... en François et Latin,
Mes écrits sont connus, malgré ce fier destin
Qui pour me travailler semble tous maus écrire.
\end{quote}

(XVII, 6r).\textsuperscript{24}

But the main emphasis, as in the last line of this passage, is on his misfortunes and his poverty. In a sonnet to Margaret of Navarre he hopes that she will be able to drive away 'ce sort maudit' (VIII, 4r). The reason for his misfortune seems to be lack of money following the loss of his patron, Jeanne d'Albret. Perhaps he hoped that Margaret would persuade her husband, Henry of Navarre, to continue his mother's patronage. However, Henry seems to have been unwilling to do so since La Jessee finally settled for Alençon as patron. At the moment, however, he needed money desperately and he asks the Cardinal d'Esté to be his Maecenas,
In this work, there are several references to a Latin poem by La Jessee entitled the *Henriade* and written for Anjou (see III, 2v and IV, 3r). Indeed the subtitle of this collection is 'Avec quelques vers Latins, servans de Praeface à cet Oeuvre, et dependans de L'Henriade de l'Auteur.' This Latin poem appears to be lost now.

Around this time, therefore, La Jessee urgently needed a patron. In *Le Poëte Courtisan* he describes the poverty which impelled him to search for a protector and how he was eventually successful in finding one in Francis, Duke of Alençon (youngest son of Henry II),

\[
\text{Avant que m'y fonder, quelque tempz s'escoula} \\
\text{A cognoistre ceus-cy, à rechercher ceus-là:} \\
\text{Jusqu'à ce qu'à chanter ce grand Duc je m'applique,} \\
\text{Héroïque d'esprit, et de coeur Héroïque:} \\
\text{Qui désors me receut, ayant sçeu qui j'estois,} \\
\text{Et me fit plus d'honneur que je ne meritois.25}
\]

The Duke of Alençon was a centre for all the malcontents at court and it is natural that La Jessee, dissatisfied with his lack of recognition and possibly even persecuted for his beliefs, should have joined the Duke's followers. Despite his personal deficiencies, Alençon was also supported by serious and learned men, such as Jean Bodin, who hoped for tolerance in religious matters.26 Moreover, Alençon had gathered around himself a remarkable collection of Catholic and Protestant writers and musicians, several of whom were members of Baïf's Academy which discussed, among other things, religious reconciliation.27 La Jessee's acceptance of Alençon's patronage was thus not inconsistent with his religious beliefs. As early as 1569 there was an alliance between Reformers and moderate Catholics and the term 'politiques' had begun to have general currency. For a while, Alençon symbolised in Europe the hopes of the 'politiques' for a State where Catholics and Reformers could worship freely, as opposed to the style of tyranny displayed by the Spanish.28
In his Declaration of 1575, Alençon said that he was fighting for the whole of the French nation 'tant d'une que d'autre religion.'\(^{29}\)

In France Michel de L'Hospital had been the first to express the aspirations of the 'politiques' in an attempt to save the country from anarchy and total destruction through civil war. In his speech at the opening of the assembly of the General Estates in 1562, he separated citizenship from Catholic orthodoxy and announced a policy of tolerance,

> Le roi ne veut point que vous entriez en dispute quelle opinion est la meilleure; car il n'est ici question de constituenda religione, sed de constituenda respublica; même l'excommunié ne cesse pas d'être citoyen.\(^{30}\)

In 1598, the Edict of Nantes was to give formal recognition to the principle of the separation of citizenship from religious orthodoxy and in a speech to the Paris 'parlement' a few days before its registration, Henry IV said,

> Il ne faut plus faire de distinction de catholiques et de huguenots, mais il faut que tous soient bons Français et que les catholiques convertissent les huguenots par exemple de bonne vie.\(^{31}\)

The beliefs of the 'politiques' were neatly summed up by Richelieu in 1616 when he said,

> Les diverses créances, ne nous rendent pas de divers Etats; divisés de foi, nous demeurons unis en un prince...\(^{32}\)

The aim of Alençon's followers was internal peace founded on the edict of January 1562 which gave Reformers an enormous amount of legal freedom and was the most tolerant edict passed in any country at that time. After the Saint Bartholomew's Day Massacres, the 'politiques' hoped to remove Charles IX's Italian advisers such as Alberto Gondi (the Duke of Retz) and Birague who had succeeded Michel de L'Hospital as Chancellor.

After the siege of La Rochelle and Anjou's departure for Poland, there
were many plots at court centring around Alençon who was angry at not being given the post of General Lieutenant by Charles IX. Navarre and Condé united with Alençon with the result that both Alençon and Navarre were kept under very close guard by Catherine de' Medici and Charles IX. This enforced captivity of his patron must have affected La Jessee who published no poems during this period except Le Tombeau de Feu Tres-Noble Seigneur Henri de Foix. This was dedicated to Damville, Henry of Montmorency (brother of Francis) who was the Catholic governor of Languedoc and leader of the united party of Reformers and 'politiques' in the South. La Jessee's allegiance to the alliance of his co-religionaries and the 'politiques' is thus confirmed.

La Jessee may even have been involved in some of the intrigues of that troubled time. There were several plots instigated by Alençon's advisers to assist Alençon to escape from court and join Ludovic Nassau's army of German mercenaries in Sedan. These mercenaries had been raised by Nassau ostensibly to fight against Spain in the Netherlands, but they could equally be put to use in France by Alençon with the aid of Reformers in the South (under Damville) and in the West (under François de La Noue). The date of the first plot, planned by Thoré and Turenne, was March 1574 but Alençon panicked, revealed the scheme to his mother and he and Navarre were forced to sign a confession of loyalty to the King. The failure of this first 'Mardi Gras' conspiracy did not however dampen the enthusiasm of the plotters. The 'politiques' were still demanding freedom of conscience, an assembly of the General Estates and the exclusion of foreigners (that is, Birague and Retz) from the Privy Council. The secret aim of the 'Mardi Gras' conspiracy had been to make Alençon heir rather than the more solidly Catholic Anjou.34

A second plot for the escape of Alençon was hatched by La Molle and Coconat in April 1574. This too was betrayed - this time by Francis of Montmorency - and La Molle and Coconat were executed. Montmorency was
himself imprisoned in the Bastille and Alençon and Navarre were again obliged to justify themselves. After Charles IX's death, plots continued (aided by the English) to get Alençon out of Catherine's hands before Henry arrived back in France from Poland to take up power. Around this time, La Jessee was imprisoned for several months. Was it perhaps because of involvement in plots centring round his patron? We can only guess at this, but it is certain that La Jessee felt the need to conciliate the new King, Henry III, by writing very many poems celebrating his return from Poland. He also wrote a poem to Henry III (Stanses, au Roy) to ask for freedom and to declare his loyalty to the King. One is reminded of the poems Clement Marot wrote from prison, similarly pleading for release. La Jessee's conciliatory policy towards Henry III was in keeping with the general attitude of the Reformers and 'politiques' at this time. With Alençon still under close surveillance at court, they were obliged to recognize Henry as King and to show loyalty to him at first in order to increase their chances of gaining some concessions. Whatever the reason for La Jessee's imprisonment, he was released after several months.

In 1574, La Jessee published his Epigrammaton ad Principes, et Magnates Galliae, permultosque; alios insignes viros, pro Xeniis: Libri Duo. Interestingly, this reveals that La Jessee was still in difficulties with the authorities because his epigram to Peter Ramus (Petri Rami doctiss. viri) has been censored in all the copies I have had access to, by being cut out (B. I, p. 13). Ramus had been killed during the Saint Bartholomew's Day Massacres.

Plans for the escape of Alençon (or Anjou, as he was now called) continued under the reign of Henry III and he finally escaped from court on 15 September 1575. On the 16, he entered Dreux where he was joined by thousands of noblemen, among them most likely La Jessee. On 18 September,
Alençon issued his Declaration justifying his actions and setting forth his claims. Meanwhile, Catherine was urgently trying to reconcile Henry III and Alençon, for it was known that Condé was waiting with German mercenaries at Strasbourg to invade France and that La Noue's army of Reformers from the West had already joined up with Alençon. On 21 November 1575, the Champigny agreement which was to last for seven months was signed between Henry III and Alençon. But in December of that year, Alençon began moving towards Paris with his troops. By March 1576, Condé had met up with Alençon and Navarre had escaped from court to join them. Henry III was obliged to make concessions as the army drew nearer, and the Edict of Pacification ('La Paix de Monsieur') was signed on 6 May 1576. This contained the first public acknowledgement of the Saint Bartholomew's Day Massacres as a crime and all the victims, including Coligny, were rehabilitated. 41

It has been necessary to describe all these events in a certain amount of detail since it is likely that La Jessee participated in at least some of them. His involvement with the 'politiques' and malcontents and their desire to remove Italian advisers, was to influence his later poetry in its hostility to Italian influence in France and especially in his reaction to Machiavelli.

Alençon returned to court where there was a continual undercurrent of suspicion and feuding between his followers and Henry III's favourites. Alençon finally escaped to Angers in 1576 and two years later he was allowed to satisfy his thwarted ambitions by leading an expedition to the Netherlands. La Jessee probably went with him, for in the dedicatory epistle to Alençon in Les Premieres Oeuvres Françoyses, La Jessee speaks of the later (1580) expedition as his second trip to the Netherlands,

Quant à moy, Monseigneur, qui avoir projecté dès longue main de vous dedier mon treshumble service, et vous donner quelque signification d'une telle devotion: j'en ay curieusement recherché les moyens à mon second voyage en ces Pays-Bas, où Dieu vous a légitimement appelé.

(ed. cit., p. 4).
The expedition lasted from July 1578 to January 1579 when Alençon returned to France without having achieved very much. In 1579, a genealogy of the Montmorency family was published. This work has been attributed to La Jessee. If it is by him, it shows his continuing links with Alençon and the circles around him, for Francis Montmorency and his brothers were closely allied with the 'politiques' and with Alençon.42

Alençon spent August and September 1579 in England furthering his marriage plans by meeting Elizabeth I at Greenwich. La Jessee was amongst those who accompanied him.43 Meanwhile, Alençon had been awarded Cambray (25 October 1579) and offered sovereignty of the Netherlands by Deputies who had come to Tours for this purpose. In the treaty of Plessis-Les-Tours (September 1580), Henry III secretly agreed to aid Alençon in the Netherlands and the latter set off on his second expedition to that country.

La Jessee accompanied Alençon to the Netherlands. By now, he had published more poems - the *Discours du Temps, de Fortune, et de La Mort* and *Les Odes-Satyres, et quelques sonets*.45 These latter (dedicated to Margaret of Valois, at this time a supporter of Alençon) are a collection of odes with a mixture of lyricism and satire in the manner of Joachim Du Bellay's *Regrets*. Like the *Regrets*, this work contains much anti-courtier and anti-Italian satire but La Jessee, probably because he was writing later in the century than Du Bellay when Machiavelli was more widely-known, turns his anti-Italian satire into satire specifically against Machiavelli. In 1578, La Jessee had also published a collection of love poems called *La Grasinde*, dedicated to Alençon.46

La Jessee also collaborated with other writers in two works published around this time, suggesting perhaps that he was becoming more widely accepted as a poet. In 1579, along with Robert Garnier, Ronsard and Amadis Jamyn, he wrote some prefatory lines for a satirical poem which appeared at Lyons that year entitled *L'Estrille et Drogue Au Quereleux*.
In 1580, there appeared at Antwerp *Les Cantiques du Sr. de Maisonfleur* and a second edition of this work was published at Geneva in 1581. This edition contains a dedicatory epistle to Charlotte of Bourbon, Princess of Orange, dated Antwerp 27 March 1580 and signed P.M.D.M.S.D.L.G. J. Pineaux has identified these initials as meaning 'Par Monsieur de Mauvesin, Sieur de La Gessee.' The preface to the reader is also signed with these initials. Like La Jessee, Maisonfleur had a great admiration for the Pleiade poets and this volume contains Christian poems by Belleau, Desportes, Ronsard and Joachim Du Bellay. The mixture of Protestant and Catholic authors may have been the reason for the popularity of this work which went through six more editions at Paris. By the third of these Paris editions (in 1587) the epistle and preface by La Jessee have disappeared and instead there is a *Hymne Chrestien de la Liberté* signed I.M.D.L.G. (Jean Mauvesinois de la Gessee).

In 1582, La Jessee published his *Discours sur la Venue et Honorable Reception de Monsieur Fils et Frere de Roy ... es païs bas*. This is a prose description, obviously written by an eye-witness, of the celebrations at Antwerp (19 February, 1582) welcoming Alençon as ruler. Also in 1582, he published at Antwerp *La Flandre, à Monseigneur. Plus XIII Sonnetz Francoys, et quelques Vers Latins*. In this work, Alençon is extolled as defender of Flanders, France and England against Spain. La Jessee's message in *La Flandre* is strikingly similar to the line of propaganda adopted by the Valois tapestries which were made in the same year (1582) as *La Flandre* appeared and in the same city (Antwerp). The tapestries were very probably commissioned by William of Orange to enlist the support of the Catholics and of Henry III for liberal policies in the Netherlands. After 1566, the 'politique' ideals expressed in France by L'Hospital and
others, were taken up by nationalists in the Netherlands who rose up against the Spanish led by William of Orange. The latter hoped to unite Catholics, Lutherans and Calvinists against Spain that is, to achieve unity on a civil plane despite religious differences. However self-interested Alençon's ambitions in the Netherlands may have been, his followers and supporters, especially Orange, saw in him the hope of a liberal ruler in opposition to Philip II of Spain.

La Flandre follows the same line of propaganda as the Valois tapestries for La Jessee builds up Alençon as saviour of the Netherlands and urges Henry III to come to the aid of his brother. La Jessee describes Alençon as a great warrior come to free the Netherlands from Spanish tyranny,

Que doncques on le prise, et que chacun l'attire:
Afin que désormais ce serf Pays respire,
Aprez les factions de l'Estranger felon.

(p. 10).

He emphasises Alençon's lack of personal ambition,

Seulement pour ayder le Sceptre de son Frere,
Et ne mettre à néant les conseilz de sa Mere,
Il a refait la guerre: ...

(p. 11).

He tells Alençon,

Flandres à jointes mains te prie la defendre,

(p. 13).

The collection also contains a sonnet addressed to William of Orange (pp. 21-22) and one on the death of the Princess of Orange (pp. 23-24), as well as Latin poems to Elizabeth I of England and to William of Nassau. La Jessee's propaganda was evidently pleasing to Alençon for by 1583, he had taken the title of 'Secrétaire de la Chambre de Monseigneur.'

However, Alençon's campaign in the Netherlands ended in failure: through ambition he wrecked Orange's liberal policy by attacking Antwerp. His loyal followers such as Jean Bodin were shocked and horrified. Many of the French were taken prisoner at Antwerp on 17 January 1583 and to raise money
for their release, Alençon had to give up nearly all the places he had conquered and pay off his troops. He began to retreat in April 1583. With Alençon's failure ended the hopes of the 'politiques' for national unity and religious tolerance in the Netherlands: the South came under the dominance of Spain whilst the North became an independent federation of Calvinist states.

Alençon died on 10 June 1584 and La Jessee published a collection of poems entitled *Larmes et Regretz, sur la Maladie et Trespas de Monseigneur François de France, Filz et Frere de Roys*. This work best shows La Jessee's loyalty to his patron. In the opening sonnet, he stresses that he above all others has been the poet to praise Alençon,

Moy qui seul plus que tous ay ta gloire espandu.

*(Aiir).*

We learn that La Jessee was actually at Alençon's deathbed (*Lettres, ou Epistres Funebres, du mesme autheur*, II, IIr) and that he has been a loyal follower of Alençon in the Netherlands,

Depuis trois années j'ay couru en pays estrange sa fortune encore plus estrange.

*(Lettres, ou Epistres Funebres, IV, p. 12).*

He says that he never received any material reward from serving Alençon (*Discours au Roy*, 7r-v). Before his death, Alençon had listened to some of La Jessee's Christian poems and liked them. He had intended that La Jessee should write the history of his life but he delayed too long in giving the order, says La Jessee, and now it is too late (*Lettres, ou Epistres Funebres, VII*). He says,

Plusieurs ayment leur Maistre, pour l'amour d'eux. J'ay aymé le mien, pour l'amour de luy mesme... Et m'en est à tesmoing le fidelle service que je luy ay rendu, et le peu d'avancement qui m'en demeure.

*(13r).*

La Jessee praises Alençon as the sole defender of France, often to the detriment of Henry III. In his *Priere à Dieu*, he says of Alençon,
De luy presque seul, aprez toy [Dieu], depend le salut general de ce Royaume.

(A iiv).

In Discours au Roy addressing Henry III, he describes his feelings as Alençon lay dying. He includes traditional moral philosophy on the changes of fortune and the decline of empires. With Alençon gone, La Jessee implies, France will be in a dangerous position,

Un si puissant Royaume en seurté ne sera,
Quand ce second appuy sa terre laissera:
Et bien que son Aisné qui sans cesse te prie,
D'un peuple si gaillard aye la seigneurie:
Nous redoutons pourtant que les rudes efforts
Des hommes factieux resveillent noz discord:
Et que l'Ambition qui les grands espoinçonne,
Perde l'honneur du Lis, et ce Sceptre tronçonne.

(6v).

It was surely very brave (or foolhardy) to include these lines implying that Henry was not powerful enough to defend his own kingdom, especially as Henry was hardly likely to share La Jessee's sorrow at the death of his ambitious, scheming younger brother.

In one of his Lettres, ou Epistres funebres in the same volume, La Jessee says of Alençon,

Il est vray que de luy en partie dependoit le repos de ce Royaume, et la conservation de l'Estat.

(II, Iir).

Indeed, all question of self-interest apart, La Jessee seems to have been genuinely fond of his patron. He certainly appears to have believed that Alençon was important for the preservation of France (there was no need for flattery after Alençon's death). His relationship with Alençon is interesting in that it reveals the devotion which was inspired by this youngest brother of three Kings who has come down to us in history as cowardly, treacherous and self-interested, as well as physically repulsive due to repeated attacks of small pox. Alençon, says La Jessee, will live on in his followers' memories,
(Lettres, X, 14r).

The Lettres, ou Epistres Funebres are an important historical document revealing as they do, the disarray caused to Alençon's followers by his death. There are several hints that many of his entourage had not been paid for their services (see III, IV), and therefore his death must have an even greater blow to those who were dependent on him.

There is now a period in La Jessee's life when we do not know what became of him. In view of the loss of his patron and his loyalty to Alençon it is unlikely that he would have been in Henry III's favour and circumstances may have forced him into exile for a while. He may even have returned to his native Gascony where Navarre was living at this time. He may have fought for Navarre since no further publications by him are known till the appearance of La Philosophie morale et civile in 1595. These are quatrains reflecting on life and politics in the manner of the more well-known Quatrains of Pibrac, Antoine du Favre and Pierre Matthieu, though showing a greater willingness to depart from traditional moral philosophy than these latter three authors.

Obviously a great deal of La Jessee's work has been lost: in the preface to La Philosophie morale et civile (p. 4), he says that his exile and sufferings have caused most of his work to be scattered. By 1579, he had already written enough poetry to fill 'diz, ou douze volumes'. In the only collected edition of his work which we possess - Les Premieres Oeuvres Francoyses published in 1583 - he tells Alençon that he has written 48 books of poetry, 5 books of prose and some translations, but he says that he is only publishing half of this. Even that much he was later to regret. In the preface to La Philosophie morale et civile he describes his collected works as
His prolific output was remarked upon by a contemporary, D'Aubigné, who says that La Jessee belongs to the second rank of modern poets but
plus pour la facilité d'escrire que pour la foelicité. D'Aubigné may have known of more of La Jessee's works than are available to us today.

The collected works of La Jessee comprise four volumes. In the first are Les Jeunesses, in the second Les Meslanges which includes translations of Latin and Italian authors as well as translations from the Bible. The third volume contains his three collections of love poems (dedicated to Margaret of Valois, 'La Severe' and 'La Grasinde' respectively.) The fourth volume contains his Discours poétiques, longer poems heavily imitative of Ronsard, but interesting for his ideas on poetry. La Jessee promised to publish some tragedies he had written, but these appear to be lost now.

As regards his religion, La Jessee is a difficult poet to classify. Born in Gascony and formed under the Protestant influence of Jeanne d'Albret, he seems to have been a sincere Reformer and even persecuted for his beliefs, at least until he joined Alençon's followers. From this point, his beliefs become somewhat more difficult to determine since his political loyalties to the Catholic Alençon play a more prominent part in his poems from now on than does his religion. An exception is his share in producing the edition of Maisonfleur's poems (which in any case was composed of religious poems by Reformers and Catholics). Allegiance to Alençon need not necessarily imply an abandoning of his Protestant beliefs, but he gives no importance to them in his works and his political attitude resembles more closely that of a 'politique'. As Lecler points out (op. cit., vol. II, p. 414), Reformers were usually intolerant in religious
matters, keeping to the medieval formula of 'une foi, une loi, un Roi.' Only in groups on the margin of the Reformers do we find support for tolerance, amongst mystics, anabaptists, humanists and 'politique' Reformers. La Jessee's tolerant attitude appears to place him in the latter category.

During his period of allegiance to Alençon, many of his poems are addressed to Catholics. There is a hint that he may have renounced his Protestant beliefs at one time under pressure. It is perhaps also significant that it was to Alençon, a Catholic, rather than to the leader of the Reformers, Navarre, that La Jessee gave his allegiance despite the fact that he was born in Gascony and served Navarre's mother. In La Flandre dedicated to Alençon, although of course La Jessee is still hostile to Spain, he praises Alençon as fighting to preserve the Catholic faith (he could just have easily praised Alençon for coming to the defence of Reformers in Flanders). The ill-defined nature of La Jessee's religious beliefs after joining Alençon probably accounts for his otherwise curious omission from La France Protestante (ed. Eug. and Em. Haag).

Whilst in Antwerp, La Jessee may have come into contact with the secret sect, the 'Family of Love', which flourished in that city in the entourage of the great printer, Plantin (who published La Jessee's collected works in 1583). This sect was largely indifferent to outward forms of religious worship and was opposed to sectarianism and its consequences. New adherents were won through personal contact and through cautious circulation of books. Clovis Hesteau de Nuysement, like La Jessee a poet and 'secrétaire de la chambre' of Alençon, visited Antwerp in the latter's entourage (February 1582-January 1583), and Pierre Porret (the main representative of the 'Family of Love' in France) tried unsuccessfully to recruit Hesteau for the 'Family of Love'. Guy Le Fèvre de la Boderie was another secretary of Alençon who had Familist links. La Jessee could not have failed to be influenced by the ideas of spiritual reconciliation circulating in Alençon's
entourage: Postel who was certainly an adherent, is praised by La Jessee and he may also have been acquainted with Bodin who was influenced to some extent by Familist ideas. As Kirsop says,

there is little doubt that Alençon's household was a favourable milieu for opinions of the kind held by the Familists. (op. cit., p. 113).

La Jessee is an interesting poet and one who deserves to be more widely known since he is one of the few French poets who were in Alençon's entourage, making his works valuable as historical documents in themselves. In the context of Machiavelli's impact on his poetry, his links with the Familists at Antwerp are especially interesting since at least one contemporary pamphlet associates the Familists with followers of Machiavelli.
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THE INFLUENCE OF MACHIAVELLI ON JEAN DE LA JESSEE.

There is considerable variation in Jean de La Jesse's attitude towards Machiavelli at different stages of his life. During his early life as a Reformer, his works show little trace of any reaction to Machiavelli, either favourable or unfavourable. After he joined with Alençon's supporters and later, when his patron had died, his attitude to Machiavelli is revealed in two works: the Odes-Saytres, et quelques sonets (published in 1579) and his quatrains on La Philosophie morale et civile (published in 1595). I shall deal with these works separately as La Jessee's treatment of Machiavelli is very different in the two collections.

1) The Odes-Satyres: La Jessee's anti-Machiavellian attitude.

The Odes-Satyres are heavily influenced in style and subject matter by Joachim Du Bellay's Regrets. The preliminary sonnet in La Jessee's collection sets the tone of lyricism and satire just as Du Bellay does in sonnet no. 1 of the Regrets. It is perhaps worth quoting the whole of La Jessee's preliminary sonnet for it captures the mood of this book which we are going to examine in relation to Machiavelli,

L'oyseau plus dous en ses accors
Vient tristement sa voix espandre,
Et se plaint au bord de Meandre,
Ou sur Caîstre aux plis retors.
Moy qui m'éveille, chante, et sors,
Fâché, plaintif, brusque à reprendre.
Je me fay voir, cognoistre, entendre:
Mettant au jour ces boute-hors.
Or' Satyriqueraent lyrique.
Or' Lyriquement Satyrique,
Je montre quelque eschantillon.
Si la pieçe entiere je tire.
De Cygne je seray Frélon,
Et mon Ode sera Satyre!

As in the Regrets a large part of the Odes-Satyres is taken up with alternately lamenting and satirizing life at court. Both Du Bellay and
La Jessee criticise the dissimulation and craftiness which courtiers employ in order to satisfy their ambitions. Du Bellay stresses the necessity of dissimulation at court in the Regrets nos. 139, 140, 142 and 150. If your aim is to be a successful courtier, he says, 'surtout garde toy d'estre trop veritable.' In the Odes-Satyres, La Jessee exclaims,

\begin{quote}
Bons Dieus, que d'entreprises folles!
Que de complots, et monopolles!
Que de traysons pleines d'emyoy!
S'il en fut onc entre les hommes,
C'est ore en ce temps oû nous sommes
Sans amour, sans ame, et sans foy!
\end{quote}

(II, p. 8).

Although Machiavelli was often accused of encouraging dissimulation, anti-courtier satire of this kind is not in itself proof of hostility towards Machiavelli. Before the Italian author was widely known in France, there was much anti-courtier satire in poetry dwelling upon the ruse and dissimulation prevalent at the French court. P. M. Smith has demonstrated that anti-courtier satire appears in the sixteenth century as early as the poetry of the 'Grands Rhétoriqueurs.' The court was the centre of Italian influence in France through the dominance of Catherine de' Medici and her Italian favourites, and thus anti-courtier and anti-Italian satire became linked. But not all anti-Italian satire was an attack on Machiavelli - after all, French anti-Italian satire was in the first place directed against another Italian book - Castiglione's Il Cortegiano. Well before the 1560's, Italians were attacked for their social behaviour and corruption of French 'mores' with their alleged libertinism and deceit.

Even afterwards, criticism of Italians does not necessarily imply criticism of Machiavelli. After the 1560's, the Italians came to be criticised more for their political ideas. For example, they were held responsible for the high taxes and the poverty in France. They were often attacked for using religion as a political convenience. These criticisms of Italians
frequently appear in the poetry of Ronsard and Du Bellay without it being necessary to say that they were reacting in this way because of their knowledge of Machiavelli.\(^7\)

This kind of anti-courtier satire (that is, not specifically Machiavellian) appears in Les Jeunesses, poems presumably, from the title, written in La Jessee’s youth, though not published till the collected edition of his works in 1583. Anti-courtier satire is also found in the Discours Poétiques, particularly in the Discours de la Fortune, L’Esperance and Le Poète Courtisan. The criticisms of courtiers are basically the same in all these poems: they are dissimulating, crafty, deceitful and ambitious. There is, however, nothing to suggest that La Jessee is blaming the influence of Machiavelli’s teachings for behaviour at court.

To define anti-courtier and anti-Italian satire as specifically anti-Machiavellian, more definite proof of first hand knowledge of Machiavelli’s works is needed. There should be some verbal echoes of Machiavelli in the French author, or perhaps a similar use of imagery. Rather than anti-Italian, the criticism should be specifically anti-Tuscan or anti-Florentine.\(^8\) There may perhaps be great stress on the evils of breaking one’s promises, an emphasis introduced into traditional anti-courtier satire as a result of French writers’ reaction to Machiavelli. The theme of broken promises is one of the factors which will help us to define Louis Des Mases’s attacks on the morality of courtiers as specifically anti-Machiavellian.

All these elements appear in La Jessee’s attacks on the behaviour of courtiers in the Odes-Satyres.

In the Odes-Satyres V, dedicated to Pibrac, there is stress on the broken promises of courtiers as well as their deceit and lack of religion. La Jessee says that just as Plato and Pythagoras banished Homer from their cities because he was a poet and dealt in fiction (untruth), so Christians
should avoid uttering deceits,

Nous qui d'un meilleur Maistre ensuivons la doctrine,  
Portons le nom de Christ gravé dans la poitrine,  
Nous tenons (mon Pybrac) un plus heureus sentier,  
Ou le devons tenir: car fuions ce mestier  
Foy manque, Dieu s'esmeut, loy se romp, fraude a vogue:  
Et bref du monde faus le Vice est Pedagogue:  
L'un ore à ses égauls preste une charité,  
L'autre a le coeur bouffi d'enfleure, ou vilité:  
Cettui-cy nous apprend au milieu des caresses,  
Que les fols sont liez par les vaines promesses:...

(pp. 15-16).

La Jessee appears here to be opposing Machiavellian pragmatism to Christ's teaching.

Ode-Satyre VIII is more clearly anti-Machiavellian. It is dedicated to Rusé, a learned churchman,

Toy vieil Praelat, moy jeune Poette,  
(Et ce vain titre je n'appette)  
Nous voyons pourtant à clos yeus  
Qu'il n'est rien qu'aus bons on promette,  
Qu'on ne tienne aus seuls vicieus.  
   Si scay-je que la Palme forte  
Plus on la charge, et plus supporte:  
Et vraiment ma plainte, et ce faix,  
Ne font que je me deconforte,  
Sondant ce que je pense, et fais.  
   Suspectes me sont ces promesses,  
Suspectes ces faveurs traistresses,  
Et dis loing d'un trac si tortu:  
Fy des grandeurs, fy des richesses,  
Qui n'ont soucy de la Vertu! ...  
Ce qui plus aigrit mon envie,  
C'est cette licence suivie  
De maus, d'excez, et de larçins:  
Et si ne vis onc en ma vie  
   Tant de Juges, et Medeçins.  
   Aussi pour mieux nuire, et forfaire,  
Tel se fait qui vouant deffaibre  
D'un rogue coeur, et d'un fin art,  
En temps, et lieu, sçait contrefaire  
Et le Lyon et le Renard.  
   Mais il est temps que je me taise!  
Toy qui par fois montes en chaise,  
Tu vois mieus ce monde imposteur:  
Monstre, qui testu suit son aise,  
Et n'oit la voix du vray Pasteur.  

(pp. 21-22).

It seems certain that it is Machiavelli's teaching which is being contrasted
here with that of Christ. Not only is there the theme of broken promises
and (by implication) the theme of atheism, there is also use of Machiavelli’s
imagery of the fox and lion in *Il Principe* ch. 18.  

This specific echo of Machiavelli encourages us to discern anti-
Machiavellian sentiment in other passages of the *Odes-Satyres* which criticise
the use of ruse and dissimulation. In *Ode-Satyre I*, La Jessee says,

J'execre ce malheureus age
Qui s'affuble d'un feint visage,
Et ja nous farde d'un tel fard,
Que celuy qui ne se deguise
Est soudain taxé de bestise:
Tant peut l'erreur, l'audace, et l'art!
(p. 5).

In one of the sonnets at the end of the *Odes-Satyres*, La Jessee includes
some anti-Italian lines as well as general attacks on deceitful behaviour,

Sainseval, (car je veus plus à plein te coignoistre,
Et me coignoistre aussi peut-estre tu voudras)
Je fuy, deteste, et hay, le dol, l'heur, et le bras,
Couvrant, aisant, aidant, l'homme feint, lache, et traistre.
L'un se fait à la fin par ses ruses paroistre,
L'autre obtient sans travail ce qu'il ne gaigne pas:
Et le tiers, qu'on diroit ministre du trespas,
Par le mechef d'autruy ses meschefs vient acroistre.
Bien que ces vices-là soient propres à ces trois,
Je n'en puis (Sainseval) exempter le François:
J'entens François-bastard, que l'estranger embouche.
Je le veus, et ne puis, veu nos comportemens!
Pourroy-je taire aussi cela qu'à tous momens
L'art montre, le sens craint, l'oeil void, et la main touche?
(IV, p. 29).

Here, La Jessee makes dissimulation into a non-French characteristic
and probably by 1579 anti-Italian satire had become so common that there
would be no need any longer to mention the name of the nation that was
leading the French astray — his sixteenth century reader would immediately
think of Italy. In *Les Jeunesses* Book II, La Jessee refers to dissimulation
as something specifically Tuscan,

Pourquoyn, mal-caut, ne suis-je bon pour estre
Un sac à Diable? expert à bien cacher
Mes passions, tardif à me facher? ...
La Jessee takes traditional themes of anti-courtier and anti-Italian poetry, and makes them into something specifically anti-Machiavellian. This anti-Machiavellian feeling is not surprising in one who was a follower of Alençon. Part of the policy of the 'politiques' was to remove Italian advisers from court, especially the Privy Councillors Birague and Gondi. Italians were judged by Alençon's supporters to be responsible for the high taxation in France and the use of violence against the Reformers. Alençon's Declaration of 18 September 1575 criticised those who allegedly wanted to destroy France by dividing it and making the country poor (policies elsewhere attributed to Machiavelli's followers). He aimed to restore the ancient traditions of France, abolish taxes and keep the nobles' privileges that is, Alençon says that he is fighting for the true French nation and he speaks of those,

personnes presque tous estrangers, qui sont emparez du roy et des principaux États et gouvernements du royaume, contre les loix d'iceluy.¹¹

Innocent Gentillet, a Reformer and close supporter of Alençon, helped to publish Alençon's Declaration in December 1575 at Geneva. He added to it a long commentary in which he interprets these 'estrangers' as being specifically Italians and followers of Machiavelli.¹² In this commentary, as well as in his Discours contre N. Machiavel (first published in 1576), Gentillett's political programme coincides with that of Alençon - that is, he hopes for a return to traditional French ways of governing which he sees as threatened by the pernicious influence of Machiavelli's teaching,

Machiavel par sa doctrine et enseignemens a fait changer le bon et ancien gouvernement de France, en la maniere de gouverner
Florentine, dont nous voyons à l'œil que la ruine entière de tout le Royaume s'ensuivra infalliblement.\textsuperscript{13}

La Jessee, like Gentillet a follower of Alençon, would have been interested in Gentillet's book and may even at this stage have borrowed some of his criticisms of Machiavelli from Gentillet. There were other writers among Alençon's supporters who wrote against Machiavelli. For example, François de La Noue in his Discours politiques et militaires (in the 'Sixième Discours' he says that he agrees with Gentillet's criticism of Machiavelli's works). La Jessee must at some time have made the acquaintance of Jean Bodin who gave his support to Alençon after having lost Henry III's favour by opposing the King at the assembly of the General Estates at Blois in 1576. Like La Jessee, Bodin accompanied Alençon to England in August 1579 and to the Netherlands in 1583.\textsuperscript{14} It would be useful to be able to ascertain whether La Jessee's interest in Machiavelli was stimulated by Bodin's profound (and accurate) knowledge of the Italian author.\textsuperscript{15} The only hint of this possible influence on La Jessee comes in the preface to La Philosophie morale et civile (published in 1595), the work which reveals a much more detailed and first hand knowledge of Machiavelli than the earlier Odes-Satyres. La Philosophie morale et civile, says La Jessee,

doit les commandementz de sa naissance, à l'encouragement que me donnerent autrefois sur un tel subject, plusieurs Gentils-hommes letrez, et mes singuliers Amys; de la maison de feu Monseigneur, et Maistre, le Duc d'Anjou.\textsuperscript{16}

This could very well refer to Bodin who was one of the most learned supporters of Alençon.

It is indicative of how indiscriminately Machiavelli's name was bandied around in political propaganda that the 'politiques' themselves were often accused of being disciples of Machiavelli. This was largely because their preference for religious tolerance (see above p.l\textsuperscript{4} of this
chapter) easily lent itself to the accusation of putting State interests before those of religious belief. A contemporary definition of the 'politiques' is given by the author of Copie d'une Lettre envoyée par un Catholique à un du parti contraire. The 'politiques', he says,

ont voulu régler les affaires de la religion, par les maximes de l'estat.  

In one of his letters, dated February 1588, Estienne Pasquier says of the Catholic League preachers,

parce qu'ils voyent l'humeur du Roy, plus disposée à la guerre, ils crient à gueules bées, contre ceux qui désirent restablir nos affaires en tel état qu'elles estoient auparavant le soulèvement de la Ligue: les appelant tantost Politiques, tantost machiavellistes; c'est-à-dire, du tout sans Religion.  

Machiavelli’s name is indeed linked with that of the 'politiques' in the League pamphlet, Declaration des consuls, eschevins, manans et habitans de la ville de Lyon, sur l'occasion de la prise des armes par eux faicte le 24 février 1589,

les Politiques et Machiavelistes, ... ne cherchent que pêcher en eau trouble, et faire leurs affaires: ne se soucians de la Religion, sinon en tant qu'elle leur sert de moyen d'avoir croyance parmy les Catholiques ...  

Another pamphlet of the League, L'Athéisme de Henry de Valoys; où est montré le vrai but de ses dissimulations et cruautés says that those Catholics who have abandoned defence of their religion,

quittans le ferme propos et resolution qu'ilz avoient prinse de vanger la querelle de nostre Dieu et de son Eglise, ont fait banqueroute à la foy Chrétienne, pour ... embrasser l'évangile de Machiavel ... et ceux la sont nos politiques tant renommez au jourd'hui.  

The author of the pamphlet _Advis aux catholiques François_, speaks of 'cest athee Machiavel, Evangeliste des politiques du jourd'hui.'  

La Jessee's attitude to Alençon is typical of the writings of his supporters: Alençon is built up as the honest, upright leader needed by France, in contrast with Henry III who is presented as being under the influence of Italian theories on governing. S. Hastellone has shown how the
frequent comparison of Alençon to Hercules was not intended to be merely flattering, but was part of the specific policy of the 'politiques' for getting rid of foreigners, especially Italians. Alençon was to be France's liberator from Italian influence. La Jessee also compares Alençon to Hercules, for example in *Larmes et Regrets, sur la Maladie et Trespas de Monseigneur*.

It is not surprising, therefore, to find anti-Machiavellian material in La Jessee's poetry at a time when he was a follower of Alençon. The collection is dedicated to the sister of Henry III and Alençon, Margaret of Valois, who was often inclined to support the latter against the King. In the writings of the 'politiques' and malcontents, criticism of Machiavelli becomes linked with propaganda for Alençon and against the Italians. As S. Mastellone points out, this opposition to Machiavelli was a real political policy of the malcontents towards Machiavelli, rather than just psychological or moral opposition to his ideas. La Jessee's reaction to Machiavelli in the *Odes-Satyres* thus falls into the first of the two categories of anti-Machiavellianism as defined by Mastellone,

*L'uso del termine 'machiavéliste' è connesso, da un lato, con la polemica condotta dai sostenitori del duca d'Alençon contro i consiglieri italiani e, dall' altro lato, con la discussione sul concetto politico di tirannia.*

(op. cit., ch. 2, p. 41).

La Jessee's hostility towards Machiavelli in the *Odes-Satyres* proclaims him to be a loyal follower of Alençon and an adherent of the political programme of the 'politiques'.

2) *La Philosophie morale et civile*

La Jessee's original hostility towards Machiavelli was determined by political imperatives rather than by any personal or moral repulsion. It may even have come from a second hand knowledge of Machiavelli, perhaps through Gentillet's book or through acquaintance with Bodin. By the time that
La Philosophie morale et civile was published in 1595, La Jessee had come to know the Italian author much better; his criticisms of him are much more detailed and he sometimes adopts Machiavelli's ideas.

i) Opposition to Machiavelli.

Collections of moral quatrains reflecting on life and politics seem to have been popular towards the end of the sixteenth century and the beginning of the seventeenth century. Pibrac (a 'politique' to whom La Jessee addressed some of his poems) published his Cinquante Quatrains, contenans preceptes et enseignements utiles pour la vie de l'homme, composés à l'imitation de Phocylides, d'Epicharmus, et autres anciens Poetes Grecs in 1574. These, like the later collections of Pierre Matthieu and Antoine du Favre, contained traditional moral philosophy often based on the Bible or classical texts (the title of Pibrac's collection reveals the intentionally imitative character of this work). Pibrac recommends acceptance of the type of government one is born under even if it means having to endure a tyrant (CIX, CX). He opposes absolute power as contrary to divine and human laws (XCIII).

In many ways, La Jessee's quatrains are similarly traditional and conservative in their teaching — indeed the anonymous dedicatory verses compare these quatrains to those of Pibrac. In Part I, III, La Jessee depicts the ruler setting an example to his subjects,

Le Prince...par ses faitz esclairantz,
Au Peuple sert de lampe, et d'exemplaire.

In VII there are the traditional comparisons of a King to a shepherd and to a father watching over his children.

In Part I, LXXVII, he stresses that it is more important for Kings to be just and virtuous, than to be valiant in war,
Machiavelli had said that a Prince must know the art of war above all others (Il Principe ch. 14, p. 62 quoted in my chapter on Ronsard, p. 5).

In quatrain LXXXI, La Jessee criticises immoral, tyrannical rulers,

Malheureus est tout genre de servage:
Mais plus que tous accroist en malheurté
Ce joug facheus, où le Tyran porté
Se permet tout par fraude, ou par outrage.

If these lines have a faintly anti-Machiavellian ring, quatrain III in Part II is even more hostile to Machiavelli,

Foible, et sans los, cest Estat qui s'obtient
Par fraude, ou force, ou faveur, ou Fortune.
Le moindre assaut outrément l'importune,
Et son seigneur à peine se maintient.

The second line echoes the subject matter of Il Principe chapters 6, 7, 8 and 9. The titles of these chapters are 'De principatibus novis qui armis propriis et virtute acquiruntur' (that is, 'par force'), 'De principatibus novis qui alienis armis et fortuna acquiruntur' (that is, 'par fortune'), 'De his qui per scelera ad principatum pervenere' (that is, 'par fraude'). Chapter 9 ('De principatu civili') is defined by Machiavelli as the case of someone 'che si ascende a questo principato o con il favore del populo o con il favore de' grandi.' Thus we find in consecutive chapters of Il Principe the four methods of gaining power described by La Jessee in this quatrain.

The whole of Il Principe is devoted to advice on how a Prince who has come to power by one of these four means (prowess, fortune, favour and crime) can preserve his power and keep his State stable. La Jessee is thus here attacking the basic premise of Machiavelli's book by saying that a rule founded on any one of these four methods can never be secure. In four
lines, La Jessee has shown more insight into the basic principles of Il Principe than most sixteenth century French writers in whole books - one could cite the example of Gentillet.

Quatrain XXXVII is similarly anti-Machiavellian in tone,

Le Mensonger ne déplaist moins aux Dieux,  
Qu'au genre humain! outre la desplaisance,  
Sur tout au Prince, il apporte nuisance:  
Car c'est un fléau qui le rend odieux.  
(p. 29).

The phrase 'sur tout au Prince' is perhaps intended as a warning against Machiavelli's book where it is the prince in particular who is urged to manipulate the spoken word. Earlier, there is an attack on Machiavelli's well-known advice to princes to break their promises if necessary, for La Jessee asks in quatrain XXXIII,

Qui par bonheur sa fortune redore,  
Est plus que pauvre, et fut-ce un brave Roy,  
S'il se dement, et n'observe sa foy.  
Qui perd sa foy, que peut-il perdre encore?  
(p. 10).

Compare his criticism of those courtiers who break their promises (in Odes-Satyres, see above p. 71 of this chapter).

By now, La Jessee had obviously read Machiavelli's works for himself since his criticism of Machiavelli is more detailed and closer to the actual text of Il Principe than are the general allegations of ruse and dissimulation in the Odes-Satyres. La Jessee had probably read at least Il Principe and the Discorsi in the original for he understood Italian and even took an Italian phrase for his personal motto - 'Vita della morte.' In La Jessee's collected works, Book VI of the Meslanges consists entirely of translations and imitations from Italian authors.

He has read Il Principe carefully and rejected the philosophy underlying it (or what he saw as Machiavelli's philosophy): he rejects the idea that deceit, fraud and even brute force are necessary for a
prosperous rule. The successful ruler is one who relies on God. Here, as in the Odes-Satyres, La Jessee combats Machiavelli with the help of Christian teaching. In La Flandre, he depicts Kings as chosen by God to establish justice and to be loved by their subjects,

Ce grand Dieu les [Rois] eslit pour s'opposer au vice, Images de grandeur, images de Justice. 
(p. 5).

In Discours du Temps, the figure Time says of Kings,

Il est vray qu'on les doit reverer en tout lieu, Pour estre ainsi sur vous instituez de Dieu. 
(p. 8).29

Despite his tolerant attitude in religious matters, it is certain that La Jessee never approved of atheism. In La Flandre, he attacks atheists as immoral and loose-living,

L'Eglise combatra ces hommes-chiens Athées, Sans foy, sans Roy, sans Loy, vivantz comme porçeaus. 
(p. 18).

As a Christian, La Jessee is therefore totally opposed to Machiavelli's underlying philosophy in Il Principe of the necessity of deceit, fraud and manipulation of religion in government, but this does not prevent him from agreeing with Machiavelli on certain points of detail about the art of rule and in his assessment of some historical figures.

ii) Endorsement of Machiavelli.

a) In assessing historical figures.

In La Philosophie morale et civile Part II, quatrain XCII, La Jessee gives a comparison between Hannibal and Scipio,

Fuy l'exçessif. Ce glaive eust combattu Un Scipion, trop dous et debonaire, Un Annibal, trop dur et sanguinaire: Sans leur extreme admirable vertu. 
(p. 38).
Discorsi III, 21 is concerned entirely with a comparison between the 'umanità e pietà' of Scipio and the 'crudeltà, violenza e infideltà' of Hannibal. Both of these men's characters were extreme, says Machiavelli, the one in leniency the other in severity, yet their great valour compensated for this,

Importa, pertanto poco ad uno capitano per qualunque di queste vie e' si cammini, pure che sia uomo virtuoso e che quella virtù lo faccia riputato intra gli uomini. Perché quando la è grande, come la fu in Annibale ed in Scipione, ella cancella tutti quegli errori che si fanno per farsi troppo amare o per farsi troppo temere.

(p. 447).

So, says Machiavelli,

è necessario queste cose che eccedono mitigare con una eccessiva virtù, come faceva Annibale e Scipione.

(p. 447).

Note the closeness of the wording in the two authors: 'una eccessiva virtù' and 'extreme admirable vertu.' Both authors agree that the excesses in the characters of Hannibal and Scipio were compensated for by their great virtue, though La Jessee is less willing than Machiavelli to trust always in extreme valour to overcome excesses in behaviour. 'Fuy l'excessif' advises the French author, whilst Machiavelli says that,

tenere la via del mezzo non si può appunto perché la nostra natura non ce lo consente.

(p. 447).

There are two other instances where La Jessee's and Machiavelli's assessment of historical figures coincides, but this may be because they were using the same source, Livy. Nevertheless, though it is impossible to ascertain whether La Jessee is following Machiavelli or Livy, it is worth citing the two examples to demonstrate the closeness of agreement between La Jessee and the Italian author. In Part I quatrain LIV, La Jessee says,
En dol, en foy, mille vrayment et mille
A deux Romains cedent leur titre vieus.
L'un fit perir Manie calomnieus,
L'autre exalta le preus-sage Camille.

(p. 14).

The Manlius mentioned here is Marcus Manlius Capitolinus and the Camillus is Marcus Furius Camillus whom Machiavelli frequently praises for his faith and encouragement of religious observance at Rome - see for example, Discorsi I, 12, 55. In Discorsi I, 29, we hear of Camillus being banished unjustly by the people of Rome and then reinstated with great honour. Camillus is twice mentioned in the Discorsi in connection with Manlius. In Discorsi I, 8 we learn of Manlius's envy that Camillus was treated with such respect by the Romans,

... carico d'invidia, non potendo quietarsi per la gloria di quello, e veggendo non potere seminare discordia infra i Padri, si volse alla Plebe, seminando varie opinioni sinistre intra quella.

(p. 150).

Machiavelli concludes that 'era adunque Manlio Capitolino calunniatore' (p. 152) and was justly punished for his calumny by the Republic. 31

Discorsi III, 8 again mentions Manlius's calumny of Camillus and his subsequent condemnation to death. Thus, in the Discorsi, readers are given a recurring picture of Camillus as someone trustworthy and pious ('le preus-sage Camille') and of Manlius as full of ruse and trickery ('calomnieus'), an analysis which perhaps prompted La Jessee's own assessment of their characters in La Philosophie morale et civile, though the story of Manlius and Camillus may have been known to La Jessee from Livy Book V (the account of Camillus's exile and return) and Book VI (Manlius's jealousy).

In Part I quatraine XCI, La Jessee says,

Ce que l'advis du cunctateur Fabie,
Ni la fierté de Varron bataillant,
Ne peut gaigner: Scipion le vaillant,
Par heur l'acquit sur le Chef de Libye.

(p. 20).
Like the previous quatrain, this is probably based on Livy Book XXII, but it is worth pointing out that he could have found these character assessments in Machiavelli.

In Discorsi III, 9, Machiavelli deals with one of his favourite topics 'Come conviene variare co' tempi, volendo sempre avere buona fortuna' (see Discorsi III, 8 and Il Principe chapter 25 for this theme). Fabius Maximus, he says, was unable to adapt to the times.

Ciascuno sa come Fabio Massimo procedeva con lo esercito suo rispettivamente e cautamente discosto da ogni impeto e da ogni audacia romana; e la buona fortuna fece che questo suo modo riscontrò bene con i tempi... E che Fabbio facessi questo per natura e non per elezione, si vide, che volendo Scipione passare in Africa con quegli eserciti per ultimare la guerra, Fabio la contradisse assai, come quello che non si poteva spiccare da' suoi modi e dalla consuetudine sua; talché se fusse stato a lui, Annibale sarebbe ancora in Italia; come quello che non si avvedeva che gli erano mutati i tempi, e che bisognava mutare modi di guerra.

(p. 417).

Like La Jessee, Machiavelli concludes that Fabius would have lost the war where Scipio won it,

E se Fabio fusse stato re di Roma poteva facilmente perdere quella guerra; perché non arebbe saputo variare col procedere suo secondo che variavano i tempi. Ma essendo nato in una repubblica dove erano diversi cittadini. e diversi umori, come la ebbe Fabio, che fu ottimo ne' tempi debiti a sostenere la guerra, così ebbe poi Scipione ne' tempi atti a vincérla.

(p. 417).

Fabius's unsuccessful opposition to Scipio over Africa is mentioned in Discorsi I, 53 and Scipio's triumph is described in Discorsi II, 12 and 32. In the Discorsi, the rashness of Varro (who took over the command of the Roman army from Fabius Maximus at one point) and the delaying tactics of Fabius come across most clearly as their distinctive characteristics.

In Discorsi I, 31, Machiavelli says,

E quanto agli errori per ignoranza, non ci è il più bello esempio che quello di Varrone: per la temerità del quale sendo rotti i Romani a Canne da Annibale, dove quella Republica portò pericolo della sua libertà.

(p. 204).
In Discorsi I, 53, Machiavelli makes a sharp distinction between the delaying tactics of Fabius and the boldness of Varro. He speaks of

la malvagia opinione che surse in Roma di Fabio Massimo, il quale non poteva persuadere al popolo romano che fusse utile a quella Republica procedere lentamente in quella guerra, e sostenere senza azzuffarsi l'impeto d'Annibale; perché quel popolo guidicava questo partito vile e non vi vedeva dentro quella utilità vi era...

(p. 250).

This opinion of the Roman people resulted in them giving the command to Varro,

fece dipoi console Varrone, non per altri suoi meriti che per avere per tutte le piazze e tutti i luoghi pubblici di Roma promesso di rompere Annibale, qualunque volta gliene fusse data autorità. Di che nacque la zuffa e la rovina di Canne, e presso che la rovina di Roma.

(p. 250).

Varro's rashness is mentioned by Livy Book XXII and it is impossible to say whether it was La Jessee's knowledge of Livy or his reading of Machiavelli's assessment of the situation at Rome and the personalities of Scipio, Fabius and Varro, that led the French writer to oppose in this quatrain 'la fierté de Varron bataillant' to the 'cunctateur Fabie' and to conclude that neither man was equal, as Scipio was, to carrying off a victory in Africa.

b) In the use of imagery.

In La Philosophie morale et civile Part II, XCI, La Jessee, as would be expected in a sixteenth century work on moral philosophy, speaks of man's reaction in the face of changing Fortune,

Nous pouvons bien Fortune seconder
En ses desseingz: et en luy faisant teste,
Choquer ses flotz, non fuyr sa tempeste,
Parer ses coupz, non ses conseilz sonder.

(p. 38).

Whether La Jessee is here treating 'Fortune' according to the pagan concept of the amoral goddess who rules men's lives, as in Machiavelli, or whether,
like many sixteenth century poets, he is using the word 'Fortune' to denote the element of inscrutability in the Christian concept of providence, does not concern us here: it is the imagery he uses in describing Fortune which interests us in connection with Machiavelli.

As one modern historian has pointed out, the concept of Fortune prevades Il Principe as it does no other sixteenth century treatise on kingship - a fact which would have struck the contemporary reader. Machiavelli went further than traditional writers of treatises in stressing the fact that Fortune can be combated by 'virtù'. In Il Principe chapter 25, he says,

E' non mi è incognito come molti hanno avuto e hanno opinione che le cose del mondo sieno in modo governate dalla fortuna e da Dio, che li uomini con la prudenzia loro non possino correggerle, anzi non vi abbino remedio alcuno... Non di manco, perché el nostro libero arbitrio non sia aspento, judico potere esser vero che la fortuna sia arbitra della metà delle azioni nostre, ma che etiam lei ne lasci governare l'altra metà, o presso, a noi.

(pp. 98-99).

In Discorsi II, 29, he says,

Affermo bene di nuovo questo essere verissimo, secondo che per tutte le istorie si vede, che gli uomini possono secondare la fortuna e non opporsegli.

(p. 367).

There is a verbal echo of this sentence in La Jessee's quatrain,

Nous pouvons bien Fortune seconder.

The two authors share the same views on Fortune: it may be combated, though never completely mastered. They both reject the traditional idea of submission to the whims of Fortune. In Discorsi II, 30, Machiavelli says that Fortune can be overcome by a man of 'virtù',

... dove gli uomini hanno poca virtù, la fortuna mostra assai la potenza sua: e perché la è varia, variano le repubbliche e gli stati spesso, e varieranno sempre infino che non surga qualcuno che sua della antichità tanto amatore che la regoli in modo che la non abbia cagione di mostrare, a ogni girare di sole, quanto ella puote.

(p. 371).
In quatrain LII of Part I, La Jessee says,

Soit sur la Terre, ou les champz de Neptune,
Que le meschef acourra te trouver:
Sage tu dois tes forces esprouver,
Et par vertu combatre la Fortune.

(p. 13).

Moreover, in Part II quatrain XCI (quoted above, p.\(\text{\textsection}4\)), La Jessee has borrowed Machiavelli's imagery of the storm and the flood. In

Il Principe chapter 25, Machiavelli says,

Et assomiglio quella /Fortuna/ a uno di questi fiumi rovinosi, che, quando s'ad
dirano, allagano e' piani, ruinano li arberi e li edifizii, lievono da questa parte terreno, pongono da quell' altra: ciascuno fugge loro dinanzi, ognuno cede allo impeto loro, senza potervi in alcuna parte obstare. E benché siano così fatti, non resta però che li uomini, quando sono tempi quieti, non vi potessino fare provvedimenti e con ripari et argini, in modo che, crescendo poi, o egli andrebbono per uno canale, o l'impetto loro non sarebbe né si licenzioso né si dannoso. Similmente interviene della fortuna: la quale dimostra la sua potenzia dove non è ordinata virtú a resistere, e quindi volta li sua impiet, dove la sa che non sono fatti li argini e li ripari a tenerla.

(p. 99).

Such a developed image stands out amidst the otherwise rather stark and logical prose of Il Principe and may well have appealed to the poet La Jessee for this reason. He was not the only sixteenth century French reader whose attention was caught by this imagery: Henry III used it in some notes to his secretary, Nicolas de Neufville, seigneur de Villeroy.

Machiavelli concludes his chapter on Fortune with another striking image of Fortune as a fickle woman whom it is necessary to tame. While it was traditional to depict Fortune as a woman and inconstant, the idea of the possibility of beating her into submission is unique to Machiavelli and fits in with his belief that the taking of risks can modify events. He says,

Io iudico bene questo, che sia meglio essere impetuoso che rispettivo, perché la fortuna è donna; et è necessario, volendola tenere sotto, batterla et utarla. E si vede che la si lascia più vincere da questi, che da quelli che freddamente procedono. E però sempre, come donna, è amica de' giovani,
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perché sono meno rispettivi, più feroci, e con più audacia la comandano.

(p. 101).

In his *Discours Poëtiques*, in the autobiographical *Amoureus Errant*, La Jessee uses the image of Fortune as a fickle woman and introduces, in the last two lines, the Machiavellian idea of the possibility of beating her down,

Ne cedez à Fortune: elle n'est qu'une feme,
Muisible de nature, ayant l'esprit leger,
Qui tient vrayement du sexe, et n'ayme qu' à changer:
Memes quand elle void rembarrer sa puissance,
S'adoucit, ne pouvant exerçer sa nuisance.  

La Jessee's use of Machiavelli here is interesting since not only does he share the Italian author's view of Fortune, but he is also one of the few sixteenth century French poets to borrow imagery from Machiavelli.  

**c) For advice on political and military matters.**

i) In *La Philosophie morale et civile* Part I, quatrain LI, La Jessee says,

Tousjours l'argent n'ayde aus grandz capitenes.
Trop mieus à Sparte et ses libres Soudars,
Et son conseil, acquirent l'heur de Mars:
Que l'art, ni l'or, aus Citoyens d'Athenes.

(p. 13).

Machiavelli was well-known for opposing the traditional idea, found in Quintus Curtius, that money is the sinews of war.  

He was criticised for this opposition by, among others, Guicciardini. In *Discorsi II*, 10 ('I danari non sono il nervo della guerra, secondo che è la comune opinione'), Machiavelli says that 'l'armi fedeli' (faithful troops) are more important than money when waging war,

Non è adunque, replicandolo di nuovo, l'oro il nervo della guerra; ma i buoni soldati. Son bene necessari i danari in secondo luogo, ma è una necessità che i soldati buoni per se medesimi la vincono; perché è impossibile che ai buoni soldati manchino i danari, come che i danari per loro medesimi trovino i buoni soldati.

(p. 305).
He goes on to cite the example of the Athenians whom Pericles advised to wage war,

mostrando ch' e' potevano vincere quella guerra con la industria e con la forza del danaio. E benché in tale guerra gli Ateniesi prosperassino qualche volta, in ultimo la perderono; e valsono piú il consiglio e li buoni soldati di Sparta che la industria ed il danaio di Atene.

(p. 305).

La Jessee's quatrain echoes this last sentence when he speaks of Sparta's 'libres Soudars' (Machiavelli says 'li buoni soldati') and 'conseil' ('consiglia') which overcame 'l'art' ('la industria') and 'l'or' ('il danaio') of Athens.

La Jessee's change of 'buoni soldati' to 'libres Soudars' reflects Machiavelli's dislike of mercenary soldiers which is revealed in many places. In chapter 12 of Il Principe, Machiavelli cites Rome and Sparta as examples of cities which survived because they relied on their own citizen armies rather than on mercenaries, 'Stettono Roma e Sparta molti secoli armate e libere.' (p. 55). La Jessee may have transposed the adjective 'libre' to characterize Sparta's soldiers from Il Principe chapter 12. Indeed, the closeness of the verbal echoes of Machiavelli in La Jessee's quatrains suggests that the latter had the texts of Il Principe and the Discorsi to hand when working on La Philosophie morale et civile.

ii) In Part I, quatrain LX, La Jessee says that one must not wage war unless it is necessary,

Contre voysins, et loingtains adversaires,
Defendz tes droitz: mais jaçoit qu'amorcé,
N'arme jamais volontaire, ains forçé.
Justice suit les armes necessaires.

(p. 15).

The spirit of this quatrain is almost anti-Machiavellian in its desire for a defensive foreign policy: in Il Principe chapter 14 Machiavelli advises the Prince to train for war even during peacetime and
in the Discorsi, there is great admiration for Rome's expansionist policies. However, the last line of the quatrain echoes a sentence from Livy Book IX, I, quoted at least twice by Machiavelli. In Il Principe chapter 26, Machiavelli speaks of his dream of a united Italy which would rise up and drive out foreigners. Such a war would be just, he says, because it is necessary and he cites Livy,

Iustum enim est bellum quibus necessarium, et pia arma ubi nulla nisi in armis spes est.

(p. 103).

In the Discorsi III, 12, he again cites this sentence and says,

Sicché questa necessità è chiamata da Tito Livio 'ultimum ac maximum telum.'

(p. 428).

Though the idea was commonplace in medieval and Renaissance times that a just war once established as such was a necessary war, it does seem to have been linked in the latter part of the sixteenth century with Machiavelli in particular. In Le Theatre de France, Charles de Boss says,

N'est-ce pas mesmement une des maximes de Machiavel où il dit, que la guerre est juste qui est necessaire, et les armes raisonnables, quand on ne peut avoir esperance d'ailleurs?

(p. 43).

In the Bibliotheca Selecta, Antonio Possevino remarks that there would be wars all the time if rulers adopted Machiavelli's definition of the just war. The only legitimate reasons for war, says Possevino, are to restore religion or peace,

Neque enim quidquam perniciosius effari poterat, quam quum bell i justitiam in ea, quam quisque putat sibi esse necessitatem, statuat.

(p. 44).

Innocent Gentillet opposes Machiavelli's definition of the just war in his Discours contre N. Machiavel (ed. cit), Part III, I. Like his contemporaries, La Jessee may have been prompted into reflecting on this sentence from Livy by his reading of Machiavelli.
iii) In Part I, quatrain LXVII, La Jessee says,

L'aspre Discord les Estatz bouleverse;
Espand le sang, sacage les Citez,
Occit le Peuple: et rend inhabitez
Tous les Pays que sa rage traverse.
(p. 16).

Despite the accusations of sixteenth century writers such as Gentillet and Matthieu, Machiavelli never approves of divisions within States. In Discorsi III, 27, he discusses 'come e' non è vera quella opinione, che, a tenere le città bisogni tenerle divise.' In Il Principe chapter 20, page 86 (quoted in my chapter on Pierre Matthieu p. 70), he says that keeping cities divided may have worked in earlier times, but it is not a good policy for modern rulers. Both Machiavelli and La Jessee are agreed that discord within a State leads to war and the eventual downfall of the State. La Jessee obviously had before him the example of France, weakened and divided by many years of civil discord.

In Part I, quatrain XI, La Jessee says that a ruler should not add to the factions in his country by arming himself against his subjects,

Ligue, ou Discord, ne te fera tant craindre,
Que tes Subjectz il faille contr' armer.
Fol qui chez soy tel feu vient allumer,
Qu'il pourra bien atiser, non esteindre.
(p. 7).

In Il Principe chapter 20 where Machiavelli describes the dangers of keeping a city divided, he also advises the ruler against disarming his subjects. If a Prince disarms his subjects, says Machiavelli, their hatred is aroused and the Prince is forced to arm himself with mercenaries against his own subjects - 'contr' armer' as La Jessee puts it.

Non fu mai, adunque, che uno principe nuovo disarmassi e' sua sudditi; anzi, quando li ha trovati disarmati, li ha sempre armati; perché, armandosi, quelle arme diventono tua, diventono fedeli quelli che ti sono sospetti, e quelli che erano fedeli si mantengono, e di sudditi si fanno tua partigiani... Ma, quando tu li disarmi, tu cominci ad offeniderli, monstri che tu abbi in loro diffidenzia o per viltà o per poca fede: e l'una e l'altra di queste opinioni concepe odio contro di te. E
Machiavelli reveals the chain of circumstances which may lead a ruler to arm himself against his own subjects, a policy which he opposes.

La Jessee may well have used _Il Principe_ chapter 20 for the second time as the source for a quatrain, or he may merely have been looking back over the events of the civil wars when the activities of the Catholic League obliged first Henry III and then Henry IV to arm themselves against a section of their own subjects. La Jessee may have in mind Henry III's action in summoning Swiss mercenaries into Paris in 1588 to protect himself against his own subjects - an event which led to the 'Day of the Barricades', Henry's flight from Paris and the assassination of the Guises at Blois. Truly, Henry III 'lit a fire that could not be put out' by bringing in mercenaries against his own subjects. As Machiavelli would have predicted, the mercenary troops were not strong enough to protect the King from his 'sudditi sospetti' and many deserted him to help the Parisians instead. Both Machiavelli and La Jessee agree on the folly of arming oneself against one's own subjects.

iv) In Part I, quatrain XCII, La Jessee gives the following advice to a ruler,

> Preven le mal! roigne l'aesle croissante  
> Au fier Aiglet, l'ongle au jeune Lion. 
> Avant le cours d'une Rebellion, 
> Opprime aussi sa ligue encor naissante.

(p. 20).

Machiavelli frequently advises his Prince to eliminate all opposition to his rule, especially at the beginning of his reign when the Prince should kill off any supporters of the old form of government in order to prevent a future rebellion. In the _Discorsi_, Machiavelli says that a
State should make constitutional provisions for the control of ambitious men (Discorsi I, 50; 11, 19; III, I), as Rome created the tribunes of the plebs which checked the ambitions of the nobles as well as of the plebs themselves. It is the ambition of the nobles which must be guarded against in particular, says Machiavelli in Il Principe chapter 9 and Discorsi I, 55. In Discorsi I, 37, he says,

"è tanta l'ambizione de' grandi, che, se per varie vie ed in vari modi ella non è in una città sbattuta, tosto riduce quella città alla rovina sua."

(p. 218).

In Discorsi III, 28 ('Che si debbe por mente alle opere de' cittadini, perché molte volte sotto una opera pia si nasconde uno principio di tirannide'), Machiavelli gives an instance of the Roman Senate foreseeing the growing ambition of a citizen and putting a stop to it before it caused any harm to the Republic. During a famine at Rome, Spurius Maelius, a very wealthy man, had distributed to the plebs some of his own private supply of corn,

"Per la quale cosa egli ebbe tanto concorso di popolo in suo favore che il Senato, pensando allo inconveniente che di quella sua liberalità poteva nascere, per opprimerla avanti che la pigliasse più forze, gli creò uno Dittatore addosso e fecelo morire."

(p. 463).

He warns that,

"la reputazione de' cittadini è cagione della tirannide delle republiche. E volendo regolare questa cosa, bisogna ordinarsi talmente che i cittadini siano reputati di reputazione che giovì e non nuoca alla città ed alla libertà di quella. E però si debbe esaminare i modi con i quali e' pigliano reputazione... Debbe pertanto una republica bene ordinata aprire le vie come è detto, a chi cerca favori per vie publiche, e chiuderle a chi li cerca per vie private."

(pp. 463-464).

The emphasis on the necessity of checking ambition before it can bring rebellion and disorder to a State, that is, on the necessity of foreseeing the dangers of someone acquiring too great a reputation, is the same in both La Jessee and Machiavelli. In Discorsi I, 52, Machiavelli gives examples of men (Cosimo de' Medici, Mark Anthony) who gained power and
brought discord into their State because their ambitions were not checked at an early stage.

La Jessee is perhaps looking back here from the vantage point of the relative stability of 1595 to the origins of the Catholic League and wondering whether it would have been possible to have restrained the ambitions of the Lorraines at the outset and thus to have avoided the long period of civil war in France.

v) In Part II, quatrain LXIII, La Jessee says,

Prince de Peuple, ou Chef d'une Cité,
Pour le party d'un plus fort ne se ligue,
A fin de nuire: un secours si prodigue,
Doit sa contrainte à la Nécessité.

(p. 33).

In Il Principe chapter 21, Machiavelli says,

E qui è da notare, che uno principe debbe avvertire di non fare mai compagnia con uno più potente di sé per offendere altri, se non quando la necessità lo stringe, come di sopra si dice; perché, vincendo, rimani suo prigione: e li principi debbono fuggire quanto possono lo stare a discrezione di altri.

(p. 92).

La Jessee echoes Machiavelli's advice here closely and even verbally. He may be thinking of the League's attempts to ally with Spain or, now that France had a strong leader in the person of Henry IV, La Jessee is perhaps realizing in retrospect the potential danger to France as a nation if Alençon's alliances with England and Germany had succeeded in allowing those countries to gain a foothold in France.

vi) In Part II, quatrain XCVII, La Jessee stresses the importance of a State being built on good foundations,

Comme sans baze on void cheoir lourdement
Un grand Colosse, accablé de sa charge:
Ainsi sur soy son poidz mesme descharge
L'Estat haussé, s'il n'a bon fondement.

(p. 39).
Machiavelli frequently emphasises the importance of a State having good foundations and he defines these as consisting of strong laws and strong defences. In *Il Principe* chapter 12, he says,

> Noi abbiamo detto di sopra come a uno principe è necessario avere e' sua fondamenti buoni; altrimenti conviene che rovini. E' principali fondamenti che abbino tutti li stati, così nuovi, come vecchi o misti, sono le buone legge e le buone arme. (p. 53).

Machiavelli's stress on the importance of laws is unique: many writers, for example, Bodin in *Les Six Livres de la République*, Book IV, base the stability of a country on its laws, but they do not state that laws reinforce virtue. In the *Institutio* chapter 6, Erasmus says that laws should not be relied upon to foster virtue (or only as a last resort).

In *Discorsi* I, 16, Machiavelli praises the founder of the French state, Charlemagne, for building his kingdom on a sound constitution (see also *Il Principe* chapter 19). In *Discorsi* II, I and III, 8, he praises the original constitution of Rome which enabled her to endure for so long. Indeed, concern for basing the State on solid foundations is one of the main elements in the genesis of *Il Principe*. In *Discorsi* I, 58, he says,

> i principi sono superiori a' popoli nello ordinare leggi, formare vite civili, ordinare statuti ed ordini nuovi. (p. 265).

He believes that to organise a constitution and base the State on solid foundations should be the work of one man of exceptional 'virtù' - the type of man who possesses the ability to follow the methods prescribed in *Il Principe*. In echoing Machiavelli here, La Jessee has reached the heart of the Italian writer's thought:

> There remain two further quatrains in *La Philosophie morale et civile* where, although the sentiments expressed are commonplace in classical and Renaissance literature, the thought also coincides with ideas found in Machiavelli. It is perhaps worth discussing them here in view of La Jessee's
detailed use of Machiavelli in other quatrains for he may have been aware
that the Italian author had also dealt with these topics.

vii) In Part II, quatrain LX, La Jessee says,

Ne reduy point jusqu'à l'extremité,
Ton Ennemy; s'il offre obeyssance.
Le Desespoir est voysin de Puissance,
Ire, et Dепit, l'est de Necessitez.

(p. 33).

This is a commonplace in writings on military affairs: it is found for
example, in Gargantua chapter XLI. But it is also supported by
Machiavelli, for example in Discorsi III, 12 ('Come uno capitano prudente
debbe imporre ogni necessità di combattere a' suoi soldati, e, a quegli
degli inimici torlă'), he says that armies fight better when constrained
by necessity,

...conosciuta adunque dagli antichi capitani degli eserciti
la virtū di tale necessità, e quanto per quella gli animi de'
soldati diventavano ostinati al combattere, facevano ogni opera
perché i soldati loro fussero constretti da quella; e dall' altra parte
usavono ogni industria perché gli nimici se ne
liberassero:... Quello adunque che desidera o che una cittā
si defenda ostinamente o che uno esercito in campagna
ostinatamente combatta, debbe sopra ogni altra cosa ingegnarsi
di mettere ne' petti di chi ha a combattere, tale necessità.

(pp. 425-426).

Livy (Book IV) gives Vettius Messus's speech to his army where he says
that his men are equal to the enemy,

virtute pares, quae ultimum et maximum telum est, necessitate
superiores estis.

This speech is in fact quoted by Machiavelli in Discorsi III, 12. However,
unlike La Jessee and Machiavelli, Livy does not draw out the rule that
one should not allow the enemy to despair. Like La Jessee, Machiavelli
prefers that a captain encourage the enemy to surrender if possible rather
than reducing him to the despair which may make him fight all the better,

Debbe adunque uno capitano,... quando egli assalta una
terra, con ogni diligenza ingegnarsi di levare, a' difensori
di quella, tale necessità, e per conseguenza tale ostinazione,
promettendo perdono se gli hanno paura della pena, e se gli avessono paura della libertà, mostrare di non andare contro al comune bene ma contro a pochi ambiziosi della città.

(p. 427).

The idea that necessity and despair engender valour in an army has an important place in Machiavelli's military theories and it may be that La Jessee based his quatrain on the Italian author rather than using other classical or Renaissance sources.

viii) In Part I, quatrain LXXIX, La Jessee extols the merit of giving rewards quickly,

Ouvre au besoin ta grand' main tresoriere.
Qui donne tost, ses dons sçait ordonner,
Qui donne tard, vend plutot, que donner:
L'achapt en est l'instance, ou la priere.

(p. 18).

Likewise, in the second book of Les Jeunesses he stresses the importance of bestowing benefits speedily,

Celuy qui donne tost, donne deus fois ensemble.
Comme dit volontiers un proverbe Romain:
Et ne faire aujourd'huy pour attendre à demain,
Puis à demain encor, c'est abus ce me semble...
Le bien qui tost se fait, double se va nommant:
Veus-tu donc en effait ta promesse ainsi mettre?
Fay tost, et tu feras deus biens ensemblement.

(p. 77).

As La Jessee remarks, the expression 'bis dat qui cito dat' was proverbial, but it is perhaps worth pointing out that Machiavelli also advises rulers not to delay in conferring benefits. In Discorsi I, 32 ("Una republica o uno principe non debbe differire a beneficare gli uomini nelle sue necessitadi"). Machiavelli says that when rewards are given because the ruler could not do otherwise, the recipients will not be at all grateful. The Roman Senators were fortunate, he says, since although they rewarded the plebs out of necessity, because they needed their help against an external enemy, the populace remained loyal to them, but he warns,
non sia alcuno che, confidatosi in questo esempio, differisca ne' tempi de' pericoli a guadagnarsi il popolo; però che mai gli riuscirà quello che riuscì ai Romani. Perché l'universale giudicherà non avere quel bene da te, ma dagli avversari tuoi; e dovendo temere che, passata la necessità, tu ritolga loro quello che hai forzatamente loro dato, non arà teco obbligo alcuno.

(p. 205).

Machiavelli often stresses the importance of conferring benefits wisely (Discorsi I, 24) and the necessity for a government to avoid the vice of ingratitude (Discorsi I, 28, 29, 30). In Il Principe chapter 8, he says,

e' benefizii si debbono fare a poco a poco, accio che si assaporino meglio... perché, venendo per li tempi avversi, le necessità, tu non se' a tempo al male, et il bene che tu fai non ti giova, perché è indicato forzato, e non te n'è saputo grado alcuno.

(p. 44).

La Jessee may have had in mind the importance of this precept in Machiavelli's works when he wrote quatrain LXXIX.

La Jessee was one of the more discerning sixteenth century French readers of Machiavelli. Several times in La Philosophie morale et civile he echoes or opposes the most fundamental theories of the Italian author, such as, the four methods a ruler may use to gain power, the necessity for a State to have strong foundations and the importance of a country's constitution containing within itself the necessary machinery to check the self-interested ambition of any of its citizens. He appears to have composed his quatrains with Il Principe and the Discorsi at his elbow, verbally echoing Machiavelli's ideas, particularly, perhaps, when he felt their applicability to events which had taken place in France over the past few years.

La Jessee's early hostility to Machiavelli in the Odes-Satyres was rather superficial, being motivated largely by his political sympathies. Yet this superficial anti-Machiavellianism in the Odes-Satyres reveals his originality in that in a genre where he is imitating the satirical poems
of Ronsard and Du Bellay, La Jessee nevertheless manages to introduce a new note of anti-Machiavellian sentiment into the anti-courtier and anti-Italian satire of the earlier writers — he is not merely a servile imitator of the Pleïade school. Similarly, in *La Philosophie morale et civile*, he uses a genre already successfully employed by Pibrac but lifts it out of traditional moral philosophy with its rather conservative, abstract view of politics and brings it into the realm of practical politics through his imitation of Machiavelli. Indeed it is striking to see such utilitarian advice in a genre usually devoted to philosophical reflections on life. He himself put his practical aim alongside his moral purpose in the introduction to *La Philosophie morale et civile*,

> J'ay curieusement diversifié pour l'édification, et l'utilité publique, ce nouveau Recueil de sentences Moralles. (p. 3).

By the time of the composition of *La Philosophie morale et civile* La Jessee appears to have gained a certain detachment from the political struggle going on around him and his attitude to Machiavelli could be more objective than in the *Odes-Satyres*. He is able to separate the advice in Machiavelli which he found useful for political and military matters and for historical analysis, from the underlying philosophy of politics which La Jessee believed was immoral and irreligious and therefore unlikely to succeed in the long term since it was opposed to Christian teaching. The development of his attitude from early superficial hostility towards Machiavelli, to a more objective and balanced approach, may be compared with the similar evolution of the authors discussed in the previous two chapters, Pierre Matthieu and Estienne Jodelle.


4. In the *Regrets* no. 95, Du Bellay laments 'le François corrompu par le vice estranger', and specifically names the Italians (p. 168). He describes the dissimulation which is necessary at the Roman court for example, in nos. 85, 86, 115 and 127 - 'Icy de mille fards la traison se desguise' (p. 201). In the *Elegie d'Amour*, he says that he will not dissimulate in love, 'car je suis ny Tuscan, ny Lombard' (Jeux Rustiques, vol. V of the Chamard edition, p. 79). It is not necessary to postulate reaction to Machiavelli here.

5. The dissimulation of Italians is mentioned by Claude de Trelon in *'Sonnets de l'Auteur durant sa prison à Thuring* (in *Le Ligueur Repenty*, Lyons, 1595, (BN Rés Ye 4936), IX and X). It is not certain, however, that de Trelon is directly attacking Machiavelli, see chapter 10, pp. 67a-iv.


> Il me fâche de voir les hommes estrangers,  
> Changeurs, postes, plaisans, usuriers, mensongers,  
> Qui n'ont ny la vertu ny la science aprise,  
> Posséder au jourd'hui tous les biens de l'Eglise:  
> De la sont procedés tant d'abus infinis,  
> Et tu les vois, ô Dieu, et tu ne les punis!  
> Et nous, sacré tropeau des Muses, qui ne sommes  
> Usuriers, ny trompeurs, ny assassineurs d'hommes,  
> Qui portons Jesuchrist dans le cueur aresté,  
> Ne sommes avansés sinon de pauvreté.  


7. See chapters 9 and 10. For more on anti-courtier satire and its links with opposition to Machiavelli, see my chapter on *Des Masures*, pp. 124-5.

8. As in D'Aubigné and Pont-Aymery - see my chapters on these two poets.
9. The fox and lion image occurs frequently in French political literature of the later sixteenth century, probably partly due to popular knowledge of II Principe. It became customary to accuse one's political opponents, particularly, perhaps, Henry III, of acting with fox-like cunning. See my chapter on Pierre Matthieu, note 4.3.

10. This sonnet is nearly identical to that dedicated to Villeroy in Les Jeunesses, Book I, p. 3.

11. Déclaration de Monseigneur le Duc d'Alençon, faicte le 18 de Septembre, 1575, (BL 1193 c 4 (2)), p. 137.

12. Brieve Remonstrance à la Noblesse de France sur le fait de la Déclaration de Monseigneur le Duc d'Alençon, 1576, (BL 1193 c 4 (2)).


15. For Bodin's knowledge of Machiavelli as displayed in his Methodus and Les Six Livres de la République, see the informative article by G. Cardascia, 'Machiavel et Jean Bodin', BHR, III, (1943), pp. 129-167.

16. La Philosophie morale et civile, Paris, 1595, (BN Rés p Ye 383), p. 3.

17. s.l., 1590, (BL 1192 g 5), p. 14. For contemporary propaganda against the 'politiques' as irreligious see La Description du politique de nostre temps par un gentilhomme françois, Paris, 1588, (BL G 15441) and the allegorical portrait of a 'politique' in the Recueil de l'Estoile (F 1a) reproduced by K. Cameron in his study of Aspects of the Satirical Iconography of Henri de Valois, Exeter, 1978, pp. 73-76.


21. Advis aux catholiques françois, sur l'importance de ce qui treflace aujourd'hui sur l'irresolution de quelques scrupuleux ..., Paris, 1589, (BL 3900 a 60), p. 13. The author is probably Pierre Matthieu, see my chapter on that writer, p. 3. 4. For more links between Machiavelli and the 'politiques', see the epistle to the reader in P. Ribadeneira, Princeps Christianus adversus Nicolaum Machiavellum, caeterosq. (1603), Les Meurs, Humeurs et Comportemens de Henri de Valois ... (attributed to A. de Rossant), Paris, 1589, (BL 14028), p. 37, and Le Politique. Dialogue traictant de la puissance, autorité et du devoir des Princes ..., (in Mémoires de l'Estat de France sous Charles IX, attributed to S. Goulart, Middelbourg, 1578, (BL 283 b 7-9), vol. I, 68v). See also S. Mastellone, Venalità e Machiavellismo in Francia (1572-1610), Florence, 1972, especially chapters 4-7.


23. Such as the Larmes et Regretz of 1584 and the Odes-Satyres no. 5.

25. La Philosophie morale et civile, Paris, 1595, (BN Rép p Ye 383), p. 5. This is the edition used throughout this chapter.

26. See the following quatrains (LXXVIII) where La Jèsee says that power and valour are nothing without prudence. And compare Ronsard's Institution pour l'Adolescence du Roy Treschrestien Charles Neufviesme de ce Nom (in Discours des Misères de ce Temps, ed. Malcolm Smith, Geneva, 1979, p. 52, l. 13-26). Here, Ronsard may be intentionally opposing Machiavelli (see my chapter on Ronsard, pp.516-517).

27. See chapter 10 of this thesis, pp.547-548 on Du Bartas for another example of a French poet using the chapter titles of II Principe.

28. He signs himself with this in for example, La Rochelleide (1573) and in the Nouveau Discours sur le siege de Sanserre (1573).

29. See also the Discours au Roy (in Larmes et Regretz, p. 6) and Les Meslanges (p. 615) for a recurrence of this traditional idea that God chooses and guides Kings.

30. For another comparison between Hannibal and Scipio, see II Principe ch. 17. Livy describes the clemency of Scipio (Book XXVII) and the cruelty of Hannibal (Book XXI) but he does not compare the two figures and there is no suggestion that the extremity of their characters was outweighed by their excessive 'virtù'.

31. See also Discorsi I, 24 for mention of Manlius's calumny which caused his downfall.

32. See my discussion on Fortune in the chapter on D'Aubigné, pp.284-288.


34. This chapter of the Discorsi is based on events described in Livy Book V from which Machiavelli draws his title,

Adeo obcaecat animos fortuna, cum vim suam ingruentem refringi non vult.
(Book V, 37).

The philosophy is Machiavelli's own, however, and in view of the verbal echo of the Italian author, it is probable that La Jèsee is following Machiavelli here rather than Livy.


36. See for example, Ronsard's Complainte contre Fortune (in Le Second Livre des Meslanges, 1559, in vol. X of the Laumonier 'critical' edition), where Fortune is depicted as a woman playing with men's hopes. Ronsard, however, was also familiar with Machiavelli's description of Fortune, see below note 38.

37. Premieres Oeuvres Françoyses, ed. cit., vol. IV, p. 1483. According to Randle Cotgrave (A Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues, London, 1611) the verb 'rembarrer' means 'to restrain' or (nearer the image in Machiavelli) 'to knock, to thump'.
38. Ronsard was another poet who borrowed Machiavelli's image of Fortune as a woman who prefers young men to old, see Discours des Misères, ed. cit., p. 249 and see note to 1. 118-119.

39. This idea is found in other classical authors such as Tacitus (Book II, 24) and Cicero (Philippics V, XII). See my chapter on the La Taille brothers pp. 422-423 for a fuller discussion of this theme in Machiavelli.


41. See for example, Discorsi I, 21 and 43 and II Principe ch. 12.

42. See M. J. Heath, Attitudes in French writing of the sixteenth century towards a Turkish war, University of Wales Ph.D. thesis, 1977, Part II.

43. Le Théâtre de France, auquel est contenu la resolution sur chacun doubt, qui a retenu la Noblesse de se joindre à l'Union Catholique, Paris, 1589, (BN Lb 70/), p. 38. De Boss does not seem to know that this idea originated in Livy.

44. Rome, 1593, (BL 819 m 1), Book I, p. 128.

45. See my chapter on D'Aubigné pp. 392-394 for a discussion of this misreading of Machiavelli by French authors.

46. See Discorsi II, 30 where the dangers of depriving one's people of arms are again discussed.

47. For the importance of laws in Machiavelli's concept of the State, see J. H. Whitfield, Discourses on Machiavelli, Cambridge, 1969, chapter VIII.


49. See also Discorsi II, 12, 'quella necessità fa virtù, come più volte abbiamo detto' (p. 309) and Discorsi, II, 8 where he says that a group of people forced by necessity to leave their own lands make a very formidable army to oppose when they seek to invade another country,

Sono pertanto questi popoli formidolosissimi, sendo cacciati da una ultima necessità; e se e' non riscontrano buone armi, non mai saranno sostenuti.

(p. 299).

50. It is found amongst others, in Seneca, see Erasmus's Adagiorum opus, s.l., 1558, (BL 12304 1 20), pp. 284-285.
Life of Louis Des Masures

The chief source for our knowledge of Louis Des Masures's eventful life is his own poems, in particular the long poems to Ronsard, Joachim Du Bellay and Charles, Cardinal of Lorraine. He was born around 1515 at Tournai in Belgium and entered the service of Cardinal Jean de Lorraine in 1533. This allowed him to frequent the group of writers and humanists who lived at the court of Francis I, such as Clément Marot, Jacques Péletier du Mans and François Rabelais. On the request of Cardinal Jean de Lorraine he began translating the first two books of the Aeneid and his translation appeared in 1547. His life at this time seemed set in the pattern typical of those writers living at the French court in the middle of the sixteenth century and he appears to have been successful in establishing his reputation as a poet for he tells us that even Francis I deigned to listen to his poetry on occasion.

However, a change came in 1547: Des Masures had taken part in the wars against the Emperor Charles V and was accused of betraying French secrets to the Imperial leaders. He strenuously denied the charge, believing that it was jealousy of his success at court which had prompted the accusation, but Henry II demanded his banishment from court. This event completely altered Des Masures's life since from now on he was forced to lead the wandering life of an exile. In his poem A Joachim Du Bellay he says,

Le sort, l'envie et le malheur,
Sans cause ou merite, en souffrance
Me firent traverser grand erre
Meinte mer, meinte estrange terre.
(Oeuvres Poétiques, ed. cit., p. 19).

In the Hymne Chretien, he describes himself as

Fuyant la furieuse envie
Des malins poursuivans ma vie.
(Oeuvres Poétiques, ed. cit., p. 44).
He fled to Italy via Switzerland and Sicily, and spent fourteen months in the entourage of Cardinal Jean Du Bellay at Rome. He dedicated his translation of the third book of the Aeneid to his new patron. In November 1549, with the death of Pope Paul III, the Cardinals assembled at Rome to elect a successor and Des Masures was reunited with Cardinal Jean de Lorraine who promised to take him back to France and re-establish him in Henry II's favour. However, the death of Cardinal Jean de Lorraine near Lyons in May 1550 put an end to these plans. Once again Des Masures had to flee France, this time to Nancy, where he entered the service of Christine of Denmark, niece of Charles V.

On his way back to France with the late Cardinal Jean de Lorraine's entourage, Des Masures had broken his journey for a few days in order to have talks with Beza and Calvin in Lausanne and Geneva. This is the first indication we have of Des Masures's leanings towards the Reformed faith. He had probably known Beza in Paris since they had both frequented the same literary circles at the French court. It was during his stay at Geneva that the possibility of a collaboration between Beza and Des Masures in translating the Psalms into French was first discussed. Before his death, Jean de Lorraine had asked Des Masures to begin a translation of those Psalms not dealt with by Marot. Hearing that Des Masures had already embarked upon this work, Beza probably took the opportunity to encourage Des Masures to continue.

In the edition of the Correspondance de Théodore de Bèze begun by F. Aubert and H. Meylan, the bearer of a letter from Beza to Calvin is said to be Louis Des Masures. If this is so, it is an important document for knowledge of Des Masures's life since in it, we first learn of his growing sympathy with the cause of the Reformers. Beza describes the bearer of the letter in the following terms:
Beza continues his letter by describing the project of dividing up the translation of the Psalms between himself and the bearer of the letter,

Vertit psalmos aliquot, feliciter quidem ut opinor. Novi enim pridem quantum in eo scribendi genere valeat. Itaque hunc vertendi laborer cum eo partiri institui, si modo id tibi probetur.

Beza's reference to that type of writing probably refers to translation and is presumably an allusion to Des Masures's translation of the Aeneid which had already earned him quite a considerable reputation in the eyes of his contemporaries (see below p.307). Beza hopes that the bearer of the letter will very soon become a member of the Reformed Church and in one of his poems, Des Masures describes how Beza urged him to break with the Catholic Church over a period of several years. In the dedication of the Vingt-Six Cantiques chantés au Seigneur (published in 1564) Des Masures acknowledges his debt to Beza who, he says, encouraged him in his adherence to the Reformed Church,

Tu m'enhortes de suivre et fermement tenir
La vérité certaine...
Quantes et quantes fois ay-je depuis esté
Par toy fidelement encore admonesté
De mon juste devoir? Tes lettres tant exquises
M'en sont comme un tresor de richesses acquises.

It does seem, therefore, that Beza helped in bringing about Des Masures's conversion though in fact Des Masures did not openly declare his adherence to the Reformation till 1558. This poem confirms that Des Masures early began to lean towards the ideas of the Reformers and Beza's letter to Calvin may indeed be referring to Des Masures.
There are some interesting parallels between the lives of these two Reformers, Beza and Des Masures. Like Des Masures, Beza till his flight to Geneva in 1548, had seemed set for a life at the French court cultivating literary acquaintances and writing in the humanist vein. Like Des Masures, Beza's open adherence to the Reformation was finally prompted, after much hesitation, by an illness (in this case, his own). For both writers, their conversion affected their literary style to some extent: both gradually moved away from the use of pagan mythology and the Pleiade's conception of poetry, in order to write on religious subjects (though Beza retained a secret affection for his youthful Poemata and continued to work on them after his adoption of the Reformed faith). Both set their dramas in the framework of the medieval mystery plays, and used their personal experiences as part of their propaganda for the Reformation.

Beza mentions Des Masures by name in a French postscript to a letter to Farel (dated November 4, 1554),

\begin{quote}
Ce petit mot à la haste pour monsieur de Dompmartin, s'il vous plaist. C'est que j'ay entendu que des Masures estoit malade et en grand danger de la mort. Je le prie d'avoir souvenance de mon affaire par ses amys de par dela, s'il s'offre quelque bonne occasion. Car peult estre que Nostre Seigneur luy aura touché le cuer en sa necessité.14
\end{quote}

The 'affaire' probably refers to the translation of the Psalms by Des Masures which Beza was still awaiting: it was finally published in 1557. The reason for the delay may have been Des Masures's reluctance to compete with Beza or, more probably, the constraints imposed by his position at the Catholic court of Christine of Denmark.15 It is almost certain that Des Masures collaborated with Beza in his work on the Psalms, for although the two collections were published separately (Beza's translation of thirty-four of the Psalms appeared in 1551) Des Masures has, with the exception of two of the Psalms, avoided translating those already dealt with by Beza.16
In exile in Nancy, Des Masures often complains of being cut off from the society of other writers, yet Du Bellay and Ronsard continued to address poems to him in exile (see below p.202) and another of the Pléiade poets, Rémont Belleau, visited him at Nancy (see Des Masures's sonnet to Ronsard in the Laumonier 'critical' edition of Ronsard's works, vol. X, p. 162). Des Masures collaborated with Ronsard, Du Bellay, Belleau, Peletier and others in translating verses from Latin for Pierre de la Ramée's new edition of Dialectique (published in 1555).

Although he claims to be missing the intellectual stimulation of the French court, Des Masures continued to publish works during his stay in Nancy. 17 1552 saw the first edition of Des Masures's translation of the first four books of the Aeneid. 18 In 1553 he was ennobled by Christine of Denmark in gratitude for the various minor political duties and missions he had performed on behalf of the house of Lorraine. 19 His Oeuvres Poétiques were published in Lyons in 1554 and a second edition appeared in 1557. 20 Also published in 1557 at Lyons were his collection of Latin poems, Ludovici Masurii Nervii Carmina, 21 his Vingt Pseaumes de David, Traduits selon la Verité Hebraïque 22 and his translation of Vida's poem Le Jeu des Eschez. 23 In 1558 he published his Hymne sur la justice de Metz at Toulouse and in the same year Du Bellay's sonnet praising Des Masures's translation of the Aeneid appeared. 24 In 1559, Des Masures published his Chant pastoral sur le partement de France et la bienvenue en Lorraine de Mgr. Charles Duc de Lorraine et de Mme. Claude de France son épouse, part of a series of official poems he composed for the Lorraine family which give no hint of his Protestant sympathies and which continue to use pagan literary models. 25

The complete translation of the Aeneid was published finally in 1560. 26 More than all his other works, it was Des Masures's translation of the Aeneid which established his reputation in the eyes of his contemporaries and he was often known only as the translator of Virgil. 27
He revised his translation between 1554 and 1560 deliberately in order to keep up with literary tastes.  

Des Masures's statement that the Muses were a consolation to him in exile is thus borne out by the number of works he published during his stay in Nancy. But his life there was shortly to be disturbed. Around 1558 his name begins to be linked more closely with that of other Reformers in Lorraine and, largely prompted by the shock of his son's near death, he began to make an open confession of the Reformed faith. He moved to Saint-Nicolas-du-Port which was one of the three semi-secret Protestant communities within the Catholic province of Lorraine. He frequented the company of other Reformers such as Francis Hotman whose career as a militant propagandist for the Reformers' cause was shortly to begin with the publication in 1560 of the Epistre envoiée au tigre de la France.

Des Masures's former acquaintances in Paris seem to have been not unaware of the change in his views for in his Elegie à Des Masures of 1560, Ronsard reproaches the Reformers for their attacks on his poetry and indirectly criticises Des Masures for siding with the Reformation. Despite their differences in religion, however, Ronsard and Des Masures appear to have remained on amicable terms: in 1560, he changed the dedication of his Hymne de la Mort to Des Masures and the year before, in his sonnet A Louys des Masures (published in Le Second Livre des Meslanges in 1559), Ronsard had expressed his regret that Des Masures, along with other writers, had been forced into exile,

Ah, que je suis marry, qu'encore ne demeure
En France ce troupeau divinement apris,
Qui sous le Roy François pour emporter le prix
Chantoit à qui mieux d'une Muse meilleure!
Pour une opinion de Baize est delogé,
Tu as par faux raport durement voyagé,
Et Peletier le docte a vagué comme Ulysse...
Ronsard seems to have been the poet whose literary influence Des Masures most missed in exile (see Discours à Ronsard, pp. 159-160 and his two sonnets to Ronsard, pp. 161-162).

Des Masures became more and more involved with the activities of the Reformers at Saint-Nicolas-du-Port until, in 1562, along with other Reformers from that community, he was obliged to flee from an attack by the Duke of Lorraine's troops. The attack followed the performance of a baptism at Saint-Nicolas by the Reformers. Their activities had been betrayed to the Duke by an informant whom Des Masures was later to compare with the figure of Doeg in the Tragedies Sainctes. In the dedicatory epistle of the Tragedies Sainctes, Des Masures compares himself to David who in the play is

...poursuivi de Saul, qui avec
L'avis et faux rapport du malheureux Doeg
Oppresse l'innocent ...

He defends the Reformers of Saint-Nicolas in the Epistre à Madame la duchesse where he lists the accusations against them and defends them against the charge of political rebellion (ed. cit., pp. 8-9). As in the Tragedies Sainctes, he compares himself to David in his zeal for God (p. 8) and ends by telling Claude de France to warn her husband, the Duke, against Doeg and other flatterers who lead Princes astray (pp. 26-28). There is also a reference to this episode in Des Masures's poem Babylone, where he describes how the frightened Israelites (representing the Reformers) have to be on their guard lest

...quelque faux attrapeur
Descouvrist et cogneust leur fidele asserlee.

Des Masures and his family (he had married twice whilst at Nancy) finally settled at Metz where there were numerous Reformers. He abandoned pagan literary models definitively and increased his preaching and writing in defence of the Reformers until, at the end of 1562, he was ordained pastor. He now began to write militant propaganda in favour of
the Reformers, even in poems dedicated to Catholics. For example, his Eclogue spirituelle sur l'enfance de Monseigneur Henri, Marquis du Pont announces the triumph of the Reformers' cause, the end of discord between Reformers and Catholics and asks Henry's protection for Reformers.  

In 1564, he published a French translation of Beza's Bref Traité des sacremens en general.  

However, Des Masures's most important work in defence of the Reformers is his trilogy, the Tragedies Sainctes, first published at Geneva in 1563. His prefatory epistle to Philippe le Brun reveals his feelings at this time. We see his sorrow at being forced into exile,

...ainsi par force et guerre
Des malins, suis contraint d'abandonner ma terre,
Pour éviter de mort le poursuivant danger,
Emmenant avec moy en pays estranger,
Pour souffrir désormais des peines mille et mille,
Et vivre en dur exil, femme, enfans et famille.  

(ed. cit., p. 4).

We see his personal bitterness against the Lorraines whom he had served for so long and who had repaid him by forcing him out of Saint-Nicolas,

...le loyal service est en vain despendu
Souvent envers les Rois et grans seigneurs du monde,...
Ce qu'on peut voir en moy...
...à qui la recompense
Du servir de trente ans loyal, entier et pur,
Est aujourd'hui l'exil, indigne, amer et dur.  

(p. 8).

Des Masures identifies with the cause of the persecuted Reformers and is writing this trilogy to encourage them to be brave in the face of difficulties,

Or toy, mon Brun, mon frere, et moy, si en nous vit
La vraie et ferme foy, qui anima David,
A l'exemple de luy marchons de bon courage
Tout à travers du monde, encontre tout orage,
Nous asseurans en Dieu, dont la main nous a mis
Au combat, pour defaire en fin nos ennemis.  

(p. 10).

Like Beza, though later in the day, he announces his intention of giving up literature modelled on classical antiquity in favour of Biblical subjects.  He reiterated this intention the following year in
Epistre à Madame la Duchesse,

Ores, comme jadis, l'ordre je ne pratique
Des poètes menteurs. Mais autant que je puis,
En lieu qu'au vain mensonge adonné je me suis,
Je desire chanter désormais en mes vers
Dieu, le Dieu veritable, authore de l'univers.

(ed. cit., p. 25).

His stay at Metz was thus the turning-point in Des Mases' life as a Reformer: he became openly associated with their cause and began to be more militant in his attacks on the Catholic Church. The same year as the publication of his Tragedies Sainctes saw the publication at Geneva of the poem Babylone, ou la Ruine de la Grand Cité. Des Mases was writing at a time when the Reformers were confident of future success and one historian has described this poem as one of the most accomplished polemical and religious poems of the Reformation. It is a violent satire on the idolatry, atheism and ferocity of the Babylonians (representing the Roman Catholics) under the tyrannical leadership of 'la grande paillarde Babylonienne' (the Pope). It may have been inspired by Des Mases' own experiences (see above p.294) and by the start of the civil wars in France (the three brothers referred to (Bîr) are obviously the Coligny brothers).

Interestingly, there is a poem published in the Mémoires de l'Estat de France sous Charles IX which uses the Babylonians in a similar way, to represent the Catholic Church. The poem is written by a Reformer in defence of the Reformed Church and is signed with initials L.M.S. It is dated 1573 and seems to have been inspired by the Saint Bartholomew's Day Massacres. It is entitled Discours du Gouvernement et Estat de la Vraye Eglise. Although it cannot be definitely proved that this poem is by Des Mases (one would have expected for example, the initials L.M.T., that is Tournaisien, instead of S.), there are nevertheless certain points of similarity between this poem and Babylone: both begin with praise of God and his power to reduce his enemies to naught and to give
courage to the faithful; both describe the fate of Protestant martyrs in a similar way - they mention the tortures imposed on them and their cries to God in the midst of the flames; both use the Biblical imagery of the wolf and the sheep. In addition in the Discours, there is a reference to God protecting the faithful as he protected the Israelites against the Babylonians and, as in the Tragedies Sainctes, the Catholics are depicted as inspired by Satan (588r). The subject matter is thus typical of Des Masures and the style is of the same high standard as the Babylone poem. It may have been written either by Des Masures himself or by an imitator.

In 1567, persecution of the Reformers was renewed and Des Masures was obliged to leave Metz. After moving around for a while, he eventually settled in Alsace where he worked on his Latin epic describing the religious wars in France, Borboniades, sive de bello civili ob religionis causam in Gallia gesto. He finished this work in Basle where he spent a year (1572-1573) studying at the university. He returned to Alsace in 1574 and died there in June, leaving behind a reputation for his generosity to the poor and for his preaching.

An expanded edition of his Carmina was published at Basle in 1574. This had been revised by Des Masures before his death to reflect his open adherence to the Reformed faith. Despite the fact that he lived outside France for most of his life, Des Masures's work seems to have been popular in France in the sixteenth century. In his preface to the French translation of Les Oeuvres de Publie Virgile Maron (Paris, 1577), Claude Micard says that he has no need to recommend Des Masures to the reader since

l'autheur de soy mesme est assez cogneu d'un chacun...

That Des Masures sought as wide a public as possible is indicated by the fact that he translated much of his work into Latin.

Three other works have been attributed to Des Masures: the poem Dépucellage de la Ville de Tournay which he could not have written, and
the two tragedies Josias and Adonias both published under the pseudonym of 'M. Philone'. Josias was published in 1566 at the same place (Geneva) and by the same publisher (François Perrin) as Des Masures's poem Babylon and the second edition of his trilogy, Tragedies Sainctes (also published in 1566). The sub-title says that it has been 'Traduite d''Italien en François' and describes the play as a 'Vray miroir des choses advenues de nostre temps.' It is attributed by the BL and BN catalogues to Des Masures and also by Antoine Du Verdier in La Bibliothèque (1585) but the authorship has been much debated. Des-Masures had already used one pseudonym in Babylon and it is unlikely that he would choose another.

Josias is written for the most part in blank verse, which is unusual for French tragedy and does not reveal the same dramatic skill as the Tragedies Sainctes. There are, however, certain similarities with the latter: like the Tragedies Sainctes, Josias is a mixture of tragedy and mystery play and the author uses the description of the idolatrous worshippers of Baal to attack the Catholic Church. There are certain themes in Josias which recall the major preoccupations of Des Masures's own work - such as the anti-courtier tirade in Act II, in particular the warning against calumny where Kings are advised not to listen to ambitious courtiers but rather to the victims of calumny (this would have particular relevance to Des Masures's personal experiences). Dissimulation is condemned and the reciprocal duties of a King and his subjects are stressed.

Josias is aimed at the French rulers and shows the importance of a government based on the true religion: when Josias discovers the Word of God which has lain hidden for centuries, he removes the priests of Baal (representing the Catholics) and reforms his kingdom. Charles IX at the beginning of his reign was often compared to Josias, since the Reformers hoped that, with the removal of the Guises from power, they would be treated more leniently. In the play, Catherine de' Medici is represented by the figure of Idida and Michel de L'Hospital by Saphan. As with the
Tragedies Sainctes, Josias appears to be setting before Charles IX a
model of good rule at the outset of his reign.

All these themes have something in common with the Tragedies Sainctes
but I believe that it is unlikely that Des Masures wrote Josias. A
reissue of the latter play appeared at Geneva (published by Gabriel Cartier)
in 1583 and in 1586 Adonias was published at Lausanne by Jean Chiquelle.
This also bears the pseudonym 'M. Philone' and has a similar sub-title to
Josias - 'Vray Miroir, ou Tableau, et Patron de l'Estat des choses presets.'
It is extremely unlikely that Des Masures was the author of this play since
he died in 1574. Indeed apart from chronological considerations, the
verse in Adonias is so execrable that one wonders how it could have been
seriously attributed to Des Masures. Nor is the author necessarily the
same person who wrote Josias, though it is possible that the author wishing
to depict recent events in France (in particular, the problem of the
successor to Henry III), was influenced by the recent reissue of Josias
to use the same pseudonym. Adonias bears certain thematic resemblances to
the Tragedies Sainctes: the author may have believed in the common
attribution of Josias to Des Masures and in Adonias sought consciously to
imitate the latter's method of defending the Reformers' cause. By taking
as its subject David's death and the conflict between Solomon and Adonias
for the throne, Adonias completes Des Masures's trilogy on the life of
David.

The thematic resemblances between the Tragedies Sainctes and Adonias
are particularly relevant to our examination of the influence of
Machiavelli in these plays and will be dealt with in the following section
of this chapter. Although Des Masures was known in the sixteenth century
primarily as a translator and a poet, and indeed if it had not been for his
conversion he might never have written a play, yet it is as a dramatist
that he is mainly known today and it is his work as a playwright we will be
describing with reference to Machiavelli.
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Nicolas, contre leurs calomniateurs en la cause de l'Evangile, Lyons,

20. This is the edition in the BN (Rés Ye 366 and 420). Extracts from
some of these poems can be found in Gilles Corrozet's collection,
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Que pleust à Dieu que tant de bons espriz que je cognoy en France, en lieu de s'amuser à ces malheureuses inventions ou imitations de fantaisies vaines et deshonnestes, (si on
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(Abraham Sacrifiant ed. K. Cameron, K. M. Hall,
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41. In Beza's Abraham Sacrifiant, the idolatrous Babylonians similarly
represent Catholics (see the 'Cantique d'Abraham et de Sara',
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677 b 23 (l), p. 168). This is the second edition of the Poemata
published together with poems by George Buchanan. Another edition
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war (589v). The author says that 'Justice et pieté' have fled
leaving atheism behind (588v-589r). This is probably a reference to
the Massacres through which the author believes Charles IX lost the
right to his motto.
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excludes a mythological poem about the adultery between Mars and
Venus, and publishes new poems addressed to Beza, as well as attacks
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1584, p. 296).
50. Lebègue, op. cit., p. 343. There is a copy of this poem (s.l.n.d.) in the BN (Rés Ye 3823) where it is attributed to Des Masures. The titlepage, however, reveals that the poem was written in 1513.

51. The BN has a copy of Josias at Yf 6508, and the BL has one at 11408 aaa 18.

52. Lebègue (op. cit., p. 323) takes at face value the statement that it has been translated from Italian and believes that it was written by an Italian refugee living in Switzerland. Des Masures's authorship has been questioned by Forsyth (E), La Tragédie Françoise de Jodelle à Corneille (1553-1640), Paris, 1962, p. 171, note 6; by Jonker (G.O.), Le Protestantisme et le Théâtre de Langue française au XVIe siècle, Batavia, 1939, p. 121, and by Balmas (E), 'Note sul teatro riformato italiano del cinquecento: Josias, di M. Philone', Annali dell' Università di Padova, Facoltà di Lingue in Verona, serie II, vol. I, (1966-67), pp. 281-313.

53. Jonker, op. cit., p. 121, note 2, suggests that 'Philone' could be derived from the Greek 'philoneos' and is perhaps the pseudonym of a college principal.

54. For example, the tribe of Juda says,

Que le Roy se souvienne avoir plus d'une aureille,
Et qu'il en garde l'une au povre homme accusé,
Si à l'accusateur ouvrir l'autre appareille.

(ed. cit. p. 31).

I have used the edition in the BL (11408 aaa 18).

55. For the comparison of Charles IX with Josias by Reformers see the work sometimes attributed to Beza, Histoire ecclésiastique (Antwerp, 1580, BL 295 i 25-27, Tome I, B. IV, p. 432 and p. 480), and the Deux épistres en rithme françoise by E.M.S.E.A. (s.l., 1561, EN Rés Ye 3849, Bv). The comparison was later taken over by Catholics when it became apparent that Charles IX was not favouring the Reformers, see Jacques Bourié, Congratulation au Roy de France, (Paris, 1568, EN Rés Ye 1778, Aliv, Aliir) and B. Le Tour, Cantique au Nom du Roy (Paris, 1568, EN Rés Ye 1780, Aliu v).

56. There is a copy of this edition in the Bodleian library (8° T 51 Art). There is no appreciable difference from the 1566 edition.

57. There is a copy of this edition in the BN (Rés p Yf 10 bis).
THE INFLUENCE OF MACHIAVELLI

A MACHIAVELLI IN THE TRAGEDIES SAINTES

Louis Des Masures's trilogy David combattant, David triumphant and David fugitif, on the early life of David is based on the Biblical account in I Samuel 17, 18 and 26, but it was also intended to have relevance to contemporary political and religious events. We have already seen how, in the dedicatory epistle to Philippe Le Brun, Des Masures compares the persecution and exile of David with his own exile and sufferings (see above, pp.207-7), and speaks from personal experience about the ingratitude of rulers. But his trilogy is not merely a description of his own sufferings: it portrays the persecution of Reformers in general. Like David, they should learn to put their trust in God, for

...l'homme qui là-sus à Dieu leve son coeur,
Ses ennemis renverse, et demeure veinqueur.

Des Masures prays that the Duke of Lorraine and all other Catholic rulers, will end the violence against Reformers and base their actions on God's commandments,

...Que pleust au Souverain
Qu'en ceste escole instruit nostre bon Duc Lorrain
Conformast à David entierement sa vie...
Rejettant le conseil de la langue nuisante,
A cruauté soymesme et le glaive aiguisante,
Pour le sang innocent espandre à l'abandon.
(p. 6).

In David fugitif there is a specific and anachronistic reference to the Reformers when Satan says,

Or j'espere demain sans doute
Voir David et ses gens en route.
Fort bien se dresse l'entreprise
Pour exterminer ceste Eglise.
(p. 251). 2

The 1588 edition of the Tragedies Sainctes was published in the same volume as Florent Chrestien's translation of George Buchanan's tragedy Jephté, ou le Voeu. 3 Buchanan's play, like Des Masures's trilogy, contains
Protestant propaganda (the priest's sophistic arguments are contrasted with Jephtah's desire to obey the will of God and follow his own conscience as Reformers claimed to do).

Many Reformers in the sixteenth century used the story of David and Saul to illustrate contemporary events, particularly in the latter part of the century. In 1551 a mediocre tragedy, La Desconfiture de Goliath by Joachim de Coignac, was published at Geneva. In the dedication, Coignac compares Edward VI of England to David chosen by God to defeat Goliath (who represents the Pope in Coignac's play). In Saül le furieux (written around 1562 and published in 1572) and La Famine (published in 1573), Jean de La Taille uses the Biblical account of Saul's reign to point to contemporary abuses by rulers.

Poets also used the story of David and Saul: in his Seconde Sepmaine, (Les Trophées), Guillaume Saluste Du Bartas praises David as the ideal King and uses his refusal to harm Saul as an argument against tyrannicide. In the preface to the Tragiques (first published in 1616), Agrippa D'Aubigné compares the Reformed Church to David fighting against Goliath (who symbolises the corruption in the Catholic Church). In the treatise Du Debvoir mutuel des Roys et des subjects (published in 1622), D'Aubigné, like Du Bartas in Les Trophées, takes David's attitude to Saul as exemplifying the exact nature of resistance allowed to subjects ruled by a tyrant (chapter 3). Des Masures was thus one of the first in a long line of Reformers to use the story of David to illustrate problems facing the Reformed Church and this foreshadowing of later Reformers is a characteristic of Des Masures which we shall come across again when dealing with his treatment of Machiavelli.

The first French tragedy written specifically to defend the Reformers' beliefs was Abraham Sacrifiant. We have seen that Des Masures was acquainted with Beza personally and he most certainly would have read Abraham Sacrifiant which came out the same year as Des Masures's visit to
Beza at Lausanne in 1550. In the epistle to the Tragedies Sainctes, Des Masures echoes many of Beza's ideas on abandoning pagan, mythological subjects to write on sacred themes. He may even have been influenced in his choice of subject by the list of topics proposed by Beza in his preface to Abraham Sacrifiant for the purpose of encouraging Reformers in their faith. Beza says that in exile, he finds comfort in the example of Biblical figures who experienced a great testing of their faith,

Mais entre tous ceux qui nous sont mis en avant pour exemple au vieil Testament, je trouve trois personnages auxquels il me semble que le Seigneur a voulu représenter ses plus grandes merveilles, à savoir Abraham, Moïse, et David: en la vie desquels si on se miroit aujourd'hui, on se connoistroit mieux qu'on ne faict.  

Beza chose the subject of Abraham because he felt that this best mirrored his own experiences, whilst Des Masures chose the story of David to recount his own and others' sufferings. It would be interesting to know whether, during Des Masures's visit to Beza, the two writers discussed the apportioning of subjects for tragedy in the same way as they divided the translation of the Psalms between themselves.

At first sight, therefore, Des Masures's trilogy seems to be concerned solely with defending the Reformers' cause but since in the sixteenth century it was almost impossible to discuss theology in the abstract, Des Masures is led to consider also the political situation of the Reformers in France, that is, how far their adherence to the Reformed Church affected their everyday lives. His political views are a reflection of his religious beliefs: as often in the sixteenth century, how the author views man's relation to God, influences the way in which he views man's relation to man. Thus, interwoven with Des Masures's defence of the Reformers' cause in the Tragedies Sainctes are political ideas which are not without links with anti-Machiavellian themes.

The accusations of Machiavellianism centre mainly around the figures of Saul and Doeg. These two figures bring in the question of the connection between Machiavellianism, tyranny and the courtier theme in French
literature. For in *David Triomphant* and *David fugitif*, Saul is depicted as a tyrant whose rule is in opposition to God's laws and Doeg is presented as an ambitious courtier who encourages his King in acts of tyranny. Machiavelli's *Il Principe* was often seen in France as a handbook for tyrants and it was generally believed that Machiavelli had modelled his advice on the description of a tyrant in Book V of Aristotle's *Politics*. Des Masures seems to have shared this view that Machiavelli was teaching rulers how to be tyrants rather than legitimate princes, for in his portrayal of the tyrant, Saul, there are several traits often associated with the Machiavellian ruler.

The second strand of anti-Machiavellian sentiment in the *Tragedies Sainctes* relates to courtiers. Earlier in the century, French courtiers had been attacked for 'Italian' vices such as atheism, libertinism, philistinism, sexual perversion and ostentatious dress. Around 1560 and especially during the civil wars, courtiers came to be attacked not so much for their social behaviour and corruption of French 'mores' as for their political behaviour. Italians at court, favoured by Catherine de' Medici, were held responsible for the worsening financial situation and for high taxation, as well as for encouraging the King in acts of tyranny. So around the time that Des Masures was writing his *Tragedies Sainctes*, the anti-courtier satire changed from social to political satire and took in opposition to Machiavelli.

During the latter part of the sixteenth century, it became very common to accuse courtiers, and especially Italians, of instructing the King in Machiavellianism. In the *Discours contre N. Machiavel* of 1576, Gentillet calls *Il Principe* 'l'Alcoran des Courtisans'. In the preface to the *Six Livres de la République*, Jean Bodin says that Machiavelli 'a eu la vogue entre les couratiers des tyrans'. The accusation of Machiavellianism was often connected with the criticism that courtiers encouraged their King in tyranny: in his *Lettre à M. Chandon, Secrétair*
du Roy, Estienne Pasquier describes Machiavelli as

ce malheureux authour que je voy estre chery et honoré
presque de tous les courtizans, dont la condition est telle,
que tout ainsi qu'ils sont nez pour estre esclaves, aussi ne
projettent ils rien que de rendre les autres esclaves. 15

In his pamphlet Le Theatre de France, the Catholic author Charles de Boss,
links French courtiers with Machiavelli's theories when he speaks of
'ceste vermine de court' who teach the King that religion can 'servir à la
conservation de l'estat politic et tyrannic, et retenir le peuple en
quelque crainte tremeur suyvant la doctrine de Machiavel'. 16 Thus courtiers
were also accused of having a Machiavellian disregard for religion. In the
Deux Dialogues du Nouveau Langage François Italianizé, Henri Estienne
accuses courtiers of atheism and links them specifically with Machiavelli's
ideas on religion. One of the speakers, Philausone, says

Aussi pour vous dire la vérité, plusieurs de ceux qui
vivent en la cour et de la cour, estudient bien mieux la leçon
du courtisanisme que du Christianisme: et ont ceste maxime de ne
se formalizer d'aucune chose [sic] qui le concerne.

Celtophile replies,

Voyla une merveilleuse maxime: elle semble estre Machiavellique. 17

By his portrayal of Doeg as a Machiavellian courtier encouraging his
King in atheism and acts of tyranny, Des Masures foreshadows later
comparisons of French courtiers with Machiavelli. 18 Il Principe itself
was often regarded as the result of Machiavelli's wish to reinstate himself
with the Medici by offering attractive advice on how to increase their
power.

Any study of the influence of Machiavelli on the work of Des Masures
owes much to Ruth Thomas's thesis on The Conception of King and Kingship
in French Biblical Tragedy where Machiavelli's influence on the Tragedies
Sainctes was first pointed out. 19 However in a thesis more exclusively
concerned with Machiavelli's influence, it is perhaps worth re-examining
the Tragedies Sainctes with the focus more particularly on Machiavelli,
acknowledging the debt to this earlier study wherever necessary. As a
forerunner of later critics of Machiavelli, Des Masures is an important figure in the history of anti-Machiavellianism in the sixteenth century and no examination of the influence of Machiavelli on French Renaissance drama would be complete without mentioning his name.

i) The theme of broken promises

The theme of broken promises was often connected in sixteenth century French literature with Machiavelli's advice to his ruler in _Il Principe_ chapter 18 (see my chapter on Garnier pp 120-22). As R. Thomas points out (op. cit., pp. 165-182) the theme is dwelt upon in the _Tragedies Sainctes_ in such a way as to suggest that Des Masures is deliberately opposing Machiavelli's views on this subject.

Firstly, there is great stress on Saul's broken promise to reward and protect David for having killed Goliath. The Chorus of Israelites, the 'Trouppe' in _David combattant_ remarks that

```plaintext
...souvent les Rois et Princes
Promettent citez et provinces,
Et tout ce qu'on peut dire mieux:
Mais il en est peu sous les cieux
En qui soit ferme l'assurance.
```

There are three layers of meaning here, relating to Saul's promise to David, Des Masures's personal experiences in France and also to the Reformers in general. Protestant writers seem to have been particularly aware of the dangers to their Church if French rulers adopted a policy of breaking their promises to protect the adherents of the Reformed religion (see my chapter on D'Aubigné pp 190-93).

In _David triumphant_, David comments on the lack of faith in rulers-

```plaintext
...Mais aussi say-je bien
Qu'il n'est Prince mortel, tant soit homme de bien,
Qui ait et garde en soy la fermeté requise.
Maint et maint controuveur lui pallie et desgusie
Le vray par faux rapports: et la foy bien souvent,
Branlante, il esracine, et fait voler au vent.
```

(p. 99).
Again, this refers to Doeg's calumny of David, but also to Des Masures's own belief that he had been framed by jealous courtiers who had spread rumours about him to Henry II and the Duke of Lorraine. In addition, these lines contain a general warning to Reformers not to trust the promises of Kings.²¹ By contrast, Jonathan swears to keep his promise of eternal friendship with David whatever happens.

In the same play, Adriel's comment on Saul's promise to give his daughter in marriage to David, is that

La Roy l'a bien promis aujourd'hui, mais demain
Il changera d'avis. De ce que le Roy peut
A son sujet promettre, il en tient ce qu'il veut...
Que lui est-il besoin tenir à ses despens
Une promesse faite? ô l'opinion folle
D'une fidélité de garder sa parole!
Le Roy (de mon conseil) sa foy garder apprenne
Sans plus, pour maintenir sa puissance et son regne,
Se montrant véritable à la tourbe credule,
Où la chose est legere, et d'importance nule,
Pour au peuple nourrir l'opinion qu'il donne
D'une verité pure, et conscience bonne.
Mais ou de son dommage il apperçoit le pointc,
Que sa foy soit rompue, et ne la garde point.

(p. 129).

This, as R. Thomas points out (op. cit., p. 178) is very close to chapter 18 of Il Principe. Des Masures has included in Adriel's speech Machiavelli's stress on dissimulating the fact that one has broken one's promise, as well as his scorn of ordinary people ('la tourbe credule' - 'sono tanto semplici li uomini' p. 73). The Chorus comments on Saul's treachery to David (p. 169) and the lesson of David triumphant as explained in the Epilogue is that men cannot trust others, especially Princes (p. 178).

In David fugitif, the theme of broken promises is continued as Eliab (David's brother) remarks,

On voit souvent que le dire d'un Roy
Tient pour un temps, puis vain en l'air s'envole.
Et qu'est un Roy s'il ne tient sa parole?

(p. 187).
Jonathan swears that he will keep his promise to David because it was God who was the author of the promise and duty to him overrides even ties of kinship and obedience to the monarch—

Mais je sen d'autre part ceste foy cordiale
Que je doy à David. Je luy ay à fiance
Promis, et repromis maintenir l'alliance
Immuable entre nous. Doit le devoir humain
De pere à fils, corrompre une foy de la main?...
...Or Dieu est aujourd'hui
Entre David et moi, Dieu vivant, Dieu même est-ce
Qui fut seul entre nous autheur de la promesse.
Doy-je faillir à Dieu, Dieu, qui jamais ne faut,
Qui toute faute voit et punit de là haut?...
C'est lui à qui premier, sans autre esgard quelconques,
Arrester je me doy. A qui tiendray-je donques
Ma promesse qu'à Dieu? Je l'ay dit et promis.
(pp. 227-228).

Jonathan is here opposing Machiavellian arguments based on expediency such as were proffered by Adriel, with an argument for keeping promises based on obedience to God and his laws. The theme of promises is rounded off as God is described as keeping his promises (p. 274) and the author claims to have kept his promise to recount the story of David (p. 275).

The emphasis throughout the trilogy on Saul's broken promise and the treachery of princes arose partly out of Des Masures's personal experiences and partly out of a desire to show the dangers of Machiavellian policies for Reformers. The theme of promises was specially relevant to the Reformed Church because of the central role played by reliance on God's promises in the doctrine of justification by faith. Like Jonathan, they had to keep their promises out of obedience to God, but also they had to trust in God's promise to them. The notion of alliance was important: the Reformers believed they had a new alliance with God since the old alliance with the Catholic Church had been disobeyed. The 1588 edition of the Tragedies Saintes was published in the same volume as Florent Chrestien's translation of Buchanan's Jephté, ou le Vœu which also deals with the theme of promises (though not in connection with Machiavelli): Jephthah has to decide whether or not to keep his promise
to God. This similarity is possibly a reason for the plays being published together. Des Masures's treatment of the theme of broken promises in connection with Machiavelli foreshadows later discussion by French writers of this topic and is an early example of opposition to Machiavelli on this subject.

ii) Atheism

The accusation of atheism centres around Saul's 'Machiavellian' adviser, Doeg, who first appears in the second play of the trilogy, David triumphant. The links between anti-courtier and anti-Machiavellian literature have already been examined (see pp.224-5 of this chapter). The most common criticisms of courtiers were that out of self-interest, they advised their King to abandon traditional French ways of governing in favour of 'Italian' and Machiavellian methods, encouraging him in atheism, absolutism and the use of ruse. All these traits are to some extent found in Doeg.

Before his entry, Doeg is described by Satan as a hypocrite who feigns religious belief and who will be used by Satan in an attempt to lure David away from God—

Les bons j'attire à mes appas:
Les autres, qui bons ne sont pas,
Mai de bonté font bonne mine,
Sont ceux en qui plus je domine:
Car ceux qui sont les plus couverts
Sont volontiers les plus pervers.
La Loy de Dieu feint l'hypocrite
Avoir dedans son coeur escrite:
Mais trop grande est la difference
De l'effect, et de l'apparence.
De ces bons ainsi apparens
Est Doeg, et ses adherens.

(pp. 131-132).

This is similar to Machiavelli's advice on feigning religion in Il Principe chapter 18 (quoted in my chapter on Pierre Matthieu p.59).

When Doeg first appears, his opportunism is revealed in the way he prefers to rely on fortune rather than on God (p. 135). He says,
A qui a le coeur haut,
Fortune est preste, et moyen ne lui faut.

(p. 135).

As R. Thomas points out (op. cit., p. 177). this may be an intentional echo of Machiavelli's discussion on fortune in _Il Principe_ chapter 25. She also mentions Doeg's Machiavellian attitude to religion (op. cit., p. 178).

The portrayal of Doeg as an atheist is continued in _David fugitif_ where we learn that he was the only person who had dared to carry out Saul's command to kill the priests. It is emphasised that he had no regard for the sanctity of their position. His atheism is shown up sharply in a soliloquy where he reflects that even though David believes in God, nevertheless he suffers persecution. Doeg concludes by saying,

Moy, j'aime mieux
N'avoir ni croire un Dieu des cieux...
... He, que say-je aussi
Si Dieu nous voit? s'il a souci
Des choses de la terre basse?
Qu'il soit Dieu: il faut que je passe
Selon mon désir ceste vie.
... Non, non, je ne regarde pas
Ce qui est après le trepas.

(p. 204).

Doeg is repeatedly claimed by Satan as one of his adherents.

Machiavelli's advice to his prince in _Il Principe_ chapter 18 to feign religious zeal was well-known in France, and because he frees his ruler from moral and religious restraints, he was often called an atheist. Even as early as 1563, Des Masures appears to have been familiar with Machiavelli's views on religion and uses this knowledge to portray Doeg as a specifically Machiavellian type of atheist, that is, one who manipulates appearances. Interestingly enough, later in the century, an anonymous Catholic writer mentioned Doeg in his poem _Dialogue sur les Nouvelles de la Mort de Monseigneur de Guyse, et de son frère Cardinal, massacrez à Blois_. In this poem, Guise is portrayed as a defender
of the Catholic religion and Henry III's assassination of Guise is compared with Doeg's killing of Abimelech. A few lines further on, Henry is described as a hypocrite and a Machiavellian. Again, we see Doeg portrayed in an unfavourable and, by extension, Machiavellian light.

iii) Dissimulation

Doeg is portrayed as using ruse and dissimulation, tactics approved of by Machiavelli in Il Principe chapter 18 (see my chapter on Pierre Matthieu p. 61). The use of dissimulation was often linked with Machiavelli by French authors (see my chapter on Pierre Matthieu p. 61) and sometimes in relation to anti-courtier literature. David describes the atmosphere of dissimulation and fraud at Saul's court where

...si quelqu'un, ami de simplesse et rondeur,
Va de sa conscience espandant saine odeur,...
Il est pressé de torts, de fraudes, de rapines.
(David triumphant, p. 137).

In David fugitif, Doeg lists the Machiavellian ruses which he has employed to encourage Saul to break his promise to David,

J'ay tant fait par finesse et dol,
Par ma langue, duite à tout vol,
Vaine et legere comme vent,
Par flatter et mentir souvent,
Dont j'ay une science exquise,
Que j'ay du Roy la grace acquise.
(p. 201).

Such subtlety (Doeg later speaks of his 'art cauteleux et subtil') was often seen as specifically Machiavellian and it is exemplified not only by Doeg, but also by his followers, the 'Trouppe', who use dissimulation to uncover the secrets of David's sympathisers. They say,

Ainsi, avec paroles feintes,
En contrefaisant des gens sainctes,
Et en feignant estre des leurs,
On vient descouvrir leurs valeurs.
(p. 213).
A whole atmosphere of deceit and dissimulation is built up around Doeg and the court. Doeg is given the Machiavellian characteristics of ruse, fraud and treachery, and it seems as if in portraying him, Des Masures wished to criticise not just courtiers, but especially courtiers who follow Machiavelli's teachings. Like these Machiavellian courtiers, Doeg is acting purely out of self-interest in calumniating David (see David fugitif p. 202). As we have seen, Machiavelli was sometimes accused of writing Il Principe out of self-interest, to gain employment with the Medici, and in the Pourparler du Prince, Estienne Pasquier hints that the Machiavellian figure, the 'Curial', is trying to secure his own advancement by encouraging the Prince's tyrannical tendencies. Doeg's self-interested dissimulation seems particularly Machiavellian.

iv) Encouraging the King in absolutism

A frequent accusation against Machiavellian courtiers is that they encouraged their King in acts of tyranny (see p. 225 of this chapter). One Reformer speaks of the Kings of France

qui ont esté instruits des Machiavelistes, de commander absolument, sans s'astreindre à estre reprins de personne.

A Catholic pamphleteer complains of

quelques rusez disciples du secretaire Florentin qui... se sont parforcez de faire à croire au monde qu'un Roy peut tout en son Royaume...

Des Masures's description of Doeg belongs to this tradition of linking Machiavelli's name with courtiers who encouraged their rulers in absolutism.

In David triumphant Satan says that he will encourage Doeg to stir up Saul's ambition to exert his power in acts of tyranny against his own subjects. In David fugitif Doeg puts this into practice and in a soliloquoy he says,
Ainsi mon venin goutte à goutte
Coule au coeur du Roy qui m'escoute.
Il est preste à m'ouir et croire,
Quand je lui parle de sa gloire...
(p. 202).

As R. Thomas points out (op. cit., p. 177) the use of poison was often thought to be particularly Italian. Sometimes it is even associated especially with Machiavelli. Thus Jean Bodin speaks of Machiavelli's 'ruses tyranniques, qu'il a recherchées par tous les coings d'Italia, et comme une douce poison coulée en son livre du Prince...'32 In the chapter on D'Aubigné (p.272) the links between the use of poison and the portrayal of Catherine de' Medici as a Machiavellian figure are examined.

Doeg exults in the fact that he is encouraging Saul's tyrannical nature—

\[
\text{Il est facile, il est credule:...} \\
\text{Aussi ne di-je qu'à plaisir} \\
\text{Toute chose, à quoy son desir} \\
\text{Encline et tend.} \\
(p. 219).
\]

There is a long scene during which Doeg urges Saul to exercise his power against David, whilst Abner tries to warn Saul of the dangers of listening to flatterers. Left alone, Abner comments on courtiers who encourage their King's worst tendencies—

\[
\text{Il n'est poison tant mortelle au Roy, comme} \\
\text{Le flatteur doux, le menteur, le faux homme,} \\
\text{Qui en faisant couler sa langue fine,} \\
\text{Le Prince abuse, et l'infector ne fine.} \\
(p. 220).
\]

Again, Doeg's methods are described as poisonous and another of his Machiavellian traits - dissimulation - is mentioned.

Under Doeg's guidance, Saul develops into a specifically Machiavellian type of tyrant not only in the area of breaking promises but also in his intention to lead his subjects into war out of self-interest and ambition without thinking of the welfare of his subjects. In De la Puissance Legitime du Prince sur le Peuple, et du peuple sur le Prince, the author
attributes to Machiavelli the description of precisely this kind of tyrant who suspects his subjects (as Saul is suspicious of David) and leads them into war out of ambition. Moreover, not only is Saul leading his subjects into war, he is also leading them to fight against those of his subjects who support David, that is, he is deliberately stirring up one group of his subjects against the other. This encouraging of factions was thought (wrongly) to be part of Machiavelli's advice to his prince. The description of Doeg encouraging Saul in acts of tyranny is probably intended to be seen as another facet of his Machiavellianism since the particular brand of tyranny Saul indulges in on Doeg's advice, is specifically Machiavellian. A contemporary parallel may not be out of place here: like Cromwell, Doeg has ignored Thomas More's advice and told the King not what he should do, but what he could do and, like Cromwell with Henry VIII, Doeg finds that the tyrannical tendencies he has nourished get out of control as Saul insists on waging war immediately despite Doeg's advice to delay. The lesson is that the courtiers' encouragement of tyranny (and Machiavellianism) in their King may eventually rebound against them. Des Masures was one of the first writers to express the dangers to his subjects when a King is encouraged in tyrannical, Machiavellian acts by courtiers who, like Machiavelli in Il Principe, urge their ruler to ignore all moral, legal and religious restraints.

v) Foreign Nationality

One of the criticisms frequently brought against the French Kings' advisers was that they were of foreign nationality, usually Italian. French writers feared that the traditional French ways of governing would be corrupted by 'Italian' ideas on absolutism and tyranny. Catherine de' Medici's nationality was often held against her. For example, in the Discours merveilleux de la vie, actions et deportemens de Catherine de' Medici (1574) it is stressed that she is an Italian with specifically
'Italian' vices such as atheism, guile, a fondness for using poison and stirring up faction and an enthusiasm for Machiavelli's teachings. In *Didon se sacrifiant*, Estienne Jodelle emphasises that Aeneas is a foreigner at Carthage and draws intentional parallels with Italians at the French court - not only is Aeneas foreign but also he displays Machiavellian behaviour.  

In the *Discours contre N. Machiavel*, Innocent Gentillet continually criticises Italians for having, under the influence of Machiavelli, corrupted France and he seeks to return to traditional French ways of governing based on the feudal system with the King as merely chief amongst nobles, rather than having absolute power which he sees as the Italian way of governing. In the preface to Part I, Gentillet says that

> ceux de la nation de Machiavel (qui tiennent les principaux estats du gouvernement de France) ont laissé l'ancienne façon de gouverner de nos ancêtres Français, pour introduire et mettre en usage en France la nouvelle façon de gouverner de leurs pays, enseigné par Machiavel.

In a long tirade at the end of Part I, Maxime III, Gentillet calls on the French to resist domination by Italians in France. Thus the courtiers who were accused of practising Machiavellianism were often also of foreign nationality.

Similarly Doeg who, as Saul's adviser has largely been invented by Des Masures, is a foreigner. Although he is not mentioned in *I Samuel* 17, 18 or 26 (on which the *Tragedies Sainctes* are based), a Doeg is found in *I Samuel* 21: 7. He is an Edomite and chief of Saul's herdsmen. It is he who betrays David to Saul (*I Samuel* 22: 9) and kills the priests whom Saul believes to be in league with David (*I Samuel* 22: 18). Out of the six times that he is mentioned in the Bible (*I Samuel* 21: 7, 22: 9, 18, 22, *Psalm* 52), he is five times called 'Doeg the Edomite' thus stressing his foreign nationality.

It may have been Doeg's position as a foreigner as well as the briefly delineated traits of treachery and disregard for the sanctity of
priests which led Des Masures to select him to represent the Machiavellian courtier. Des Masures has, however, greatly developed his character and added many traits which are specifically Machiavellian, such as encouraging the King in tyranny, perfidy, self-interest and the use of ruse and dissimulation. He makes Doeg into a specifically Machiavellian atheist: one who disbelieves but keeps up the appearance of religious faith. He uses, in describing Doeg, the poison image so frequently associated with Italians and with Machiavelli in particular.

vi) Rivalry between King and General

As a footnote to the discussion of Machiavellianism in the Tragedies Sainctes, it should be noted that R. Thomas (op. cit., p. 178) sees another possible Machiavellian theme in the fact that David is a general who has become greater than his King. In the Discorsi I, 29-30, Machiavelli says that in this case the King should eliminate the general—and this is what Saul attempts to do, believing that David intends to usurp the throne. Encouraged by Satan, Saul believes that David is merely feigning religious faith, in itself a Machiavellian trait. However, Saul's jealousy and suspicion of David can all be found in the Biblical account, together with the fact that David has outshone Saul in battle. Whilst it is possible that Des Masures knew of Machiavelli's ideas in the Discorsi, he had no need to look there for this episode and moreover, this would be the only example of Des Masures using the Discorsi rather than Il Principe.

B METHOD OF OPPOSITION TO MACHIAVELLI IN THE TRAGEDIES SAINCTES

Des Masures gives a contemporary touch to the story of Saul by attacking Machiavellian courtiers and Machiavellian methods of ruling as displayed by Saul. The question could be asked why Des Masures makes these criticisms of Machiavelli when he could perfectly well have
recounted the story of David without them. The answer appears to be that even as early as 1563, Des Masures felt it necessary to oppose Machiavelli since he perceived the danger for Reformers if rulers adopted Machiavellian methods of governing. As a separate group within a Catholic state, the Reformers could be prey, like David and his followers, to the suspicions and persecutions of a ruler who recognised no restraints on his power: in *Il Principe* Machiavelli frees his Prince from all moral, legal and religious restraints (though he does say that it is preferable for a ruler to set an example to his subjects by obeying his own laws).

In the *Tragedies Sainctes* Des Masures seeks to oppose Machiavelli by emphasising restraints on a ruler's power, in particular, religious restraints. Des Masures believed that if Machiavellianism was allowed to take hold in France, the monarchy would lose much of its sacred character. He feared that the King would be seen merely as another leader who put expediency before the will of God. His attack on Machiavellian courtiers as represented by Doeg, arises out of similar fears: for such advisers would be the first to lead the King astray from the word of God into a policy based on 'pragmatic' considerations.

Through David's words, Des Masures seeks to create an atmosphere of awe around Saul, even though we know that he is a bad King. He builds up a vision of kingship based on the laws of God which is in direct opposition to the self-interested, ruthless rule of Saul, encouraged by the Machiavellian Doeg. Thus David stresses that Kings receive their power from God alone—

Car Dieu a ordonné le Roy sur la province 
Pour le peuple régir, comme son lieutenant. 
*(David triumphant, p. 156).*

In *David fugitif*, it is emphasised that however mighty a King is, he can never prevail against God. The Chorus says of David,

S'il est de Dieu (comme il est) defendu, 
En vain sera par le Roy pretendu .
De l'opprimer à force d'armes fortes. 
*(p. 212).*
Des Masures stresses the sanctity of the office and indeed, the very person, of the King. He refuses to condone the policy of breaking promises because it would be an offence against God. Des Masures counteracts Machiavelli's advice by placing religious restrictions on the King's power and refusing to separate behaviour in politics from one's religious beliefs.

By linking the restraints on a ruler's power with opposition to Machiavelli, Des Masures foreshadows later works by French Reformers which likewise stress the importance of restraints on the King's power and blame Machiavelli for encouraging absolutism and tyranny in their King. Such writings proliferated after the Saint Bartholomew's Day Massacres when the evil effects of tyranny had been felt by Reformers in France. For example, the Reveille Matin des François et leurs voisins (1574) blamed Machiavelli for the royal policy of persecuting Reformers. In the ten editions of the Latin translation of Il Principe which appeared between 1580 and 1648, Il Principe is followed in the same volume by the Vindiciae contra tyrannos (which allows lesser magistrates to resist a tyrant) and Beza's De Iure Magistratum (which gives the General Estates and some magistrates the right to resist tyranny). In this way, Machiavelli comes out as a supporter of absolute monarchy or tyranny, with French Reformers opposing him. The Calvinist theory of resistance is placed alongside Machiavelli's Il Principe and revolt against such an abhorrent type of rule is thus justified. In the preface to the French translation of the Vindiciae, C. Superantius reduces this pamphlet to a treatise against Machiavelli's description of absolutism and stresses the need for restraints on a ruler's power in view of Machiavelli's conception of government.

After the Saint Bartholomew's Day Massacres, Protestant writers felt that general moral principles were not enough to restrain monarchs and they evolved their theory of constitutional restraints (see De Iure
Magistratum, Vindiciae and the Franco-Gallia) rather than the religious restraints urged by Des Masures. The latter had not yet realised the necessity of laying down constitutional guidelines to restrain a ruler's actions, but he was one of the first Reformers to link Machiavelli with absolutism and to counteract Machiavelli's advice by urging restraints on the King's power.

Des Masures also deals with the question of the extent to which a tyrant can be legitimately resisted. David's behaviour is held up as a model of the right attitude towards kingship: he says constantly that the King has been chosen by God and must not be harmed. In David fugitif, he declares,

Il est de Dieu ordonné pour le regne
Parquoy ne faut que personne entreprenne
Lui faire mal: cela seroit oser
Mesme au vouloir du Seigneur s'opposer,
Qui establit le Roy, et par justice
Veut que le peuple a lui s'assubjettisse.

This is the orthodox Calvinist doctrine of enduring tyranny, based on the Biblical teaching of Romans 13: 1, 2. Resistance to a ruler is allowed only in the case where he commands something contrary to God's will (Acts 5: 29), but even then, violent resistance is forbidden. David's words, incidentally, are in opposition to Machiavelli's views, for in the Discorsi III, 6, he shows sympathy for the killers of tyrants.

The year 1563 was the beginning of Charles IX's exercise of his majority: Des Masures may have felt that the time was ripe to present the young King with two alternative methods of ruling - according to Machiavelli's teaching or according to God's laws. Through David's words, Des Masures sets before Charles IX an image of an ideal King who is morally superior to his subjects; Des Masures thus combats Machiavelli's attitude in Il Principe chapter 18 where he allows his Prince to be limited by the level of morality (or lack of it) of his subjects, rather than encouraging the ruler to rise above his subjects in order to set them an example.
Louis Des Masures is an important author in the study of the influence of Machiavelli because he foreshadows the way in which later Reformers were to oppose Machiavelli's writings - by emphasising restraints on the ruler's power (religious restraints in the case of Des Masures, constitutional restraints in the case of Hotman, Mornay and Beza).

There is, however, no detailed refutation of Machiavelli as is found in the works of later Reformers such as Gentillet. Des Masures's method of opposing Machiavellianism is quite simple - he merely reminds rulers (and courtiers) of the necessity of obeying God's will.

Des Masures touches on only a few of the most basic teachings of Machiavelli, such as the absolute power of a ruler, the policy of breaking promises, of dissimulation and of feigning religious belief, but these were later to become the most notorious passages in Machiavelli, ones which were attacked again and again by French writers. Most of the anti-Machiavellian sentiment expressed in the Tragedies Sainctes can be traced back to chapter 18 of Il Principe which was to become the most well-known chapter in all of Machiavelli's writings. Despite the narrowness of range, it is probable that Des Masures had first hand knowledge of Machiavelli's work since one or two of the passages cited in this chapter echo the text of Machiavelli quite closely (in particular, Adriel's speech quoted on p.227). He may have first come into contact with Machiavelli's ideas during his stay in Italy (1547-1550) before Machiavelli had become well-known in France.

With their portrayal of courtiers as Machiavellian, Des Masures's plays are some of the first in a long line of writings which attack courtiers for encouraging the King in Machiavellianism and apply Machiavelli's description of a Prince to courtiers (frequently in order to avoid having to accuse the King himself of Machiavellianism). Des Masures's early use of Machiavelli in propaganda against the courtiers
and in defence of the Reformers' cause may well have inspired the author of Adonias to use similar methods when writing to encourage fellow Reformers some twenty years later.

C MACHIAVELLI IN ADONIAS

Adonias takes as its subject the problem of the successor to David and the conflict between Solomon, to whom David has promised the throne, and his eldest brother, Adonias, who intends to seize power for himself. It is based on I Kings I: 1-2: 35, but has obvious parallels with the French situation after 1584 when the death of Alençon posed the problem of the succession to the French throne. Henry III was willing to recognise the Protestant Navarre as his rightful heir but the Guises were plotting to take over the power themselves. The author, 'M. Philone', is writing to urge Henry III to keep his promise to nominate Navarre as his heir and to set before Navarre the example of Solomon who established a long and peaceful rule by exterminating conspirators.

Machiavellianism in this play centres round Adonias who, like Doeg in the Tragedies Sainctes, is portrayed as an ambitious and self-interested courtier and in addition displays the characteristics of a Machiavellian usurper.

i) Broken promises

As in the Tragedies Sainctes, the theme of broken promises is presented in such a way as to suggest conscious opposition to Machiavelli on the part of the author. In Act IV, David's last words to Solomon include a description of Joab's perfidy (Joab is the army leader who supports Adonias's claim to the throne)-

En temps de paix il a par terre
Espandu le Sang comme en Guerre,
Violant l'asseurée Foy
Qu'on a en Parole de Roy,
Et faisant tort à toute outrance
A une Comune asseurance.
In I Kings 2: 5 David talks of Joab's bloodthirsty murders but there is no mention of breaking promises. 'M. Philone' has added the Machiavellian trait of perfidy to the Biblical description of Joab. Nathan's comment is that David's words contain wise lessons for rulers (Dv-D2v).

'M Philone's' method of opposition to Machiavelli's advice on breaking promises is similar to that of Des Masures in the Tragedies Sainctes: he stresses that it is God's will that promises should be kept. David is built up as the opposite of the Machiavellian ruler, for in Act II, he tells Nathan and Bathsheba that he will keep his promise to crown Solomon—

C'est mesmes aujourd'hui, ainsi le veux promettre,
Qu'en ma place le veux establir et le mettre,
Afin que ferme soit de David le Serment.
(B7v).

Bathsheba thanks God for David's decision and stresses that it was God who enabled David to keep his promise (Cv). The Chorus to Act II places inordinate stress on the fact that Kings should keep their promises—

O que sacré et venerable
Doit estre le Dire d'un Roy,
Même s'il a donné sa Foy
Par serment jamais non muable...
(C2r).

The author is reminding Henry III of his promise to name Navarre as his heir and to protect the Reformers, but also there is the more general opposition to the type of rule based on Machiavelli's teachings. Joab miscalculates precisely because he devalues the importance of the King's promise—

De là vient toute l'Entreprise
De ce Joab, estimant vain
Le serment de son Souverain...
(C3r).

Adonias's entourage is tainted with Machiavellianism.
ii) Atheism

Like Doeg in the Tragedies Sainctes, Adonias is depicted as an opportunist who relies on purely human strength rather than on God. In Act I we see him ordering a great feast at which he will declare himself King. To this end, he is prepared to manipulate the populace's religious beliefs—

Et toy, Prelat, Ordre tu donneras
Au Sacrifice, ainsi que bien sauras
En ordonner. C'est ainsi qu'on en use
Comme d'apast, ou le peuple s'amuse.

(A8v).

As Machiavelli advises, Adonias is using religious observances for political ends and to deceive the populace. The feast is described in 1 Kings, but there is no suggestion that Adonias is using religion as a cover for his political ambitions. This is a Machiavellian trait added by 'Philone'.

In Act II (B4r), Adonias reveals his reliance on fortune and this is contrasted with the words of the Chorus which recommends trust in God (B4r-B5r). Opportunism was thought to be the mark of the Machiavellian usurper. Similarly, in Act IV (C7r-v), Adonias continues to put all his trust in human forces and the strength of his army, in contrast with David who tells Solomon,

Dieu te vueille fortifier
C'est en lui que te dois fier.

(C8v).

In Act V, the Chorus, commenting on the death of Adonias, says

Vain est, qui n'a que des Hommes l'apui:
Qui est fondé sur le Decret Divin
Comme est le Roy, bien que jeune et bien tendre,
Est comme un Roc, qui vient à se defendre
De tous ces Flots, rend tout leur Effort vain.

(E3v).53

Abiathar the priest and supporter of Adonias, is also accused of feigning religious zeal. Solomon says in Act V,
Tout le Credit qu'il a ne le pourra sauver
Ny tout le Droit qu'il prend sur les choses sacrées,
Que mes mains non à luy, mais à Dieu consacrées
Ne lui facent sentir qu'on me doit obéir,
Et non dessous couleur de saint Zele, trahir.
(D6v-D7r).

In 1 Kings 2, Abiathar is banished by Solomon because he is a supporter of Adonias but there is no mention of him being a religious hypocrite.

iii) Dissimulation

Like the true Machiavellian usurper, Adonias knows how to dissimulate for his own ends. In Act I in a soliloquoy, Adonias reveals that he is merely feigning friendship with Joab and Moab (a foreign ruler with a large army).-54

Regner ne sait qui deguiser et feindre
N'a point apris. Joab voudroit ataindre
Plus haut peut estre. Et Moab voudroit bien
Ce qu'Israel tient encore du sien,
Par mon moyen. Il suffit que me serve
De leurs moyens. Apres je me reserve
A leurs en faire ainsi qu'il me plaira...
...il faut dire, et autrement entendre
Pour parvenir au but ou on pretend.
(Aviii v-Br).

There is no mention in the Biblical account of Adonias's treachery towards his own allies.

The portrayal of Adonias as a dissimulator is continued in his soliloquoy in Act V (D7r-D8v) where he declares that he will use both 'force' and 'art' in order to be King. This is very similar to Il Principe chapter 18 where Machiavelli says that both 'forza' and 'fraude' are necessary to be successful. The fact that Adonias is being depicted as a specifically Machiavellian type of dissimulator is confirmed by the use of fox and lion symbols. Adonias says that

Ou Force faut suplée l'Art,
Et au Fort la peau de Renard
Il est bon quelque fois de prendre,
Laissant celle-la de Lion,
Pour mener à perfection
Ce qu'on ose bien entreprendre.
(D7v-D8r). 56
This Machiavellian dissimulation is linked with the anti-courtier theme a little later as Adonias says,

Il faut bien faire les doux yeux,
L'Humble Courtisan, Gracieux
Pour parvenir à mon atente.
(D8r).

To gain the throne, he pretends to Bathsheba that he is in love with Abishag and when alone, exults in the success of his pretence (Er-E2r). 57

In Act II, the Chorus, so often the mouthpiece for 'Philone'’s own views, opposes the Machiavellian policy of deceit and dissimulation in politics-

O Indigne et pauvre Devise
Qu'on veut aux Princes enseigner:
Qui Feindre ne sait, ne Regner,
C'est le fin qu'on prend par feintise...

C'est le Lien seul, seur et ferme
De l'Humaine societé,
Que la constante Verité:
Seule l'entretien et conferme. 58
(C2v).

iv) Clemency

Opposition to Machiavelli in Adonias follows similar lines to that in the Tragedies Sainctes: criticism of the policy of broken promises, of feigning religion and of dissimulation. There is one further opposition to Machiavelli, pointed out by R. Thomas (op. cit., pp. 279-280) which does not appear in the Tragedies Sainctes - that is, that a ruler should begin his reign with an act of clemency, rather than cruelty, as Machiavelli had advised in Il Principe chapter 8. In Adonias, Solomon pardons his brother at the outset of his reign. This action is found in I Kings I: 52f, but it is not stressed here as a deliberate policy to be pursued in all cases. In the play, the Chorus says,

...C'est par Beneficence
Qu'on doit bien commencer son Regne, et par Clemence.
(Act III, C6v).
This seems to be in direct opposition to Machiavelli's remark that

...è da notare che, nel pigliare uno stato, debbe l'occupatore di esso discorrere tutte quelle offese che li è necessario fare, e tutte farle a uno tratto... Perché le inurie si debbono fare tutte insieme, acciò che, assaporandosi meno, offendino meno: e'benefizii si debbono fare a poco a poco, acciò che si assaporino meglio.

(Il Principe, ch. 8, p. 44).

The Chorus continues,

L'oeil benin et clement
D'un Prince debonnaire
Peut des sujets atraire
Les coeurs en un moment,
Qui par rigueur commence
Ne fait pas ce qu'il pense.

(C6v).

The 'Demi Chore' replies,

Or voici vrayement
D'une Royale Entrée
Au grand Dieu consacrée
Un bon Commencement.
Pardonne à qui Suplie,
Et à qui s'humilie.

(C6v).

D METHOD OF OPPOSITION TO MACHIAVELLI IN ADONIAS

The methods used by 'M. Philone' to oppose the Machiavellian concept of rule are substantially the same as those used by Des Masures in the Tragedies Saintes, namely to emphasise the restrictions placed on a King's behaviour by the necessity of obeying the will of God.

In Act I, the Chorus uses an echo from Job to make the following comment on Adonias's insatiable thirst for power and his determination to achieve his ends by any means available-

C'est belle chose d'estre Roy:
Mais si sai-je bien, quant à moy,
Que c'est Dieu qui oste, et qui donne.

(Br).

The Machiavellian usurper is warned that it is God who in the end chooses rulers and he can override even the cleverest schemes of men-
...il n'y a Conseil contre Dieu,
Ni Force, qui puisse avoir lieu...
Dieu d'un clin d'œil dissipe et brise
Tous complots et Conseil de gens
Tant à mal brasser diligens,
Vain rendant leur entreprise.

(B3v).

As in the Tragedies Sainctes, obedience to God's laws is the restraint which forbids a ruler to break his promises and dissimulation is said to bring about the collapse of the framework of social relations. The message of Adonias is that only reliance on God's word will ensure a long and peaceful reign. As with Josias and the Tragedies Sainctes, Adonias seems to be drawing up a model of good rule for a leader, in this case Henry of Navarre, who was likely to assume power in the near future.

The anti-Machiavellian sentiments expressed in Adonias are strikingly similar to those of the Tragedies Sainctes and, although the author is almost certainly not Des Masures himself, he must surely have been familiar with Des Masures's trilogy. This is not to say that 'Philone' s knowledge of Il Principe was not first-hand, it probably was since he uses passages from Machiavelli not found in the Tragedies Sainctes. The author may be the same person as the 'Philone' who wrote Josias, in which case it seems likely that he only read Des Masures's plays and became familiar with Machiavelli's ideas after 1566 since there is no anti-Machiavellian sentiment in Josias. If the author is the same 'Philone', then he has greatly developed his analysis of political behaviour by Adonias, for the earlier play concentrates mainly on the question of the Reformation of the Church and only touches on such topics as the use of dissimulation, the dangers of self-interested courtiers and the necessity of a ruler's reliance on God. In Adonias, there is a much more detailed description of the right kind of political behaviour and a greater grasp of the realities of power. The author was probably aided in this by Des Masures's attacks on Machiavellianism in the Tragedies Sainctes as well
as by the generally greater familiarity in France with Machiavelli's ideas by the 1580s.
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&\text{Que mieux à son vouloir soit le monde entendant,} \\
&\text{Elle /La Babylonienne, ie. the Pope/ induit, sous couleur de religion sainte} \\
&\text{Devant les yeux du peuple une sainteté fainte.} \\
&\text{(unpaginated).}
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39. See also David fugitif, p. 228, l.1233, l.1237-8.
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41. For the theme of the sanctity of kingship in French literature in general in the sixteenth century, see Yardeni (M), La Conscience Nationale en France Pendant les Guerres de Religion (1559-1598), Paris and Louvain, 1971, chapter 1.
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Ne craignant sur son chef les coups de la tempeste.
(p. 15).

Like Des Masures, 'M. Philone' is here opposing a Machiavellian type of rule, based on human reason and dissimulation, with a rule based on God's guidance.

43. First published in Paris, 1574 and reprinted in the Archives curieuses de l'histoire de France ed. Climer and D'Anjou, tom. 7. It has been variously attributed to Beza, Hotman and Nicolas Barnaud.

44. Superantius says that the author of the Vindiciae decided

   Que Machiavel avoit posé les fondemens de la tyrannie en ces livres siens, comme il nous apparut assez par les preceptes et enseignemens detestables y semez ça et là. Qu'il n'y avoit remede plus prompt et certain que de ramener la domination des Princes et le droit des peuples à ses legitimes et certains premiers principes: que la puissance des uns et des autres seroit par ce moyen arrestée en certaines limites, sans quoy le gouvernement de l'estât ne peut subsister, et consequemment les preceptes de Machiavel doyvent estre rejetez, estans du tout anéantis par ces principes.

(De la puissance legitime du Prince sur le peuple, et du peuple sur le Prince, s.l., 1581, (BL 521 b 11), p. 9).

45. This was a peculiarly French topic: during most of the sixteenth century in England, there was a general refusal to admit that any case could be made for rebellion (see J.W. Allen, A History of Political Thought in the Sixteenth Century, London, 1928, Part II).

46. Compare Calvin in the Institution Chrétienne,

   Nous devons tous à noz supérieurs, tant qu'ils dominent sur nous, une telle affection de révérence que celle que nous voyons en David, même quels qu'ils soient ... par la volonté du Seigneur ils sont constituez en un estât auquel il a donné une majesté inviolable.


This was Calvin's public position: when, in 1559 and 1560, it became apparent to him that the Reformers could hope to undertake successful resistance, his attitude — as shown in his correspondence — changed.

47. Calvin says in the Institution Chrétienne,
Calvin's attitude is connected with Augustinian deterministic theology, see Levy (G.), 'Some Theology about Tyranny', The Renaissance Reconsidered, A Symposium, Smith College Studies in History, XLIV, (1964), pp. 79-90. Calvin was, however, suspected of implication in the Amboise conspiracy of 1560, see Ronsard, Discours des misères de ce temps ed. Malcolm Smith, Geneva, 1979, pp. 30-31 (note to 1.49-50). Jean de La Taille reflects Calvin's views on this question of submission to a tyrant in Saül, le furieux and La Famine.

48. This passage seems to have been ignored by French writers, intent on presenting Machiavelli as a supporter of tyranny. It was unwittingly, therefore, that later Reformers moved closer to Machiavelli's views, as the continuous persecution of the Reformed Church in France naturally led to a desire for greater political freedom. François Hotman (in the Franco Gallia of 1574), Beza (as early as the Traité de l'autorité du magistrat en la punition des hérétiques of 1554), the author of the Vindiciae contra tyrannos, Du Bartas (in the first version of La Judit published in 1574), and D'Aubigné (in Du devoir mutuel des princes et des sujets and in the Tragiques: Princes) all allow armed resistance to a tyrant in the last resort. For literature on this resistance debate, see —


49. See Montaigne who criticises those who base their morality on what everyone else does—
le jugement de nos inclinations et de nos actions, la plus difficile matière et la plus importante qui soit, nous la remettons à la voix de la commune et de la tourbe, mère d'ignorance, d'injustice et d'inconstance.


See also my chapter on Ronsard, pp. 523-5. In Il Principe, Machiavelli despises the crowd as fickle, ignorant and full of vices, but he nonetheless allows his prince to succumb to their morality.

50. References throughout are to the edition of Adonias in the BN (Lausanne 1586, BN Rés p Yf 10 bis).

51. R. Thomas points out these lessons for contemporary rulers (op. cit., pp. 87-89).

52. See my chapter on the La Taille brothers pp. 720-75.

53. See the Chorus in Act III (C5v-C6r) and compare Josias Act I, p. 15 (quoted above note 42) for the use of the same imagery in a similar context.

54. Moab was probably intended to represent Philip II. In the passage quoted, Adonias fears that Moab is seeking to gain power in Israel by supporting him, as it was feared that the Spanish would gain a foothold in France by their support of the Guises.

55. An echo of the words attributed to Louis XI ('qui nescit dissimulare, nescit regnare') and often linked with Machiavelli's advice on dissimulation, see my chapter on Pierre Matthieu pp. 73-75.

56. This echo of Machiavelli is pointed out by R. Thomas (op. cit., p. 376). She also points out the Machiavellian implications of the theme of broken promises in Adonias (op. cit., pp. 279-281).

57. The plot is found in I Kings 2: 13-18 but not the emphasis on Adonias's dissimulation.

58. Compare Montaigne in Essais B. II, 18 where, in what is probably a veiled attack on Machiavelli, he criticises the use of deceit on the grounds that it leads to a breakdown in social relations,

Nostre intelligence se conduisant par la seule voye de la parolle, celuy qui la fauce, trahit la societé publique. C'est le seul util par le moien duquel se communiquent nos volonteiz et nos pensees...S'il nous trompent, il rompt tout nostre commerce et dissoult toutes les liasons de nostre police.

We are very fortunate in possessing a relatively large amount of information about the life of Theodore Agrippa D'Aubigné — indeed the main source of knowledge of his life comes from a work written by himself for his children and published for the first time in the eighteenth century — *Sa Vie à ses Enfants*.¹ The aim of this autobiography was to give a fuller description of D'Aubigné's actions than was possible in the *Histoire Universelle* which he regarded as too serious a work to include an account of his own involvement in events.² Like all autobiographies, *Sa Vie* is biased: D'Aubigné presents himself in a very favourable light as a loyal Reformer constantly let down by the fickleness and ingratitude of his leader, Navarre.

D'Aubigné was born on 8 February 1552 in the province of Saintonge. He was the son of a judge and lived for some of his early life in a castle belonging to the wife of Henry of Navarre's tutor. D'Aubigné thus became acquainted with Navarre at an early age. He had various tutors at home — the severe and fanatical Reformer, Jean Cottin, and the more kindly Jean Morel, also a Calvinist and renowned for his learning. D'Aubigné was taught Latin, Greek and Hebrew and he tells us that by the age of seven and a half he could translate Plato.

In 1560, whilst on a journey to Paris with his father, Jean D'Aubigné, he passed the bodies of Reformers hung for their part in the Amboise conspiracy and his father made the young D'Aubigné swear to avenge their deaths.³ Two years later, he again went to Paris, this time to study under Mathieu Béroalde. But his stay only lasted two months for, with the renewal of hostilities in June, all Reformers had to flee Paris. D'Aubigné was obliged to take refuge with 'la pieuse Renee', Duchess of Ferrara,

¹ *Sa Vie à ses Enfants*
² Like all autobiographies...
³ In 1560, whilst on a journey to Paris with his father,
in Montargis. This experience fired him with a desire to fight for the Reformers' cause like his father.

In 1563, Jean D'Aubigné died from a war wound and D'Aubigné was sent by his guardian to study in Geneva. He seems to have spent an unhappy two years in this city, oppressed by the austere atmosphere and the severity of his teachers. His Greek was judged to be below standard but he found consolation in the friendship of Loyse Sarrasin, the daughter of the house in which he was staying, who helped him with his studies. In the end, he ran away 'sans le sçeu de ses parents' to Lyons. There, he studied astronomy and magic under Loys d'Arzay, an adventurer. Eventually, his money ran out, and he had thoughts of suicide from which he was saved by what he describes as the providential appearance of his cousin with money. This was one of the many acts of God which D'Aubigné believed guided and shaped his life.

He returned to live with his guardian, but despite the latter's opposition, D'Aubigné 'enchante/De ceste pestifere et folle liberté', soon escaped and went off to fight for the Reformers in the third civil war. This was the beginning of a long military career during which he fought loyally and consistently for the Reformers' cause. After the peace of Saint-Germain in 1570, he returned to his property near Talcy having established himself, not without some difficulty, as rightful heir. He spent the time there reading and writing poetry dedicated to Diane Salviati with whom he had fallen in love. Diane was the niece of Ronsard's Cassandre and came from a rich, Italian and strictly Catholic family. D'Aubigné's love seemed doomed from the start. The collection inspired by Diane - Le Printemps - was written in various stages, some even as late as 1576. It is made up of the Odes, Stances and L'Hécatombe à Diane and was not published till the nineteenth century. Ronsard's influence on this collection of Petrarchan love poems is marked.
In 1572, D'Aubigné was summoned to Paris by Henry of Navarre to attend the latter's marriage to Margaret of Valois. Once again, providence intervened in D'Aubigné's life in the form of a duel which obliged him to flee Paris just three days before the Saint Bartholomew's Day Massacres. He took refuge from the aftermath of the massacres at Talcy, the home of the Salviatis. In that powerful Catholic household, he was safe from any physical attack - but unhappiness threatened at another level as the rift between him and Diane increased. Despite D'Aubigné's lack of money, Diane's father seems to have considered him a suitable match but Diane began to grow away from him (see the second part of L'Hécatombe). D'Aubigné returned to his own estate and composed the most plaintive poems of Le Printemps.

A change came in 1573 when he was summoned to court by Henry of Navarre to be his 'ecuyer' in gratitude for Jean D'Aubigné's service to the Reformers' cause. Like the Duke of Alençon, Navarre was at this time held virtually prisoner by Catherine de' Medici and was leading an idle life at court. D'Aubigné found himself easily drawn into this frivolous court life and spent his time writing entertainments, flirting and telling the court ladies their horoscopes. He probably had contacts with other poets at court for in 1574, he published some Vers Funèbres...sur la mort d'Estienne Jodelle. He was also involved in Protestant intrigues. During 1574 and 1575, he was twice ordered by Navarre to fight in the Catholic army for the purpose of 'whitewashing' himself since Catherine suspected him of being a dangerous influence on Navarre, now nominally Catholic. In one of these campaigns, D'Aubigné fought alongside Guise with whom he became friendly, 'ce qui ne nuisit point à le maintenir en la Cour...' (Sa Vie, ed. cit., p. 398). In 1575, Alençon escaped from court and in the following February, D'Aubigné planned Navarre's escape with Fervacques and Lavardin. Navarre and D'Aubigné joined
Alençon's forces and in June 1576, Navarre officially abjured the Catholic religion.

In 1577, D'Aubigné fought for the Reformers in the sixth civil war, but as usual, his service to Navarre was not uncritical. He once said his aim was to

Ne flatter point mon Maistre et jamais ne louer.  
(Elégie, ed. cit., p. 329).

Many times during his life, D'Aubigné was to criticise Navarre's leadership of the Reformers: D'Aubigné knew that the Reformers desperately needed a strong leader whom they could respect and he felt that Navarre frequently let his followers down by what D'Aubigné saw as compromises with the Catholics and lack of integrity in his private life. His relations with Navarre at this time were precarious. Navarre had been unwilling to defend D'Aubigné against the criticisms and plots of other Reformers and for a while, he left Navarre's service.

He spent 1578 on his estate writing the first draft of the Tragiques, conceived of during an illness after he had been wounded at Castel-Jaloux. The passages written at this time mirror his sadness at the break up of the affair with Diane, remorse for his former frivolous life as a courtier, a renewal of his faith and a conviction that he had been given a mission from God to defend the Reformers' cause. He returned to fight a while longer, but when Navarre signed the Treaty of Bergerac, D'Aubigné was furious at what he believed was Navarre selling out to the Catholics. By the end of 1579 however, D'Aubigné was once again reconciled with Navarre and fought in the 'guerre des amoureux' of 1580. He took Montaigu with only seventeen men and became governor, ruling the garrison with iron discipline till it was finally recaptured by the Catholics, much to D'Aubigné's disgust.

D'Aubigné was by now deeply in love with Suzanne de Lezay, a Reformer from a rich and noble family, who shared his commitment to their cause. On 6 June 1583, with Navarre's support, they were married and went to
live at Mursay, a property belonging to Suzanne's family. D'Aubigné liked
country life and identified with the simple peasants more easily than with
courtiers. The Misères for example, reveals the extent of his sympathy
with the sufferings of ordinary people during the civil wars. By 1585,
D'Aubigné was again away fighting for the Reformers. He took Oléron in
March 1586 but was himself captured in July after a battle. 23

D'Aubigné blamed Navarre's negligence for this defeat and when he was
released in November, he returned home determined to leave the Protestant
party. He began studying the writings of Catholic theologians but after
reading them, he remained more than ever convinced of the rightness of
the Reformers' cause. Therefore, in 1587, he again fought for the
Reformers though he remained suspicious of Navarre and refused to look
after the illegitimate child Navarre entrusted to him in the hope of
winning over his austere critic. Yet Navarre sometimes appreciated
D'Aubigné's honesty. For example, it was D'Aubigné he consulted when he
needed advice about marrying the Countess of Guiche. D'Aubigné told him
to wait for two years and reminded him of his duty as leader of the
Reformers to set a good example to his followers. 24 As heir to the
French throne, he should do nothing to imperil his chances of succeeding.

When Navarre joined forces with Henry III in April 1589, D'Aubigné
disapproved; moreover, after the assassination of Henry III, Henry IV
signed a Declaration on 4 August 1589 which merely confirmed for the
Reformers all their previous legal rights. For D'Aubigné, this was very
far from his dream of a Protestant France, but he was obliged to continue
serving Henry who, as a mark of confidence, had summoned him to guard the
Cardinal of Bourbon.

In 1593, Henry abjured the Protestant faith despite D'Aubigné's
to attempts to dissuade . him 25 Around this time, D'Aubigné took part
in various Protestant assemblies and became an occasional spokesman for the
Reformers who were trying to gain concessions from the King. Because of
his uncompromising attitude, D'Aubigné was often made scapegoat for accusations against the Reformers and he earned the nickname 'Le Bouc du Désert' 'pource que tous deschargeoyent leur haine sur luy'. In 1598, Henry IV finally agreed to give some guarantees to the Reformers in the Edict of Nantes, but for D'Aubigné these concessions were not enough. Disillusioned, he returned home to his family to continue work on his Tragiques and to plan his Histoire Universelle.

In 1597, D'Aubigné had begun his Confession Catholique du Sieur de Sancy, a satire on people who change their religion according to where their political interests lie (Sancy went through three such 'conversions'). It was inspired by Henry IV's abjuration, which brought in its wake the 'conversion' of many other Reformers, and is dedicated to Du Perron who was instrumental in bringing about Henry IV's abjuration. He probably continued working on this as late as 1617. It was first published in 1660 in Recueil de diverses pièces servant à l'Histoire d'Henri III. It appears, however, to have been circulated in manuscript during D'Aubigné's lifetime since an imitation of it, entitled L'Enfer, was written around 1609.

D'Aubigné rarely returned to court after this, for he felt out of place there now: under Henry IV and his new wife, Marie de' Medici, life revolved around strict adherence to Catholic services and ceremonies. In the preface to the Histoire Universelle, he says,

Si depuis la grande tranquillité de la France, j'ai esté moins souvent près de sa Majesté, ç'à esté aux saisons où le repos de Capué ne demande que la plume des flatteurs. (ed. cit., p. 10).

In 1601 however, he had a shortstay at court when he was summoned by Henry IV to teach the courtiers the rules of jousting and tournaments. Henry paid tribute to D'Aubigné's uncorruptible loyalty to the Reformers' cause saying that D'Aubigné was one of the few great leaders he had been unable to bribe. D'Aubigné's reply shows how far his whole life was
inspired by an unswerving faith in the Reformers' cause regardless of what was in his best political interests. With characteristic frankness and courage, he told Henry IV,

Sire, je suis tombé en election, que j'ay suyvie quand les autres la practiquoyent [bargained]. On a tiré le serment de moy qui eschet en tel cas; je ne scay que c'est de l'oublier, ni de l'explicquer; seulement je scay que tous nos plus apparents, hormis Monsieur de la Trimouille vendoyent leur peine à vostre Majesté, comme estant là pour ses affaires: je mentirois si je vous en disois autant; j'y estois pour les Esglises de Dieu, avec autant plus de juste passion, qu'elles estoient plus abaissées et plus affoiblies, vous ayant perdu pour protecteur... Sire, j'ayme mieux quitter vostre Royaume et la vie, que de gagner vos bonnes graces en trahissant mes freres et compagnons. (Sa Vie, ed. cit., pp. 435-436).

D'Aubigné returned home to continue working on his Histoire Universelle which was to be his justification of the Reformers' cause, more weighty and less polemical than the Tragiques to which it was to form a sequel. His original aim was to give the history of the Reformers' party in France from 1553 (the year of Navarre's birth) to 1602 and to describe events in other countries which had links with France during this period. Later, he added accounts of Henry IV's death and the Reformers' campaigns against Louis XIII between 1622 and 1623. D'Aubigné regarded himself as eminently qualified to write such a history since he had been with Navarre during so many important episodes of the latter's struggles towards the throne (see his preface to the Histoire Universelle, ed. cit., pp. 9-10).

In the preface to the Histoire, D'Aubigné affirms his desire not to flatter Henry IV but merely to set down the facts surrounding his life. He illustrates this charmingly by an anecdote which, he says, will replace the usual portrait of the author which prefaces most histories,

car il ne profite au Lecteur, de voir le visage et les lineamens de celui qui l'enseigne; mais bien ceux de l'ame... (ed. cit., p. 6).

The anecdote which reveals the 'soul' of D'Aubigné concerns Navarre's capture of a fine deer while on a hunting expedition—
il me disoit que cette rencontre devoit estre en son Histoire; et me conviant à l'escrire, je lui respondis...
Sire, commencez de faire et je commencerai d'escrire.

(ed. cit., p. 6).

D'Aubigné continues,

Je vous donne est eschantillon pour garantir les louanges non communes, que ce Prince...a receu de ses faictx et non de mes paroles, de son Histoire et non de moi; en qui vous ne verrez ni digressions ni exclamations, n'estant mon mestier que d'escrire sans juger des actions, comme les praemisses d'un argument, duquel celui qui lit amasse la judicieuse conclusion.

(ed. cit., pp. 6-7).

However, as we shall see, D'Aubigné's history is less impartial than these remarks may suggest.

There exists a pamphlet entitled Choses Notables et qui semblent dignes de l'histoire, advenues aux premiers troubles, et qui peuvent estre ajustées aux discours qui en ont esté escrits which may have been written by D'Aubigné prior to the Histoire Universelle. It seems to be testing out material for the Histoire since it gives various anecdotes, relating to battles under Charles IX and Navarre's escape, in which D'Aubigné was involved and which are repeated in the Histoire Universelle. Moreover, the author corrects various passages from De Thou's history of Charles IX's reign - and it was De Thou's Histoire (first published in 1604) which was one of the main sources for D'Aubigné's Histoire Universelle.

D'Aubigné continued to oppose Henry IV's plan for reconciling the two religions and for this purpose, he returned to Paris in 1607. There, D'Aubigné earned the King's wrath by debating against his attempt to unite the two Churchs. D'Aubigné left Paris in January 1608, despairing that Henry would ever help the Reformers. In 1610, D'Aubigné's prophecy came true - having renounced the Protestant faith from the heart, it was through the heart that Henry was wounded and died (see note 25). After Henry's death, D'Aubigné began work on his Discours par Stances avec l'Esprit du Feu Roy Henry Quatriesme. He continued to add to this work.
which was first published in its complete version only in 1877. In this poem, D'Aubigné reproaches Henry IV for putting State interests before those of religion and for favouring the League captains and preachers at the expense of Reformers when he became King.

Under the Regency, D'Aubigné maintained his uncompromising position, unlike many other Reformers who preferred to negotiate with Marie de' Medici. D'Aubigné criticises these 'apostats dégénérés' in the Tragiques and in Sa Vie he remarks sadly,

\[\text{Dès lors commencèrent les affaires de la Religion, et le Parti tout entier à prendre une grande decadence.} \]

(ed. cit., p. 442).

He began writing Le Caducée ou l'Ange de Paix, a prose work inspired by the Assembly of Saumur (held in 1611) where many Reformers led by the Duke of Bouillon, sacrificed their religious beliefs to their political interests. Meanwhile, loyal Reformers were preparing for rebellion under Condé. In 1615, D'Aubigné took part in this campaign, using much of his own money to help finance the Protestant army.

In 1616, the Tragiques were published anonymously. This poem is largely the work of a younger D'Aubigné and like Jean de La Taille's plays, it was already out of date by the time it was published and did not cause as much stir as it would have done had it been published at the height of the civil wars. In 1617, D'Aubigné had a poem against Concini published privately, justifying the murder of the latter on Louis XIII's orders. In the same year, he began work on his satire, the Avantures du baron de Faeneste, which arose out of Espernon's conflict with the inhabitants of La Rochelle (Espernon is caricatured in the figure of Faeneste). The first two parts of this satire were published in 1617. In 1619 the third book of the Avantures was published, the fourth being published posthumously in 1630 at Geneva where its licentious tone caused a great scandal and the publisher, Pierre Aubert, was arrested. In 1619 also, a work entitled Libre Discours sur l'Estat Present des Eglises...
Reformées en France was published in which the author pleads for tolerance for the Reformers and protection for them from the King. This work has been attributed to D'Aubigné.

In 1619 appeared the first two volumes of the Histoire Universelle but without a royal 'privilège' (Louis XIII was unwilling to give his authorization to a book which dwelt on his father's early life as a Reformer) and bearing the false dates of 1616 and 1618, respectively. In 1620 these volumes were condemned and burned by a tribunal at the Châtelet. This event, as well as his disappointment with the compromising attitude of the French Reformers, the disgraceful behaviour of his son Constant and the forced sale of his two properties to the Duke of Rohan, caused D'Aubigné to think of going to live in Geneva. Meanwhile, he took part in a Protestant uprising led by Rohan, Soubise and La Noue against the King. The Reformers were defeated and D'Aubigné was obliged to flee to Geneva, taking with him his illegitimate son, Nathan.

He arrived in Geneva on September 1, 1620 where he was warmly received by the Genevans who rented a house for him and sought his advice on military matters such as the fortification of the city in case of an attack by Catholic troops (he was also called upon to advise Berne about their defence). During the years 1621 and 1622, D'Aubigné wrote his Traité sur les guerres civiles where he attacks compromising Reformers and refers to the current belief that Louis XIII was being persuaded to exterminate heretics by his Jesuit advisers. He probably also wrote at this time Du Debvoir mutuel des Roys et des Subjects. In this work, following in the tradition of earlier Huguenot pamphlets such as Dé Iure Magistratum, Vindiciae contra tyrannos and Franco-Gallia, D'Aubigné puts limits on the power of a King and says that subjects have the right to revolt against a ruler who acts tyrannically, especially in matters of religion. No wonder that when Venice proposed D'Aubigné to be commander of some French Protestant volunteers she wished to hire, Louis XIII vetoed
this choice. Indeed, in 1623, D'Aubigné was sentenced to death in France in his absence. The Genevans, too, were afraid of offending the French King for in 1623, they took away the 'privilège' granted by the Genevan Council in September 1622 for D'Aubigné's *Histoire Universelle*. Venice, although reputedly more liberal than Geneva in matters of publication, also refused to grant him a 'privilège'.

In April 1623, D'Aubigné married Renée Burlamachi, a widow. Probably it was in 1623 also that the second edition of the *Tragiques* was published. This contained many additions. In 1624, his son Constant came to Geneva to ask his father's pardon for his behaviour, but by 1627, Constant was again betraying Huguenot interests. It is at this point, with a description of the dishonourable behaviour of his son, that *Sa Vie* ends. In 1626, a second edition of the *Histoire Universelle* was finally published in Geneva by Pierre Aubert. It carries the false mark of having been printed in Amsterdam (the Genevan Council probably turned a blind eye to this) and contains many additions made by D'Aubigné, including an Index. In 1627, D'Aubigné began to compose a fourth tome for his *Histoire* in order to include an account of the war waged by Louis XIII against the Reformers between 1619 and 1622. In 1630 the *Petites Oeuvres meslées* were published at Geneva by Pierre Aubert. These contain some paraphrases of the Psalms and meditations on them, some prayers and his poem *L'Hyver* about his feelings as an old man, counter-balancing *Le Printemps* written in his youth.

By this time, the Protestant party was growing demoralised in France and indeed all over Europe. D'Aubigné was depressed by Louis XIII's ingratitude towards those who had formerly helped his father, and continually warned Louis of the danger of following the advice of Jesuits. But the 1629 'grâce d'Alais' signed after the capitulation of La Rochelle, left the Reformers with virtually no military or political power in France. D'Aubigné had outlived the cause for which he had fought all his life.
In the autumn of 1629, he fell ill and died in May 1630.

He left behind a very vivid picture of himself: through his writings we have an image of a swashbuckling soldier with a warm heart, a blunt tongue and a reckless taste for heroic exploits. Lacking the tempering virtues of discretion, subtlety and modesty, everything in his works is heightened and exaggerated for effect, including the attacks on his enemies. The inspiration behind his actions was always his belief in the Reformers' cause and his personal faith in God guiding his life. He was a very sincere, touchy, often vain man who could not conceive of anything less than total commitment to one's religious beliefs. The one theme which runs through all his major political and historical works is criticism of those who compromise their faith, putting interests of State or career before religious beliefs.

Most of his works were published after the sixteenth century, but the thoughts which lie behind them are in the spirit of the Reformation and the experiences which shaped them took place in the sixteenth century. Sainte-Beuve was to say:

\[\text{Si jamais l'on pouvait personifier un siècle dans un individu, d'Aubigné serait, à lui seul, le type vivant, l'image abrégée du sien.}\]

D'Aubigné, like Rabelais, is one of those larger than life Renaissance figures endowed with enormous energy and passion and a vivid, not to say visionary, imagination. An epic figure, he wrote one of the finest epic poems in the French language.
FOOTNOTES


2. In the preface to Sa Vie, D'Aubigné says,

...voicy le discours de ma vie, en la privauté paternelle, qui ne m'a point contraint de cacher ce qui en l'Histoire Universelle eust este de mauvais goust.

(ed. cit., p. 383).

3. His father's words, reminiscent of Hamilcar's advice to Hannibal, were, allegedly,

Mon enfant, il ne faut pas que ta teste soit espargnée après la mienne, pour venger ces chefs pleins d'honneur; si tu t'y espargnes, tu auras ma malediction.

(Sa Vie, ed. cit. p. 386).

4. See D'Aubigné's later praise of Renée in Les Fers (Les Tragiques ed. A. Garnier and J. Plattard, Paris, 1932 vol. III, p. 130, This is the edition of the Tragiques referred to throughout this chapter).


11. For precise dating of the various poems see Desonay's introduction to his edition of Le Printemps, Geneva and Lille, 1952, and J. Pineaux, La Poésie des Protestants de Langue Française, Paris, 1971, pp. 45-47. Some of the Stances and the Odes were written for Margaret of Valois and her ladies. These were later replaced by
other, more mediocre poems, apparently for two reasons: D'Aubigné did not want to appear as a frivolous court poet and Margaret had allied with the League in 1585 and was thus a political opponent of D'Aubigné and the Reformers.


13. In a letter describing the revival of poetry under Francis the First, D'Aubigné praises Ronsard above all other poets and speaks of his personal friendship with the poet to whom D'Aubigné showed some of his poetry, Oeuvres, ed. cit., 'Lettres sur diverses Sciences', Letter XI, p. 860. This friendship is remarkable as Ronsard was easily the most influential Catholic poet. The answer may lie in the fact that both men admired people with strong and consistent views. In the 1590's, D'Aubigné became acquainted with two other committed Catholics, Scévole de Sainte-Marthe and Nicolas Rapin, see J. Plattard, Agrippa D'Aubigné, ed. cit., pp. 35-37. There is a work (now out of date) comparing Ronsard and D'Aubigné: E. Prarond, Poëtes Historiens Ronsard et D'Aubigné sous Henri III, Paris, 1873.

14. In his preface to the Mémoires d'Agrippa D'Aubigné (Paris, 1889, p. vii), L. Lalanne suggests that, like other Reformers, D'Aubigné may have heard rumours of the forthcoming massacres and fled. This does not fit in with what we know of D'Aubigné's courage and loyalty to the Reformers. It also assumes that the massacres were premeditated, a theory which is now discredited.

15. See A. Garnier, op. cit., pp. 91-141.

16. In the Elégie, D'Aubigné says,

Nos Princes clairs voient me virent au village
Roy d'un petit hameau. Prince de mon message,
Et n'eurent de repos tant que j'eusse perdu
Mon aise et mes raisons et que j'eusse rendu
Ma liberté esclave à leurs vaines promesses.
(ed. cit., p. 329).

17. For a description of Catherine's treatment of Navarre during this period see the Histoire Universelle, s.l., 1626 (BL 596 k I) pp. 7-8.

18. See Sa Vie, ed. cit., pp. 398-399. In Les Princes of the Tragiques, the battle between Fortune and Virtue for the soul of the young courtier is largely autobiographical and see Les Vengeances (the Tragiques, ed. cit., p. 13) for his regrets over his early life at court.


20. It was in 1577 that D'Aubigné refused to act as a go-between in Navarre's love affairs (Sa Vie ed. cit., p. 402). Navarre found D'Aubigné's censorious attitude very trying at times and greeted him at Oléron in 1586 with the words,

Dieu vous gard, Sertorius, Manlius, Torquatus, le vieux Caton, et si l'antiquité a encore quelque plus severe Capitaine, Dieu vous gard cestui-là.
(Sa Vie, ed. cit., p. 423).
21. He had had an earlier vision of this work in 1573 when he fell ill following the break with Diane Salviati; and see the preface to the Tragiques,

Il y a trente-six ans et plus que cet oeuvre est fait, assavoir aux guerres de septante et sept à Castel-Jaloux, où l'auteur commandoit quelques chevaux-légers, et se tenant pour mort pour les playes receuës en un grand combat, il traça comme pour testament cet ouvrage, lequel encore quelques années après il a peu poluir et emplir. (Les Tragiques, ed. cit., vol. I, Aux Lecteurs, p. 5).

He continued writing and rewriting the Tragiques, in between fighting, probably even after 1600 (see I.D. McFarlane's introduction to his edition of Les Tragiques, London, 1970, pp. 4-7).

22. D'Aubigné wrote Navarre a typically forthright letter, accusing him of ingratitude,

Sire, Vostre mémoire vous reprochera, douz'ans de mon service, douze playes sur mon estomac: elle vous fera souvenir de vostre prison, et que ceste main qui vous escrit en a defaict les verrouils, et est demeurée pure en vous servant, vuide de vos biensfaits et des corrupptions de vostre ennemi et de vous; par cet escrit elle vous recommande à Dieu, à qui je donne mes services passez, et vouë ceux de l'advenir, par lesquels je m'efforceray de vous faire cognoistre qu'en me perdant, vous avez perdu vostre très fidele serviteur etc. (Sa Vie, ed. cit., p. 407).


24. 'la monnoye de ceux qui servent le protecteur des Esglises est difficile à un Prince, c'est le zele, l'intégrité, les bonnes actions: payement de ceux qui sont vos serviteurs en quelque esgard, en autres sont vos compagnons, mais à ceste condition qu'ils vous laissent la plus petite part des dangers qu'ils peuvent, et des honeurs et avantages de la guerre l'entiere disposition.' (Sa Vie, ed. cit., p. 427).

25. D'Aubigné regarded Châtel's assassination attempt on Henry IV in December 1594 as a punishment from God for his abjuration. He warned Henry,

Sire, vous n'avez encore renoncé Dieu que des levres, il s'est contenté de les percer; mais quand vous le renoncerez du coeur, il vous percerà le coeur. (Sa Vie, ed. cit., p. 431).

See also the preface to Les Tragiques (Oeuvres, ed. cit., p. 18) where he repeats this warning.

26. The first edition of the Tragiques was entitled Les Tragiques Donnez au Public par le larcin de Promethee, au Dezert, Par L.B.D.D., s.l., 1616 (BL 1161 g 7).
27. D'Aubigné's wife, Suzanne, died in 1596 leaving him with three sons and two daughters. Two of these sons died soon afterwards. *Sa Vie* is dedicated to his surviving children: Constant, Marie and Louise.

28. Published at Cologne by Pierre du Marteau, 1660. The 1663 edition of this work contains the *Journal des choses membrables advenues durant tout le regne de Henry III, Discours merveilleux, Histoire des Amours de Henri IV, Divorce Satyrique ou les Amours de la Reine Marguerite de Valoys* (sometimes attributed to D'Aubigné). The BL has a copy at 594 a 26 (1).

29. *L'Enfer. Satire 'dans le goût de Sancy'* ed. C. Read, Paris, 1873. This is a satire on various contemporaries who are depicted in Héli. Like D'Aubigné in Sancy, the author criticises Reformers who leave the party, the fashion for duels, and the influence of the Jesuits over Navarre.

30. In *Les Feux*, he says,

```
Que si Dieu prend à gré ces premices, je veux
Quand mes fruicts seront meurs lui payer d'autres voeux,
Me livrer aux travaux de la pesante histoire,
Et en prose coucher les hauts faits de sa gloire.
(Le Tragiques, ed. cit., p. 8).
```

Later on, he says,

```
Je ne fay qu'un indice à un plus gros ouvrage.
(Éd. cit., p. 46).
```

31. It was first published in the *Archives Curieuses de l'histoire de France* ed. L. Cimber and F. D'Anjou, Paris, 1835, Première Série, Tom. 8, pp. 407-419. It is attributed there to D'Aubigné.

32. On his departure, Henry had said to D'Aubigné,

```
Aubigné, ne vous y trompés plus, je tiens ma vie temporelle et spirituelle entre les mains du Sainct Pere, veritablement vicaire de Dieu.
(Sa Vie, ed. cit., p. 441).
```


34. D'Aubigné says,

```
Tu avois mis aux pieds un parti des fidelles
Qui, pressé dans ta plume et logé soubs tes aisles,
Avoit chassé ta nuit et t'avoit delivré
De risques sur ton chef coup sur coup avenus.
(Oeuvres, ed. cit., p. 355).
```

35. See, for example, *Jugement*,

```
Je vous en veux à vous, apostats degeneres,
Qui leschez le sang frais tout fumant de vos peres
Sur les pieds des tueurs, serfs qui avez servi
Les bras qui ont la vie à vos peres ravi!
```
36. See A. Garnier (op. cit.) vol. II, pp. 181-245 for the dating of the different stages in the composition of the Tragiques.

37. See Kinser (S), 'D'Aubigné and the murder of Concini: Complaintes du sang du Grand Henry', Studies in Philology, LXII, (1965), pp. 662-693. There is a copy of the Complaintes in the Mazarine Library (35285 pièce 52 8). It takes the form of a collection of fifteen sextets.

38. There are copies of this fourth edition in the BL (1073 c 16 (1)) and in the Bodleian library (8° N 22 Art).

39. There is no modern edition. The BN has a copy of the 1619 edition at Lb36 1264 and the Mazarine Library at 49246. The BL possesses a Dutch translation published in 1632 (BL T 2256 (4)).

40. By the Syllabus aliquot dynadomum (1628), p. 23.

41. The Histoire Universelle had been largely finished by 1612. The delay in publication was due to the fact that D'Aubigné was waiting for some information to complete his sections on affairs in the East - see letters XIV and XVI in Oeuvres, ed. cit., pp. 866-869.

42. Not published till the Réaume and De Caussade edition of his Oeuvres appeared in 1877.

43. See Pithon (R), 'Notes sur une lettre de 1626', BHR, XXIX, (1968), pp. 133-151. See also D'Aubigné's letters to MM de Lomenie, Boullet and De Seaux (Oeuvres, ed. cit., pp. 866-889) on the difficulty of obtaining a 'privilège'.

44. The BL possesses a copy of this second edition entitled Les Tragiques ci-devant donnez au public par le larcin de Promethee. Et depuis avouez et enrichis par le Sr D'Aubigné, s.l.n.d., (BL C 97 aa 12).

45. A fragment of this fourth tome (part of the fourth and fifth books) was published for the first time by J. Platard, Supplément à L'Histoire Universelle d'Agrippa D'Aubigné, Paris, 1925.

46. There are copies of this work in the BL (3678 a 17 (1)) and in the Bodleian library (8° N 22 Art).

47. Many of his works were not published till the edition of his Oeuvres complètes ed. Réaume and De Caussade appeared in Paris, 1873-1892. Till then, his work remained in manuscripts belonging to his family. Eug. and Em. Haag writing in 1861, say,

Les ouvrages de d'Aubigné sont, en général, très-rares; plusieurs même ne se trouvent pas du tout et ne sont indiqués par aucun bibliographe.


48. Tableau historique et critique de la poésie française et du théâtre français au seizième siècle, Paris, 1869, p. 140. See also E. Prarond (op. cit.),

D'Aubigné est le seizième siècle même. Son âme, comme sa poésie, vit tout entière dans la politique, dans la religion.

(p. 6).
The influence of Machiavelli on D'Aubigné has not been examined so far by any historian: whenever the two authors are mentioned it is unfailingly in connection with the passages in the Tragiques where D'Aubigné criticises followers of Machiavelli in France: Misères (1: 1047-8) and the Princes (1: 651-654). Historians have ignored the fact that D'Aubigné makes some favourable references to Machiavelli and that the Index to his Histoire Universelle of 1626 gives a long list of page references under the heading 'Machiavelismes'. There is therefore a need for a complete re-examination of D'Aubigné's knowledge of and attitude towards Machiavelli, taking into account much more of his work than merely the two hostile references in the Tragiques.

Although this is a thesis dealing with poetry and drama, in this chapter it will be necessary to refer to D'Aubigné's Histoire Universelle and other prose works, for these often provide the key to his attitude to Machiavelli in his epic poem, the Tragiques. Mention will frequently be made of the Index of 'Machiavelismes' which appeared in the Histoire Universelle for the first time in 1626. By 'Machiavelismes', D'Aubigné means 'actions which I am condemning and which I attribute to the pernicious influence of Machiavelli's teachings in France,' and it is mainly his Catholic opponents whom D'Aubigné indicts in this way. In the Index, each 'Machiavelisme' has a page number beside it and while it is usually clear which actions D'Aubigné must be condemning as Machiavellian, the reference is never explicit and what follows is my own interpretation of the key given in the Index. For convenience, I have grouped these references according to subject matter and wherever possible, I shall relate the discussion to comparable passages in the Tragiques.
APPROVAL OF MACHIAVELLI

In his preface to the *Histoire Universelle* there is a long passage praising De Thou as a historian and comparing him with other historians,

> En lui vous trouverez un soin encor plus general qu'en Sleidan, les agréables recherches de Guichardin, et LES MERVEILLEUSES LUMIERES DE MACHIAVEL (/my capitals/): vous trouverez qu'il amis le nez aux Conseils plus avant que les sieurs du Belai et de Commines, lesquels je nomme tous pour les perles de nostre aage.

*(ed. cit., p. 5).*

Machiavelli is treated objectively as a historian and, as such, approved of. ³

In the work entitled *Libre Discours sur l'Estat Present des Eglises Reformees en France* (attributed to D'Aubigné) the author refers to Machiavelli in passing as a historian of Florence. Having discussed the successful rebellion of the Romans and the Swiss against their rulers, the author adds,

> Mais il ne s'ensuit pas que tels evenemens authorisent les autres à se liguer contre leurs Princes, d'autant que n'ayans aucune vocation pour ce faire de Dieu ny des hommes; telles factions ne ressentent qu'un vray brigandage. Aussi se peut il remarquer par le succes d'icelles (après Machiavell en son histoire Florentine) que de cent reformateurs armez, ou conspirateurs contre le gouvernement de leur pays, quelque mauvais qu'il soit: à grand peine s'en trouvera-il un qui ait bonne volonté, et qui ne perisse en fin miserablement...

More praise of Machiavelli appears in a letter where, speaking of important statesmen in various European countries, D'Aubigné remarks,

> L'Italie seroit plus fertile en ces esprits (/statesmen/) si nous les connaissions comme les Francois. Cosme et Laurents de Medicis se sont fait coignoi...et c'est à leur service qu'ont esclatté ces EXCELLENTS ESPRITS (/my capitals/) Machiavel, Guychardin.

Again, we have approval of Machiavelli, but this passage reveals that D'Aubigné's knowledge of Machiavelli's life was scanty: he imagines him writing at the time of Lorenzo de' Medici, the golden age of Florentine literary achievement. Although Machiavelli was born under Lorenzo de' Medici in 1469, his political and literary activities came much later, under Soderini and then Giuliano de' Medici (son of Lorenzo Il Magnifico).
and Lorenzo de' Medici (grandson of Lorenzo Il Magnifico). Moreover, Machiavelli was not exactly 'à leur service' for he spent the greater part of his life after the return of the Medicis trying to win their favour and employment. D'Aubigné is presumably thinking of the preface to Il Principe which Machiavelli dedicated to the later Lorenzo - whom D'Aubigné probably confused with his grandfather. He may have been led astray in this by Jacques Gohory who gives a biography of Machiavelli in the preface to his translation of Il Principe (published in 1571) and says that Machiavelli dedicated Il Principe to Lorenzo Il Magnifico.6 If (unacknowledged) use of Machiavelli may be taken as a sign of approval on the part of the borrower, we may cite D'Aubigné's description of King Ferdinand of Spain in Tome I of his Histoire Universelle as approval of Machiavelli's views as a historian. D'Aubigné says,

Nous avons fort peu de choses à dire de l'Espagne, pource qu'elle a reposé en soi, troublant les autres nations, ayant Ferdinand par ses ruses toujours engagé les Princes ses voisins à ses affaires en incommodant les leur /sic/ et pris le nom de la Religion pour s'augmenter.  
(ed. cit., p. 6).

Compare Machiavelli's description of Ferdinand in Il Principe chapter 21. Like D'Aubigné, Machiavelli says that Ferdinand employed neighbouring rulers to fight his wars, thus distracting them from their own interests,

Lui nel principio del suo regno assaltò la Granata, e quella impresa fu el fondamento dello stato suo...tenne occupati in quella li animi di quelli baroni di Castiglia, li quali, pensando a quella guerra, non pensavano ad innovare; e lui acquistava in quel mezzo reputazione et imperio sopra di loro, che non se ne accorgevano.  
(pp. 89-90).

Machiavelli continues by describing how Ferdinand made use of religion to increase his power,

Oltre a questo, per possere intraprendere maggiori imprese, servendosi sempre della religione, si volse a una pietosa crudeltà, cacciando e spogliando el suo regno, de' Marrani... Assaltò sotto questo medesimo mantello l'Affrica.  
(p. 90).
CRITICISM OF MACHIAVELLI

Despite these instances of approval of Machiavelli as a historian, it is mainly with Machiavelli's political views that D'Aubigné deals in his poetry and in his historical works and, in every case, opposes. The different aspects of his criticism can be grouped according to subject matter.

1) D'Aubigné's anti-Italian attitude: a prelude to his anti-Machiavellianism.

Very often in a French author, anti-Italian feeling goes hand in hand with opposition to Machiavelli whom French writers in the sixteenth century regarded as a typical exponent of Italian methods of rule. In his Discours contre N. Machiavel, Gentillet frequently blames Machiavelli's influence for leading French rulers away from traditional French methods of governing. For example, in the preface to Part I, Gentillet says,

Ceux de la nation de Machiavel (qui tiennent les principaux estats du gouvernement de France) ont laissé l'ancienne façon de gouverner de nos ancestres Françoises, pour introduire et mettre en usage en France la nouvelle façon de gouverner de leurs pays, enseignée par Machiavel.⁷

It was so well-known that Machiavelli was an Italian and indeed, a native of Florence, that allusions to 'Italian' and 'Florentine' government in political pamphlets of the time are frequently intended to suggest him. The link is made explicit in the Discours merveilleux de la vie, actions, et deportemens de la Reyne Catherine de Médicis (1574) where the author says,

Les Florentins, pour la pluspart...se soucient peu de leur conscience, veulent sembler religieux et non pas l'estre...(comme aussi Machiavel, l'un de leurs premiers politiques, le conseille à son prince).⁸

Throughout D'Aubigné's work, we find the adjectives 'Italien' and 'Florentin' linked with derogatory epithets and used as terms of abuse: Marie de' Medici's Italian favourite, Concino Concini, is called 'ce champignon florentin'⁹ and the Marshal of Retz is labelled a 'charlatan
Most often this anti-Italian attitude is linked, as in Gentillet, with opposition to Italian methods of rule. In Discours par Stances avec l'Esprit du Feu Roy Henry Quatriesme, D'Aubigné warns Marie de' Medici that Florentine, tyrannical methods of governing are not suitable for France,

Royne, il faut oublier l'air et l'art de Florence,
Rends ton joug plus léger à la legere France.
(Oeuvres, ed. cit., p. 358).

But it is another member of the Medici family - Catherine de' Medici - who is most often connected by D'Aubigné with Florentine (and hence, Machiavellian) methods of ruling. This accusation of Machiavellianism occurs frequently in political pamphlets against Catherine: as a Florentine and one who protected Italians seeking refuge at the French court, Catherine was an obvious target for such attacks. Moreover, her policy of tolerance and of keeping the balance between Catholics and Reformers, at least before the Saint Bartholomew's Day Massacres, easily lent itself to the criticism of utilitarianism and of putting State interests before those of religion. These accusations are repeated again and again in pamphlets such as Le Tocsain contre les Massacreurs et auteurs des confusions en France (1579), Le Réveille-Matin des François, et de leurs voisins (1574) and in the Discours merveilleux. Indeed, in the latter, she is explicitly linked with Machiavelli when she is accused of trying to put responsibility for her policies onto her rivals, the Guises,

...elle les veut accuser d'estre auteurs de tout et s'excuser à leurs despens, pour ainsi les chasser de la cour... trait que cette femme a bien retenu de son Machiavel.
(p. 65).

In Le Miroir des Français of 1582, Catherine is accused of introducing Italian methods of governing into France (though here Machiavelli is not named).

Frequently, it was in connection with the education of her sons, the future Kings of France, that Catherine was labelled a follower of
Machiavelli. Jacques-Auguste De Thou accused her of bringing up her children according to the precepts of

cet athée de Machiavel, dont le but a été plutôt d'enseigner le prince à se faire craindre qu'aimer, et à régner en grandeur qu'à bien régner.12

And of course, one of her sons, Henry III, later became a prime target for the accusation of Machiavellianism (see my chapter on Pierre Matthieu pp 475-50).

Whether or not Catherine did consciously adopt Machiavelli's ideas in politics, remains a matter of conjecture.13 She certainly possessed a copy of Il Principe, and her contemporaries seem to have believed that she was deliberately putting the Italian's ideas into practice: the author of the Latin translation of Gentillet's work directly accused Catherine of being the devil's chosen instrument for spreading the 'poison' of Machiavellianism in France.

Writing in 1577, D'Aubigné was able to profit from previous Protestant propaganda linking Catherine and Machiavelli. In Misères, D'Aubigné gives a long portrait of Catherine whose iniquity, he says, verges on the diabolical and whose Florentine nationality is seen as yet another vice in a long list. He says,

&Pleust à Dieu, Jesabel, que tu euss' à Florence Laissé tes trahisons.

(ed. cit., p. 92).14

She is called an 'impure Florentine' who uses 'ruses florentines' and in Les Fers, she is referred to as 'la peste florentine' (1.195). Her methods of ruling are depicted as leading the French away from their traditions. In La Chambre Dorée, D'Aubigné speaks bitterly of her Regency which will break the French tradition of Salic Law and says,

...les masles seront plus lasches que les femmes,
...on verra les lis en pillules changer
Le Tusque estre Gaulois, le François estranger.

(1. 774-776).
Catherine is accused of using typical Italian weapons such as the stiletto and poison ('venin florentin'). In Les Fers, she is accused of hastening the end of Charles IX in order to see her favourite, Henry III, on the throne (1. 1301-2). Poison was often seen as specifically Italian. In Vengeances, there is a description of the tyrannical Jezabel—behind which D'Aubigné's contemporaries were supposed to recognise Catherine,

Jezabel vif miroir des ames de nos grands,
Portrait des coups du ciel, salaire des tyrans,
Flambeau de ton pays, piege de la noblesse,
Peste des braves coeurs, que servit ta finesse,
Tes ruses, tes conseils et tes tours florentins? (pp. 36-37).

It should perhaps be pointed out here that the first edition of the Tragiquest (1616) contains several blanks in the text. These were replaced in later editions by the adjective 'florentin'. In the second edition, the adjectives are also omitted but D'Aubigné has given us a key at the back of the book, in the 'Complements des Lacunes.' D'Aubigné seems to be wary of making it too clear that it is Catherine he is attacking. In the same way, we shall see that he hesitated to name contemporary rulers outright as Machiavellians in the Histoire Universelle but used an Index to provide the key.

The continual juxtaposition of the adjective 'florentin' with derogatory epithets highlights D'Aubigné's opposition to Florentine methods of governing and is perhaps intended to suggest opposition to Machiavelli as well (since his birthplace was so well-known). At any rate, the anti-Italian and indeed anti-Florentine, propaganda prepares us for more direct attacks on Machiavelli in D'Aubigné's works.

2) Opposition to a Machiavellian-style tyranny.
   a) The danger to Reformers from external causes

   Italians and in particular Machiavelli, were blamed by French writers
for encouraging rulers to act as tyrants: such events as the Saint Bartholomew's Day Massacres or the assassination of the Guises at Blois were seen as a natural consequence of the type of absolutism encouraged in Il Principe where Machiavelli effectively releases his ruler from any moral, legal or religious restraints on his power. Disregarding the fact that Il Principe was written with a specific political situation in mind—one calling for a strong leader to unite Italy—French writers came to see the book as a handbook for tyrants.¹⁸ The type of tyranny which Machiavelli was believed to be advocating was particularly feared by French Reformers as a minority group and, at least until 1584, they wished to limit royal power by stressing both religious and constitutional restraints on the King's authority.¹⁹ D'Aubigné follows in the tradition of such pamphlets as the Vindiciae contra tyrannos and the Franco-Gallia (which were sometimes seen as specifically anti-Machiavellian, see my chapter on Des Mesures p.232), when he urges restraints on the King's power in his treatise Du Debvoir mutuel des Roys et des Subjects.

In the Tragiques, D'Aubigné emphasises the religious restraints on a King's power, and shows the danger of a tyrant who refuses to be subject to God's laws. He puts the blame for this sort of behaviour on Machiavelli. In the Princes, he describes at length the corruption at the court of the Valois Kings: one aspect of this corruption is that rulers no longer respect religion; they merely see it as a useful means of keeping the State in order and in private life, they act as they please. There is a long description of debauchery at court and the implication is that these rulers are atheists since by their behaviour they show that they do not fear God. D'Aubigné says,

Nos Rois qui ont appris à machiaveliser,
Au temps et à l'estat leur ame desguiser,
Ployans la pieté au joug de leur service
Gardent religion pour ame de police.²⁰
Machiavelli does in fact frequently stress the usefulness of religion for keeping one's subjects obedient. In Discorsi I, 11-15, he describes how the Romans used religion to maintain an ordered State — 'pour ame de police' as D'Aubigné puts it. In Discorsi I, 11, Machiavelli describes how Numa used religion for political ends, to control the unruly populace and introduce new laws into the State. But Machiavelli does not mean that rulers should sincerely believe in the State religion, merely that they should play upon the religious beliefs of their subjects ('au temps et à l'estat leur ame desguiser,/Ployans la pieté au joug de leur service'). Thus, he describes how Numa pretended to have been inspired by a nymph in order to get his new laws accepted. Machiavelli concludes in Discorsi I, 12 that,

Debbono adunque i principi d'una republica o d'uno regno, i fondamenti della religione che loro tengono, mantengli; e fatto questo, sarà loro facil cosa mantenerle la loro republica religiosa, e per conseguente buona e unita. E debbono tutte le cose che nascano in favore di quella, come che le guidicassono false, favorirle e accrescerle...

(p. 164).

Rulers should manipulate their subjects' religious beliefs just as the Romans twisted the interpretation of the auspices to suit their political needs. 21

The author of the Libre Discours sur l'Estat Present des Eglises Reformées en France (sometimes attributed to D'Aubigné) seems to have had these words of Machiavelli in mind when composing his work. In a passage reminiscent of the chapters in the Discorsi I mentioned above, the author says that the Christian religion is not merely a series of observations of external ceremonies (as French rulers appear to believe) but affects one's way of life,

les premiers législateurs n'ont en effect rien cru de tout cela: ayans seulement trouvé à propos de le persuader au peuple, pour le tenir en devoir... faisons par ce moyen de la Religion, un instrument de police, non un moyen pour gagner de fait les hommes à Dieu... A quoy ces Reverendissimes ne songent seulement pas, ne se soucians gueres que les particuliers croient de Dieu... pourveu que ce qui leur est enseigné les empesche de troubler la société publique.22
A little further on, he calls Numa the 'premier autheur de leurs superstitions.'

In the *Histoire Universelle*, D'Aubigné points to the dangerous effects for the Reformers in particular of French rulers' tendencies to adopt a Machiavellian attitude towards religion. In Tome II, Book I, chapter 3, D'Aubigné depicts the tense atmosphere at court during the preparations for the marriage of Henry of Navarre and prior to the Saint Bartholomew's Day Massacres. The King is shown as surrounding himself with soldiers (the traditional mark of a tyrant) and Coligny is repeatedly warned of the danger he is in. The tenor of these warning letters is given by D'Aubigné,

Voyez après quelle est l'éducation du Roi, instruit à jurer à tous propos et à se perjurer en termes atroces: à se mocquer de Dieu, à toutes vilénies et pechez horribles; aux dissimulations, à y composer parole, visage et contenance: sa Bible est Machiavel.

*(ed. cit., p. 534).*

The King's despisal of God's laws has led him to feign a religious fait' he does not feel. It also encourages him, say the letters, to break promises when it is to his advantage to do so and this is particularly serious for Reformers in France,

Souvenez-vous, (disoyent-ils) de la dispense de serment envers les heretiques, portée par le Concile de Constance: et que nous / the Reformers/ sommes ceux qui sont designez pour tels... Ses Confesseurs et Conseilliers d'Estat concertans ensemble, lui ont imprimé en l'esprit...que le Prince n'est point tenu de maintenir un Edict extorqué: Là dessus ils lui donnent pour patron ce que firent Commode, Caracalla, Lysandre et Galba, qui firent bien leurs afaires en brisant la foi publique...

*(ed. cit., p. 534).*

These examples of treacherous rulers are not mentioned by Machiavelli and neither does he invoke the example of the Council of Constance. Nevertheless, the whole passage is one of those labelled 'Machiavelismes' in the Index. The Saint Bartholomew's Day Massacres are seen as a natural consequence of the type of rule without God described in *Il Principe* and the dangers for Reformers in particular are made clear.  

*23*
b) The danger to Reformers from internal causes

If there was the danger of tyrants using Machiavellian methods of ruling against Reformers, there was also the danger that the Reformers themselves might be tempted to adopt a Machiavellian attitude towards religion and put their political interests before their duty to God.

Du devoir mutuel des Roys et des sujets is a treatise written by D'Aubigné in order to reproach the Reformers for precisely this kind of behaviour.

In this treatise, D'Aubigné criticises those Reformers who flatter the King by saying he has absolute power, unrestrained by obedience to God's laws,

Je n'ay plus à parler qu'à ceux de qui les doubles feintes descouvent une veritable lascheté. Ceux là opposent l'honneur qu'on doibt aux Roys à l'obeissance qu'on doibt à Dieu, faisant choquer deux choses tres unies et desquelles la seconde prend de la premiere son authorité: ceux là veulent pratiquer /obtain/ profit au dommage, et pour edifier en la ruine de leurs freres exaltent l'Estat, abbaissant la Religion... Je leur demande qui s'acquitte mieux de son devoir envers le Roy, ou ceux qui apprenent en la parole de Dieu et observent ce qui est deu aux Princes, ou ceux qui estudient en leurs affaires, en la peur de l'exil ou de la mort ou en l'esperance des pensions, ce que leur bouche et leurs plumes doibvent dire et escrire en tordant leurs consciences et leurs coeurs, s'ils en avoyent...

L'un le veut doux, l'autre le veut rude, l'un le veut aymé et honoré, l'autre le veut hay ou craint... l'un le veut loyal et l'autre perfide, et enfin l'un le veut Roy et l'autre Tyran.

D'Aubigné draws out the kind of rule to be expected from a King who refuses to be subject to God's will. Although Machiavelli is not specifically mentioned here, D'Aubigné is opposing Reformers who put interests of State before obedience to God, an attitude which by 1620 would be very clearly associated in the minds of Frenchmen with Machiavelli.

For D'Aubigné, the fact that under the Regency, some Reformers had begun putting the State before their religion, was proof of their demoralisation and he attacks these Reformers' Machiavellian attitude again and again in his writings, especially in the Confession Catholique du Sieur de Sancy (first published in 1660). Sancy is a typical example
of someone who changed his religion according to where his political interests lay. In contrast, true Reformers are opposed to this Machiavellian rejection of one's religious duty,

Tout Prince qui voudra regner sans qu'on le barboüille par l'equité et sans estre controllé de la parole de Dieu, il faut qu'il extermine les Huguenots. Car ils sont gens qui pour la gloire de Dieu foulent aux pieds toute gloire des Princes.

The ultimate example in D'Aubigné's eyes of a Reformer who put State interests before religion and thus contributed to the downfall of his party in France, is Henry of Navarre. As soon as he had the chance of the throne, D'Aubigné implies, he abandoned the Reformers' cause in favour of preserving the State. When he joined forces with Henry III in 1585,

le Roi de Navarre jouoit un personnage nouveau, ne parlant plus que de conserver l'Estât, et ayant mis les passions Huguenottes en crouppe, sur ce que s'estimant necessaire au Roi, il argumentoit de ceste necessité, ne regardant point à la foiblesse de ce Prince, qui alloit prendre loi du plus pressant. (Histoire Universelle, ed. cit., Tome II, B. V, p. 1137).

This kind of argument from necessity of State is typical of those following the teaching of Machiavelli in Il Principe.

Henry IV's abjuration is likewise presented by D'Aubigné as a Machiavellian act of State and not an authentic conversion to the Catholic Church. As early as 1589, another Reformer in an anonymous pamphlet, had warned Henry IV of the consequences of changing his religion,

...chacun croira tresaisement qu'il ne logea jamais zele quelconque de Religion dans vostre ame, que vos deportemens passez n'ont esté qu'hypocrisie, pour establir vos affaires particulières dans vostre party, que vous avez esté nourri aux blasphemes detestables des Machiavelistes, qui se masquent de toutes sortes de Religions favorables pour regner...

The anonymous Catholic author of the pamphlet entitled Le Vray Catholique Romain contre le Ligueur couvert, believes that Henry IV is incapable of adopting a Machiavellian attitude towards religion. The League, he says, wish to persuade Henry IV to convert to Catholicism in the interests of the State, but Henry will only abjure the Protestant faith when he has become sincerely convinced that the Catholic religion is the true one.
Nostre Roy ne se gouverne pas ainsi: il ne peut suyvre vostre conseil pris de Machiavel qui s'aide de vos mesmes exemples pour persuader à son Prince d'user de simulation en matiere de religion: il a l'ame trop bonne, et quant il se dira Catholique il le sera vrayement, croira ce que nous croyons: mais il ne s'arrestera jamais à ces considerations des choses du monde, à adviser s'il pourra mieux vendre le domaine de l'Eglise.31

According to D'Aubigné, such faith in Henry's integrity is misplaced, for D'Aubigné quotes the King as saying to Reformers,

Mes amis priez Dieu pour moi; s'il faut que je me perde pour vous, au moins vous ferai-je ce bien, que je ne souffrirai aucune forme d'instruction, pour ne faire point de playe à la Religion, qui sera toute ma vie celle de mon ame et de mon coeur; et ainsi je ferai voir à tout le monde que je n'ai esté persuadé par autre Theologie que la necessité de l'estat. (Histoire Universelle, ed. cit., Tome III, B. III, pp. 409-410).

D'Aubigné presents us with a Henry who does not fear to separate political behaviour from religious belief.

D'Aubigné believed that the preservation of the Reformers' party in France depended on their having a ruler who obeyed God's laws: as soon as they were ruled by leader with no religious scruples and when the Reformers themselves even began encouraging this sort of attitude by putting State affairs before religion, they were lost - that is, D'Aubigné saw that a Machiavellian attitude to religion could only lead to the downfall of the Reformers' cause.

c) D'Aubigné's method of opposition to a Machiavellian-style tyranny

For D'Aubigné, Church and State were inseparable: in Les Fers he says that the separation of religion from politics originated with Satan and that during the civil wars, the French will learn to follow Princes rather than God,

...ils auront leur fiance
En leurs princes puissans et non en ta puissance.

(p. 106).

One important argument which D'Aubigné uses to oppose Machiavelli's advice to ignore the demands of religion, is the concept of providence.
Machiavelli's writings shocked many sixteenth century readers because they lacked any notion of God's guidance working out and controlling history. Instead of the traditional belief in a providential working out of history, Machiavelli presents events as subject to the whims of Fortune, a concept similar to the goddess 'Fortuna' in classical pagan writers. Unlike the Christian concept of providence as reliable, caring, working things out for the best, this classical goddess, as presented by Machiavelli, cannot be depended upon and is often wantonly cruel and malicious. Repeatedly, Machiavelli stresses that unless men can keep up with Fortune's variability, they will be ruined. Discorsi III, 9 is entitled 'Come conviene variare co' tempi, volendo sempre avere buona fortuna.'

This idea of the necessity of adapting to all the changes of Fortune lies at the heart of Il Principe chapter 25. In Il Principe chapter 7 ('De principatibus novis qui alienis armis et fortuna acquiruntur'), Fortune is described as fickle and not to be depended upon,

Questi new rulers stanno semplicamente in sulla voluntà e fortuna di chi lo ha concesso loro, che sono due cose volubilissime et instabili.

(p. 34).

Not only is Fortune capricious, she is also often gratuitously evil. In the preface to the Discorsi Book II, Machiavelli speaks of 'la malignità...della fortuna' (p. 274). She sends good and evil upon men at random and thus appears incomprehensible to human reason. She leads men wherever she wishes: in the Discorsi II, 29 ('La fortuna acceca gli animi degli uomini, quando la non vuole che quegli si apponghino a disegni suoi'), Machiavelli says,

Fa bene la fortuna questo, che la elegge uno uomo, quando la voglia condurre cose grandi, che sia di tanto spirito e di tanta virtù che ei conosca quelle occasioni che la gli porghe. Così medesimamente, quando la voglia condurre grandi rovina, ella vi prepone uomini che aiutino quella rovina. E se alcuno fusse che vi potesse ostare, o la lo ammazza o la lo priva di tutte le facultà da potere operare alcuno bene. (pp. 366-367).
Yet there is a possibility for someone to tame Fortune if he has sufficient 'virtù', see Discorsi II, 30,

Perché, dove gli uomini hanno poca virtù, la fortuna mostra assai la potenza sua: e perché la è varia, variano le repubbliche e gli stati spesso, e varieranno sempre infino che non surga qualcuno che sia della antichità tanto amatore che la regoli in modo che la non abbia cagione di mostrare, a ogni girare di sole, quanto ella puote. 

(p. 371).

The ability to use one's 'virtù' to grasp the opportunities presented by Fortune is one of the marks of a Machiavellian leader: Cesare Borgia and Castruccio Castracani both rise to power through seizing opportunities presented by Fortune, but both are eventually defeated by her. As Machiavelli says in Il Principe chapter 25,

...iudico potere esser vero che la fortuna sia arbitra della metà delle azioni nostre, ma che etiam lei ne lasci governare l'altra metà, o presso, a noi.

(p. 99).

The very fact that Machiavelli describes man as able to tame Fortune, shows that he has a very different idea of the guiding force behind human affairs from the Christian concept of providence. Indeed in Il Principe chapter 25, Fortune is compared to a woman who must be beaten into submission. This contrasts sharply with the Christian acceptance of God's ordering of events.

Although D'Aubigné does not name Machiavelli in the context of the theme of providence, it is probably the Machiavellian attitude to the ordering of events which D'Aubigné is opposing. He connects Machiavelli specifically with encouraging a ruler to flout religion and moreover, this argument of the providential working out of history was used by other French writers to oppose Machiavelli.

Estienne Pasquier constantly stresses in his works the providential working out of history for example, in Les Recherches de la France Book II, chapter 1 entitled 'Lequel des deux, de la Fortune, ou du Conseil, a plus ouvré à la manutention de ce Royaume de France,' he concludes that
it is Fortune rather than human wisdom which has preserved France united. However, when he talks of Fortune, he means not the pagan, Machiavellian concept of Fortune but the Christian concept of providence,

Quand je nomme icy la Fortune, afin que je n'apreste à aucuns, occasion de se scandaliser, j'entans les mystères de Dieu qui ne se peuvent discouvrir par nostre prudence humaine.

Pasquier is using the word Fortune in the way poets often used it, as a personification of the inscrutability of providence. He is thus able to conclude that it is God who orders events through the guiding hand of Fortune-Providence.

In his writings, Pasquier shows how God can overthrow men's plans and he concludes from this that although God may allow a King who rules according to human wisdom to succeed for a time, he will eventually punish him. In a letter to Chandon, the King's secretary, in which he specifically mentions Machiavelli, Pasquier says,

Mais qui considéra quels sont les jugements de Dieu; il verra que tous ces Princes estoient parvenus à leurs estats par sceleratesse, ou que par la mesme voye ils s'estoient vouluz maintenir: et neantmoins que quelque sage discours humain qu'ils eussent apporté pour s'y conserver, Dieu en fin par l'injustice des hommes exerça en eux sa justice.

In another letter, talking of Kings in the Bible, Pasquier says,

Si un Roy se gouverne bien envers son peuple, Dieu bénit aussi sa fortuna; si mal, il est chastié en sa personne, ou en ses enfans, selon le plus ou le moins de son demerite. Tous les secrets de Machiavel y faillent.

Even non-Christian historians such as Livy saw history in terms of providence, says Pasquier, but Machiavelli who knew that classical historian so well, completely missed the importance of the role of fate in Livy's work, which, if he had seen it, would have prevented him from giving such bad advice to kings as to rule according to human reason.

In his Discours contre N. Machiavel Part II, Maxime X, Gentillet argues against Machiavelli's idea of blind fortune ruling the world, in favour of God being in control of events. He seeks to prove that the pagan writers themselves did not believe in the literary fiction of the
blind goddess Fortune, but had some idea of the providential working-out of history. He stresses the evils that will arise from a ruler failing to see the hand of God in history,

... toute ceste doctrine tend à mesme but que les precedentes Maximes, asavoir pour insinuer aux coeurs des hommes un mespris de Dieu et de sa providence. Car dès que l'homme aura persuasion que le bien ne nous vient pas de Dieu, mais de fortune, il quittera aisément le service de Dieu. (ed. cit., p. 209).

The reactions of Gentillet and Pasquier to the absence of the role of providence in Machiavelli's works, shed light on D'Aubigné's use of providence as an argument against Machiavelli. As a historian who believed that God is in control of events, D'Aubigné must have been just as shocked as these writers by Machiavelli's presentation of the world as subject to random fate - but he never actually says so. An examination of the Tragiques, however, reveals this belief in the unseen power of providence, for all the tyrants described there come to a bad end, and I believe that D'Aubigné is in this way specifically opposing Machiavelli's notion that a Prince may with impunity free himself from all moral and religious restraints.

In the Preface, D'Aubigné issues a warning:

Tyrans, vous craindrez mes propos.

This is a preparation for the whole of the Tragiques. In the Princes, he says that tyrants who rebel against God's teaching will in turn be disobeyed by their subjects as a punishment from God,

En vain vous desployez harangue sur harangue
Si vous ne prononcez de Canaan la langue,
En vain vous commandez et restez esbahis
Que, desobeissans, vous n'estes obeis:
Car Lieu vous fait sentir, sous vous, par plusieurs testes,
En leur rebellion, que rebelles vous estes;
Vous secouez le joug du puissant Roy des Rois,
Vous mesprisez sa loy, on mesprise vos loix.
(1. 441-448).

In Les Feux the Reformers are shown to be capable of triumphing over tyrants because they have God's help (which the tyrants have rejected)
and Anne du Bourg predicts that Henry II's reign will end in disaster because of his persecution of Reformers. In Les Fers, Charles IX comes to a bad end after the Saint Bartholomew's Day Massacres for he is punished by nightmares and remorse,

\[
\text{Du Roy, jusqu'à la mort, la conscience immonde} \\
\text{Le ronge sur le soir, toute la nuit lui gronde,} \\
\text{Le jour siffle en serpent; sa propre âme lui nuit,} \\
\text{Elle même se craint, elle d'elle s'enfuit.} \\
\text{(pp. 177-178).}
\]

The message is that a ruler can never get away with performing acts of State without reference to God's laws.

Vengeances in particular is dominated by this theme of tyrants coming to a bad end. God's speedy judgement on Nebuchadnezzar is taken as a sign of how God can destroy a tyrant's power in a moment,

\[
\text{Apprenez de luy, Rois, princes et potentats,} \\
\text{Quelle peine a le ciel à briser vos Estats.} \\
\text{Ce Roy n'est donc plus Roy, de prince il n'est plus prince,} \\
\text{Un dessert solitaire est toute sa province.} \\
\text{(pp. 41-42).}
\]

Further on, D'Aubigné says,

\[
\text{O tyrans, apprenez, voyez, resolvez vous} \\
\text{Que rien n'est difficile au celeste courroux.} \\
\text{(p. 44).}
\]

The emphasis on God's providential punishment of rulers who ignore his commandments links up with D'Aubigné's wish that the power of monarchs should be governed by religious restraints. This desire for restraints is part of his defence of the Reformers which, as we have seen, involves opposition to Machiavelli. It is possible that the stress on the role of providence in causing the downfall of tyrants is intended to protect Reformers from the dangerous effects of rulers following Machiavelli's advice to throw off the restraints of religious belief.

3) Opposition to Machiavelli's teaching on promises.

Machiavelli's teaching condoning the breaking of promises was very well known in the sixteenth century and it is likely that any writer who
continually stresses, as D'Aubigné does, the necessity of keeping promises, is specifically opposing Machiavelli. 43

In his private life, D'Aubigné always insisted on keeping his promises even when it was not to his advantage to do so. In the Histoire Universelle Tome VII, D'Aubigné tells us how he was imprisoned on Oléron but was allowed out for a visit to La Rochelle on condition that he gave his solemn promise to return. He refused to break this promise although he believed that to return would quite probably mean certain death and although friends tried to persuade him to 'subtiliser sur la promesse.' 44

In one of his letters, speaking of his attitude towards promises, D'Aubigné explains,

\[ J\'ay \text{ mieux aymé pecher en l'observation de la bienséance qu'en celle de ma foy et des serments prestés.} \]

In another letter, he shows what he thinks of utilitarian arguments,

\[ ç'a tousjours esté de la prudence diabolique de mesurer les desseins à l'utile. \]

Such a man would be likely to despise anyone who broke their promise in order to gain a political advantage.

a) The danger for Reformers.

The notion of alliance - between God and his people and between the King and his subjects - was fundamental to the thought of the Reformers. 47 D'Aubigné was especially worried about the effects on Reformers of a ruler breaking his promises for he knew that the future of the Reformers' party in France depended largely on assurances given by the King. 48 In Les Fers he says,

\[ \ldots \text{la paix et nostre foy Eurent pour fondement la promesse du Roy.} \]

(p. 151).

This was just before the Saint Bartholomew's Day Massacres when, D'Aubigné says, Charles IX

\[ \ldots \text{se monstra fidele en l'orde perfidie.} \]

(p. 151).
In Les Feux, D'Aubigné contrasts God's consistency with the perfidy of tyrants,

...il /Dieu/ pense, il se propose
Son alliance sainte, il veut garder sa foi
A ceux qui n'en ont point, car ce n'est pas un Roy
Tel que les tyranneaux qui remparent leur vie
De glaives, de poisons et de la perfidie.
(pp. 94-95).

Frequently it is Catherine de' Medici who is particularly associated with the Machiavellian policy of breaking promises: in the Misères (p. 44) she is portrayed as surrounded by (Italian) councillors who encourage her to break treaties. In the Histoire Universelle, her policy of breaking promises is linked with her alleged desire to extinguish the Reformers' party in France. In Tome I, D'Aubigné says,

Et ceste femme /Catherine/ aux Estats de Sterlin 1559 sur des nouvelles recueës de quelque secours, declara ouvertement qu'elle vouloit estendir la Religion reformée, respondant aux deputés qui lui alleguoyent sa foi promise:
Au contraire qu'il ne falloit exiger les promesses et sermens des Princes qu'autant qu'ils leur estoient utiles.
(B. II, ch. 31, p. 169).

This is one of the references given under the heading 'Machiavelismes' in the Index, showing that D'Aubigné associated this type of specious reasoning about promises specifically with Machiavelli.

D'Aubigné uses the Machiavellian attitude to promises as part of his propaganda for the cause of the Reformers. These latter are depicted as opponents of a ruler's 'right' to break promises, whilst Catholics are indicted by their willingness to urge a Machiavellian policy on their King. In the Histoire Universelle Tome II, the Reformers stress the importance of the King keeping promises,

...si les Edicts sont provisionnels, et tant qu'il plaira à sa Majesté, quelle fermeté y aura-il d'oresenavant en la foi et parole du Roi, qui doit servir à tous hommes d'exemple de fidelité? que deviennent ces mots, 'par Edict perpetuel et irrevocable?' ne sera-ce apres qu'une chanson?
In contrast, the Catholics argue the case for a King breaking his promise,

Les Kath. \textit{sic}\/ repliquoyent un traict notable, c'est qu'il peut bien estre permis au Roi de rompre ses serments envers son peuple, puis que les plus grands des Reff. et la plus part du peuple avoyent faussé le serment d'abjuration fait aux feries du massacre.

(B. III, ch. 4, pp. 840-841).

Repeatedly, it is D'Aubigné's political opponents whom he shows following Machiavelli's teachings on promises - the Guises,\textsuperscript{50} Henry III (Tome III, B. II, ch. 13, p. 209), the lukewarm Reformers. In \textit{Le Caducée} ou l'Ange de Paix, the renegade Reformers (the 'Prudans') who have joined the King, try to justify their disloyalty to the Reformers' party with specious arguments about promises. The loyal Reformers (the 'Fermes') oppose their arguments,

\begin{tabular}{ll}
Le Ferme: & Avêz vous promis, juré et signé les reglemens? \\
Le Prudent: & Ouy, mais la Rayne ayant depuis trouvé mauvais, nous nous en departons comme bons serviteurs. \\
Le Ferme: & Fault il pour estre bon serviteur violer sa foy? \\
Le Prudent: & Le Prince peut dispenser de la foy. \\
Le Ferme: & Ouy de la foy qu'il a receuë, mais non de cele que Dieu a stipulé. \\
Le Prudent: & Il n'y a point de serment sans quelque condition. \\
Le Ferme: & Le serment non conditionel est violé quand on le conditione après. \\
Le Prudent: & L'Interpretation est en la pensee de celuy qui jure. \\
Le Ferme: & Ouy la faulce, mais la vraye est aux paroles simples.\textsuperscript{51}
\end{tabular}

Conversely, leaders of the Reformers are shown as unwilling to adopt Machiavellian policies. Henry IV opposes the 'estrange conseil' of two of his councillors that he should break the promise of safe-conduct he has given to the Duke of Savoy, on the grounds that the latter had often been perfidious himself,

\begin{quote}
Le Roi respondit. J'ai tiré de ma naissance, et appris de ceux qui m'ont nourri, que l'observation de la foy est plus utile, que tout ce que la perfidie promettroit de profit. J'ai l'exemple du Roi François,\textsuperscript{52} qui pouvloit par la tromperie retenir un plus friand morceau, assavoir Charles le Quint; que si le Duc de Savoye a violé sa parole, l'imitation de la faute d'autrui n'est pas innocence, et un Roi use bien de la perfidie de ses ennemis, quand il la fait servir de lustre à sa foi.
\end{quote}

\textit{(Histoire Universelle, Tome III, B. V, ch. 5, p. 642).}
The advice of the councillors is put under the heading 'Machiavelismes' in the Index.

b) The danger for the State as a whole

As well as perjury being a threat to the Reformers in particular, D'Aubigné believed that the policy of breaking promises was harmful in a more general way for the entire State. He considered that broken promises shake the whole foundation of trust upon which a State is built. In the _Libre Discours sur l'Estat present des Eglises Reformees en France_, D'Aubigné (if indeed he is the author) says that if Kings do not keep their word, then their subjects will feel that they in turn are allowed to break their promises and this will lead to the breakdown of society,

S'il est une fois persuadé aux particuliers par leur //that is, the Kings\/
//exemple, que l'on n'est obligé à tenir sa parole. sinon autant de temps que l'observation d'icelle apportera de l'utilité, qui seroit introduire une vraye Anarchie au monde.

(ed. cit., ch. 43, pp. 205-206). 53

D'Aubigné opposes the Saint Bartholomew's Day Massacres not only because they were directed against the Reformers, but because in a general way, they set an example for breaking any Edict in the future. He describes the Massacres as,

la derniere perfidie et insigne cruauté, exercée par tout le Royaume, en foulant aux pieds la foi publique, et tous Edicts jurez sainctement.

(Histoire Universelle, Tome II, B. II, ch. 4 p. 681).

In the _Tragiques_, D'Aubigné frequently shows how promises have become devalued: no-one feels guilty about breaking his promise any more,

Ce n'est qu'un coup d'Estat que d'estre bien parjure. 54

In particular, he is referring here to Alençon's treachery which, he says, fits in with prevailing attitudes. In what may very well be an attack on Machiavelli, he uses the argument of providence to demonstrate that perjurers will be punished,
Machiavellian arguments are defeated by an appeal to God's justice against which, for D'Aubigné as for Pasquier, 'tous les secrets de Machiavel y faillent.' But Machiavelli is not named here and, as often, the key to D'Aubigné's attitude towards Machiavelli in the Tragiques lies in the Histoire Universelle where Machiavelli is specifically connected with this policy of breaking promises.

In a debate recorded in the Histoire Universelle as to whether 'les Princes doivent garder la foi à leurs subjects,' the Duke of Venice argues that to keep one's promises strengthens a ruler's authority and reveals his greatness, implying that perjury undermines a monarch's authority and disrupts the social order,

...si le Prince traiçte et paye de sa foi, il la doit dês le jour qu'il l'a promise, plus fermement, tant plus il est grand, soit qu'il l'impute à sa faute, ou à son malheur: Il l'autorise de sa force, et la rend egale à sa grandeur.

(Tome II, B. II, p. 703).

Opposition to the Duke's speech is classified as 'Machiavelismes' in the Index to the history.

One of the main themes of Du Devoir mutuel des Roys et des subjects is whether a Prince is obliged to keep promises to his subjects. In this treatise, D'Aubigné criticises the policy of breaking promises (which he associated with Machiavelli in the Histoire Universelle) using abstract legal and moral arguments rather than political propaganda, as in his Histoire. He believes that Princes are subject to natural laws, one of which is the keeping of promises and treaties. They receive their power from their subjects and as these latter do not have the right to violate promises, so they cannot confer this power on their rulers. Like Montaigne, (Essais, ed. cit., II, 17, pp. 310-311) D'Aubigné says that...
once a ruler has broken his promise, he will no longer be trusted and therefore breaking promises is, merely on the grounds of utility (from which Machiavelli had argued), not a good policy. Ferdinand of Spain, he says,

\[
\text{encor a esprouv\é quel malheur c'est au Prince, quand apr\ä
er les premieres perfidies il ne peut plus appaiser par sa parole, et luy faut chercher autre monoye que la foy et le serment.}
\]

(Du Debvoir mutuel, ed. cit., p. 480).

A King who breaks a promise to his people, relieves them of all obligation to obey him, 'le Prince qui rompt la foy à son peuple rompt celle de son peuple.' (ed. cit., p. 487). Breaking one's promises is thus ultimately self-defeating.

4) Opposition to Machiavelli's teaching on ruse and dissimulation

D'Aubigné ends Tome I of the Histoire Universelle with a warning that 'Il y a à apprendre sur tout, que les ruses qui se trament au dépens de la foi esbranlent l'Estat et perdent les frauduleux.' (B. V, ch. 33, p. 518).

As with the theme of perjury, D'Aubigné links the use of ruse and dissimulation specifically with Machiavelli's teaching and depicts those of whose political actions he disapproves, as employing Machiavellian deception in order to gain their ends. 56

In the Princes, D'Aubigné paints a vivid picture of the atmosphere of dissimulation at the court of the Valois rulers. In the first eight lines of the poem, D'Aubigné warns his readers that he is going to look behind the surface appearances at court and reveal what lies beneath the dissimulation. He gives a long tirade against flatterers whom he holds largely responsible for the atmosphere of deception at court. 57 The position of rulers at court is maintained by 'la ruse du serpent' (1. 388) and there is an echo of chapter 18 of Il Principe when D'Aubigné says,

\[
\text{Nos Princes des renards envient la finesse,}
\text{Et ne debattent point aux lions de prouesse.}
\]

(1. 907-908).
This fox and lion symbol appears in the Libre Discours where, comparing Charles IX to Julian the Apostate who persecuted Christians, the author says,

Le conseil duquel \( \text{of Charles IX/durant son bas age se servit comme Julien de la peau du renard après la paix faite au siege d'Orleans voyant que celle du lyon ne luy avoit de rien profite aux premiers troubles.} \)


In the Princes, Henry III is described as having been raised in an atmosphere of dissimulation,

Si fut-il toutesfois allaité de poisons,  
De ruzes, de conseils secrets et trahizons,  
Rompu ou corrompu au trictrac des affaires.

(1. 797-799).

It is therefore not surprising, D'Aubigné implies, if he rules like a Machiavellian Prince, using ruse and deception.

In the Histoire Universelle Tome III, Henry is specifically compared to a follower of Machiavelli (again we see how the history completes and explains the Tragiques). After the episode of the barricades at Paris, says D'Aubigné, noone knew what Henry was going to do next: he pretended to favour the Duke of Guise by making him head of the army, but in reality, he was preparing to assassinate him,

...le Roi employoit le temps, les ruses et les finances à endormir ses ennemis, soit (comme quelques uns ont estimé) avec dessein arresté de les empoigner à la pipee des Estats, soit (comme autres ont jugé) que ce fust pour rouler au jour la journée.


This behaviour is classified as a 'Machiavelisme' in the Index.

Earlier, Henry III is linked with his mother in underhand scheming to prevent the marriage of his brother, Alençon, to Elizabeth I of England. D'Aubigné labels this behaviour as a 'Machiavelisme' in the Index. Catherine herself is frequently associated with the Machiavellian use of ruse: D'Aubigné speaks of her 'ruses florentins' and mentions that she was accused of hastening Charles IX's end by 'fraude' and 'artifice'.
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Indeed, these are the two words most often used to describe her behaviour in the *Histoire Universelle* and the *Tragiques* where she is held responsible for encouraging her sons in ruse and dissimulation. Under the heading of 'Machiavelismes' in the Index comes John of Austria's deceitful behaviour towards the Reformers in Flanders (Tome II, B. III, ch. 25, p. 963). He pretends to help his Protestant subjects, but in reality he is in league with Spain against them. He is an example of a Prince not caring about his subjects' welfare and, indeed, aiming to ruin them - an aim it was believed Machiavelli's Prince held. His deception of the Reformers makes him a political opponent of D'Aubigné and, as such, an obvious target for the accusation of Machiavellianism.

Henry of Navarre is also accused of Machiavellian dissimulation: although D'Aubigné fought on the same side as Navarre, he was often a stern critic of the Protestant leader's behaviour. In the *Histoire Universelle* Tome III, D'Aubigné describes as a 'Machiavelisme' Navarre's use of deception in using a servant to find out the names of those hostile towards him.

Thus any sort of underhand scheming and intrigue seems to be associated in D'Aubigné's mind with Machiavelli.

5) **Opposition to Machiavelli's views on the nobility**

In the *Discorsi*, Machiavelli presents a picture of nobles as idle parasites living off the revenue from their estates and thus harmful to the establishment of a free republic. In *Discorsi* I, 55, he says,

> E per chiarire questo nome di gentiluomini quale e' sia, dico che gentiluomini sono chiamati quelli che oziosi vivono delle rendite delle loro possessioni abbondantemente, senza avere cura alcuna o di coltivazione o di altra necessaria fatica a vivere. Questi tali sono perniziosi in ogni república ed in ogni provincia; ma più perniziosi sono quelli che oltre alle predette fortune comandano a castella, ed hanno sudditi che ubbidiscono a loro. Di queste due spezie
Machiavelli continually stresses the important role played by the people's tribunes at Rome in restraining the ambitions of the nobles which would otherwise have harmed the republic (see Discorsi I, 3, 37, 39; III, 2).

Not only does Machiavelli believe that nobles are harmful for free States, he also says that they can be harmful to Princes. A Prince must restrain the ambitions of his nobles by ruining some and making the rest dependent on him. In Il Principe chapter 9, he says,

E per chiarire meglio questa parte, dico come e' grandi si debbono considerare in dua modi principalmente. O si governano in modo col procedere loro che si obbligano in tutto alla tua fortuna, o no. Quelli che si obbligano, e non sieno rapaci, si debbono onorare et amare... Ma, quando non si obbligano ad arte e per cagione ambiziosa, è segno come pensano piu a sé che a te; e da quelli si debbe el principe guardare, e temerli come se fussino scoperti inimici, perché sempre, nelle avversità, auiteranno ruinarlo.

(p. 46).

In particular, Machiavelli praises the French system of government which keeps the nobles in check. In Il Principe chapter 19, he says,

Intra regni bene ordinati e governati a'tempi nostri è quello di Francia; et in esso si trouano infinite constituzione buone, donde depende la libertà e sicurtà del re; delle quali la prima è il parlamento e la sua autorità. Perché quello che ordinò quel regno, conoscendo l'ambizione de'potenti e' la insolenzia loro, e iudicando esser loro necessario uno freno in bocca che li correggessi, e d'altra parte, conoscendo l'odio dello universale contro a' grandi fondato in sulla paura, e volendo assicurarli...però constitui uno iudice terzo, che fussi quello che sanza carico del re battessi e'grandi e favorissi e'minori. Né possé essere questo ordine migliore né più prudente, né che sia maggiore cagione della recurtà del re e del regno.

(pp. 77-78).

Machiavelli is thus opposed to nobles gaining power in a state, whether in a republic or under a monarchy. He especially approves of the way in which French nobles are held in check and this is why the idea arose in the sixteenth century in France that Machiavelli's followers aimed to crush the nobility, and why Machiavelli was often blamed by
French writers for encouraging French rulers to oppress the nobility. Gentillet, for example, frequently accuses Machiavelli's followers in France of wanting to move away from the traditional French way of governing in which the nobles played an important part, to an Italian situation where the King is absolute and has complete control over all his subjects.

In Discours contre N. Machiavel Part III, XXXVI and XXXVII, Gentillet combats Machiavelli's ideas on the nobility as expounded in Discorsi I, 55 (quoted earlier) and in Discorsi III, 1 (where Machiavelli says that France would be ruined if the 'Parlements' did not exist to keep the nobles in check). Gentillet indignantly defends the nobility as a necessary antidote to tyranny in France,

Car je vous prie, où a-il trouvé cela, que le Royaume de France viendroit à se dissoudre, si ce n'estoit que les Parlemens sont executeurs contre la Noblesse? N'est-ce pas autant à dire, que la Noblesse Françoise ruineroit le Royaume, si elle n'estoit tenue en bride par les Parlemens, et qu'il seroit meilleur qu'il n'y en eust point? Je ne doute pas que Machiavel ne l'ai ainsi entendu, car nous le voyons par la pratique des Machiavelistes, qui ne taschent à autre but qu'à ruiner en France toute la Noblesse, pour y établir leur tyrannie mieux à leur aise, sans contredit. (ed. cit., p. 528).

In the same way, D'Aubigné blames Machiavelli's teaching for the French nobles' loss of power and the increase in absolutist ideas which he saw as so dangerous for the Reformers. In the Histoire Universelle Tome I, D'Aubigné describes how Charles IX was declared a major without even consulting the nobles who were to pass the edict. The nobles protested but,

tant y a que le Roi l'emporta de haute lutte, et fit passer sa majorité par l'arrest du privé Conseil le vingt-quatrièmes Septembre, en termes fort absolus... Le Roi et la Roine arrivèz à Paris, ouirent derechef les plaintes de la Cour des Pairs, et y répondirent avec autorité et menaces,... Si bien que la Cour ploya et enregistra les choses passées. (B. IV, ch. 3, pp. 284-285).
This sort of riding rough-shod over the rights of the nobles is depicted by D'Aubigné as tyranny and is classified in the Index under the heading 'Machiavelismes'. More specifically, D'Aubigné blames several different parts of Machiavelli's writings for the decline of the nobles' power in France and applies passages where Machiavelli is speaking of subjects in general, to the situation of the nobility alone.

a) **That rulers should keep their subjects poor**

The idea that Machiavelli encouraged Princes to keep their subjects poor was common in France in the sixteenth century. It is a distortion of *Il Principe* chapter 16 where he advises his Prince to be avaricious rather than over-generous, in order to increase public funds, and of his admiration in the *Discorsi* for countries such as Germany where he believed that the poverty of the citizens encouraged civic 'virtú'. In *Discorsi* I, 37, he says,

\[ \text{le repubbliche bene ordinate hanno a tenere ricco il pubblico e gli loro cittadini poveri.} \] ^65 (p. 216).

French writers generally failed to realise that Machiavelli was praising a situation in which the citizens of a republic voluntarily limited their private resources in order to increase the wealth of the State as a whole. The French misapplied Machiavelli's views to their own circumstances in France where the King could impose new taxes whenever he thought fit, and believed this was the sort of action Machiavelli was advocating. But Machiavelli is thinking of a frugality freely entered into and regulated by law. Such frugality, he believed, would prevent citizens from becoming lazy and corrupt,

\[ ...gli uomini non operono mai nulla bene, se non per necessità...la fame e la povertà fa gli uomini industriosi, e le leggi gli fanno buoni. \] ^66

They would be ambitious for honour rather than wealth,
Noi abbiamo ragionato altrove, come la piú utile cosa che si ordini in uno vivere libero è che si mantenghino i cittadini poveri.

(Discorsi III, 25, p. 457).

The impoverished French, crippled by rising taxes and inflation, misinterpreted Machiavelli's praise of poverty and blamed his influence for their rulers' financial policies - all the more so as it was often Italian financiers who imposed the taxes. Thus Gentillet opposes Machiavelli in the Discours contre N. Machiavel Part III, XXXII, arguing that wealthy subjects make their ruler prosperous.

In N. Froumenteau's work, Le Secret des Finances de France, one of Henry III's ministers, Béranque, insists that the populace should be kept in poverty in order to avoid civil war, but

le Depute de Languedoc s'avança pour luy dire qu'il avoit extrait le plus beau et le meilleur de son propos de l'Alcoran de Machiavel, selon lequel Béranque et tous ses semblables voudroyent bien réduire et reformer ceste pauvre France.67

He continues,

Gens de bien ne regardent que l'heure propre proceder à une censure solennelle d'un si meschant livre, et par mesure moyen exterminer tous ceux qui font profession de sa doctrine: contre laquelle et mesmes sur la pauvreté qu'il maintient estre requise en un pays, s'il estoit besoin de confirmer le contraire par exemples, on en pourroit alleguer ininis, pour montrer que la pauvreté a esté maintesfois cause de grandes emotions et guerres civils.

(p. 417).

The author of the Remonstrance tres humble au Roy de France et de Pologne, Henry III (1588) warns Henry III against following the advice of 'cest ignorant atheiste Machiavel' to keep his subjects in order by making them poor (quoted in my chapter on Pierre Matthieu, note 47). In the Histoire Tragique et Memorable de Pierre de Gaverston, Jean Boucher depicts Edward II (representing Henry III) as aiming to ruin the nobility because they oppose his wishes,

Quand je contemple les faits et dictis de ce miserable Roy, il me semble qu'il ait practiqué toutes les reigles pernicieuses de ce perdu Machiavel... comme est celle qui dit qu'il suffit... d'appauvrir ses subjects pour les tenir en bride.68
In *Les Meurs Humeurs et Comportemens de Henry de Valois*, Machiavelli is blamed for Henry III's policy of increased taxation,

...il a imposé avec ce et selon la leçon mesme de son Machiavel, tailles sur tailles, gabelles sur gabelles...\(^6^9\)

D'Aubigné, too, believed that Machiavelli's influence was to blame for the impoverishment of the French nobility, many of whom belonged to the Reformed Church, and in the *Histoire Universelle*, it is 'le chevalier Poncet' whom he specifically accuses of encouraging rulers to adopt this Machiavellian policy.

Maurice Poncet was a member of the Catholic League and a popular preacher at Paris.\(^7^0\) There exists a pamphlet by him written in 1572, supporting the authority of the monarchy against the Reformers and praising the murder of Coligny.\(^7^1\) It was for this reason, perhaps, that he was often attacked by French authors, especially Reformers. *La France-Turquie* published in 1576 contains an anonymous pamphlet entitled the *Preface du Florentin* (linking Poncet's ideas on rule with those of the Turks), *L'Antipharmaque* (Poncet's defence) and the *Lunettes de Cristal de Roche* (a second anonymous attack on Poncet accusing him of favouring Italian as well as Turkish methods of rule).\(^7^2\) In the *Politiques Royales* a contemporary, François de Gravelle, links Poncet with Machiavelli saying they both favour tyranny.\(^7^3\)

In the *Preface du Florentin*, there is a description of a speech allegedly made by Poncet to Catherine, Anjou and Retz in 1572 just before the Saint Bartholomew's Day Massacres. Poncet is said to have urged the King to follow the example of the Turkish Sultan and establish his rule as absolute. One of the ways of doing this, Poncet is made to say, is to keep the nobles poor so that they will have no money to plot against the King, and to ruin them by overwhelming them with taxes so that they have to depend on their ruler for any favours and benefices.\(^7^4\) In the *Lunettes de Cristal de Roche*, the author links Poncet's supposed advice
with Italian methods of ruling and with the pernicious influence of Italian writers such as Machiavelli. 75

In the Histoire Universelle, D'Aubigné gives a long description of Poncet's alleged advice to Charles IX and Catherine, and puts it all under the heading 'Machiavelismes' in the Index. Poncet is describing the absolutism of the Turkish ruler,

il n'avait jamais veu qu'un Roi, asçavoir le grand Seigneur pourue que lui seul avoit en sa main l'honneur, la vie, et le bien de tous ses subjects: premierement pourue qu'en son empire il n'y a nulles dignitez naturelles, point de Princes, point de Grands qui ne doivent ce qu'ils sont à leur Roi, et qui ne soient prests de perir par un clin de son oeil... On demanda à Poncet par quel moyen le France se pourroit mettre en cest estât: Il faut (dit-il) oster les Princes et affoiblir tellement la Noblesse qu'ils ne puissent (comme il est arrivé quelquefois) contredire au Roi... laissez à vos Grands les charges ruineuses en effect, desquelles ils n'ayent que l'apparence, et donrez la vraie administration à gens de peu, et sur tout de la robe; qu'ils ne puissent conspirer: cela fait vous demantelerez les villes mutines, et les chasteaux de ceux qui en voudroyent refuser leurs testes: et lors vous ferez des biens, des vies et de la Religion tout ce qu'il vous plaira. (Tome II, B. II, ch. 2, pp. 671-672).

by putting this speech under the heading of 'Machiavelismes', the policy of ruining the nobles becomes linked with the interpretation of Il Principe as an encouragement to Princes to keep their subjects in poverty. 76

D'Aubigné has obviously read the whole of La France-Turquie for he also mentions (p. 672) the criticism of Poncet's 'Machiavellian' advice in the Lunettes de Christal de Roche and Poncet's self-defence in the Antipharmaque. He clearly believed that Poncet's advice had been followed by French rulers,

Or ces escrits, que vrais que supposez, esveillerent les esprits à choses nouvelles et dangereuses: mesmement pourue que la Cour contribuoit aux projects qui estoyent portez par eux, comme suivant les reglies de Poncet, y ajustant toutes rigueurs à ceux du Royaume, et conferant aux Italiens les charges honorables, les dons immenses, et l'autorité d'emplir la France d'exactions. 78

D'Aubigné's opposition here to the advice of Poncet - Machiavelli is not only a moral objection but one with a real political basis. We have seen that D'Aubigné wished to restrict the power of the King and one of
the ways in which he saw restraints could be possible would be to increase the authority of the nobles. He was perhaps all the more desirous of this as many of them belonged to the Reformers' party. He retained the feudal ideal of the King merely as chief among the nobles and the nobles as defenders of religion and French traditions. So enthusiastic was his support for the nobility that in the epistle 'Aux Lecteurs' at the beginning of the Tragiques, D'Aubigné has to defend himself against attacks from his enemies: 'il affectoit plus le gouvernement aristocratique que monarchique de quoy il fut accusé envers le Roy Henry quatriesme estant lors Roy de Navarre.' D'Aubigné's method of defence is to stress how loyally he has always fought for the King. In many ways, his position is close to that of the 'malcontents' who surrounded the Duke of Alençon before his death in 1584. These 'malcontents', of whom Gentillet was one, demanded that French nobles be given the important posts in the State, as opposed to the Italians whom Henry III and Catherine de' Medici favoured.

However events had overtaken D'Aubigné, for by the time Henry of Navarre ascended the throne, the character of the monarchy had changed due to the influence of the 'gens de la robe' whom D'Aubigné opposes in the extract from the Histoire Universelle quoted above p.203. These were a small group of permanent officers dealing with finance, taxation and law. They were usually men from the 'bourgeoisie' who had no wealth of their own and therefore depended on keeping their offices (in contrast with the independent position of the feudal nobles admired by D'Aubigné and Gentillet). Although these officers were Catholics, when faced with a choice between Navarre and the League, they supported the former, for the League wanted a return to an elective system of offices held only for one year at a time. By supporting Navarre, the 'gens de la robe' would keep their lands and their power. Thus, by the time Henry IV
became King, the situation in France had moved towards the concept of a
centralised monarch who was essentially the chief administrator
surrounded by other administrators - the officers who controlled all the
economic activity and productivity and who were primarily interested in
maintaining the King's absolute position (and hence their own jobs). 79

D'Aubigné clearly believed that this development was bad for
France since he relates it to the Machiavellian advice of Poncet. He sees
that the 'gens de la robe' will support the King even if he orders
actions against the welfare of his subjects and of course, this will
seriously affect Reformers in France who will lack strong, independent
nobles for leaders (in fact, the downfall of the Reformers in France
was partly caused by the defection of most of its leaders to the King's
side purely out of self-interest). 80

But D'Aubigné was out-of-date: there could be no return to the old
feudal ideal. The new administrative character of the French monarchy,
which he saw as despotism, was in reality a practical organisation of
power along purely secular lines. Well into the seventeenth century,
D'Aubigné continued to fight a battle which had already been lost,
appealing to feelings, such as loyalty to the Reformers' cause, which
were hardly relevant for the majority of Frenchmen any more. 81

Catherine de' Medici was one of the people to whom Poncet addressed
his alleged speech on the eve of the Saint Bartholomew's Day Massacres
and it was she in particular who was frequently blamed for attempting,
under the influence of her 'Italian teachers', to oppress the nobility by
keeping them poor and favouring Italians at their expense. 82 In the
Princes, D'Aubigné speaks of the self-interested councillors who are
employed by Catherine to ruin France,

De ruiner la France au conseil on decide:...
D'un cerveau feminin l'ambitieuse envie
Leur sert là de principe et de tous est suivie;... 
Les princes là dessus achetent finement
Ces traistres, et sur eux posent leur fondement,
On traite des moyens et des ruses nouvelles
Pour succer et le sang et les chiches mœelles
Du peuple ruiné, on fraude de son bien
Un François naturel pour un Italien.
(1. 529-552).

In Misères, there is a long description of Catherine favouring Italians,

Vous garderez les biens, les estats, les honneurs
Pour d'Italie avoir les fins empoisonneurs,
Pour nourrir, employer cette subtile bande,
Bien mieux entretenu, et plus riche et plus grande
Que celle du conseil...
(1. 967-970).

D'Aubigné sees Catherine as favouring Italians in order to weaken the French opposition to her tyrannical rule. Since favouring Italians was one element in Poncet's advice to ruin French nobles, which D'Aubigné had labelled a 'Machiavelisme', it is probable that there is some anti-Machiavellian feeling connected with the attacks on Catherine in the above passages from the Tragiques. This is one case where examination of D'Aubigné's prose works helps to highlight anti-Machiavellian sentiment in his poetry, which might otherwise go unnoticed.

b) That rulers should aim at a Turkish style despotism

In the speech allegedly made by Poncet to Charles IX before the Saint Bartholomew's Day Massacres and mentioned in the Histoire Universelle Tome II, Book II, chapter 2, pp. 671-672 (quoted above p.303), the Catholic theologian is said to have urged the King to follow the example of the Sultan and introduce a Turkish style absolutism into his kingdom. This would entail, says Poncet, weakening the French nobility and making them dependent on the King. D'Aubigné opposes this support for a Turkish style despotism and attributes its popularity in France to the pernicious influence of Machiavelli.

Like Machiavelli's theories on government, Turkish methods of rule were often seen as a threat to the nobility since the Turks had
abolished hereditary nobility in their Empire. Travellers brought back tales of wholesale massacres of nobles by the Turks. Since the French Renaissance saw Il Principe almost exclusively as a handbook for tyrants, Machiavelli's Prince was often equated with an Oriental tyrant, the ultimate example in many sixteenth century minds of an absolute ruler. This association of the Turkish Sultan with the Machiavellian Prince may also have arisen because Machiavelli often praises the Turks in his writings. For example, in the Discorsi I, 30, where he commends the Sultan for going into battle in person and fighting alongside his own soldiers.

Whatever the reason, Machiavelli's theories are very often linked in the Renaissance with Turkish methods of government. Frequently, as in D'Aubigné's Histoire Universelle, it is Poncet who is associated with favouring a Turkish style of rule. For example, in Charles De Boss's Le Theatre de France where the author says,

Poncet dit plus, que le Prince desireux de regner absolument, ne doit jamais permettre aucune assemblee d'estats generaux ou particuliers... Ce formateur de tyrannie sçavoit fort bien l'authorite des estats en tous royaumes bien policiez: il sçavoit mieux qu'il estoit impossible de reduire la France à la Turque, tant qu'on y tiendroit les Estats avec leurs anciennes libertez et asseurances...

(ed. cit. 58r and see 56r).

In his Politiques Royales (ed. cit., pp. 26-27), François de Gravelle links Poncet's alleged support for Turkish despotism with Machiavelli's ideas on government. In the France-Turquie (p. 9), Poncet had been accused of wishing to introduce a Turkish style of rule into France and he was in fact an obvious target for this accusation since in the Antipharmaque he admits to having spent three years in Turkey.

The link between Machiavelli and Turkish despotism is introduced by D'Aubigné as another proof of the danger of Machiavelli's ideas for the French nobility, and in particular, those nobles who belonged to the Reformers' party.
c) That rulers should keep their subjects divided

It was popularly believed in France that Machiavelli had advised his Prince to keep his subjects divided in order to maintain his authority, but in fact Machiavelli never advocates creating divisions amongst one's subjects. Discorsi III, 27 is actually entitled, 'Come e' si ha ad unire una città divisa, e come e' non è vera quella opinione che a tenere le città bisogni tenerle divise', and he says,

voglio discorrere la inutilità che si trae del tenere le terre che tu hai in governo divise. (p. 462).

In Il Principe chapter 20, he says that the policy of keeping one's subjects divided may have been all right in earlier times, but it does not work today (this passage is quoted in my chapter on Pierre Matthieu p. 70).

The misinterpretation of Machiavelli may have partly arisen from a misunderstanding of passages where Machiavelli says that it is easier to gain control of a city which is divided (Il Principe ch. 4 and 7, and Discorsi II, 21, 25) and that conflicts between the plebeians and the Senate at Rome were profitable (Discorsi I, 4, 6).88 It may also have arisen from Gentillet's Discours contre N. Machiavel Part III, XV, XXX, XXXI, where Machiavelli is wrongly presented as encouraging rulers to keep their subjects divided. A third element in this erroneous interpretation of Machiavelli, was that the policy of keeping one's subjects divided was traditionally attributed to tyrants. For example, in Book V of Aristotle's Politics, where the tyrant is portrayed as encouraging faction amongst his subjects. Since Il Principe was often seen as a handbook for tyrants and, moreover, one based on Aristotle's precepts, it was natural to attribute to Machiavelli the traditional view of favouring divisions.
The accusation that Machiavelli encouraged divisions is found in many French works. For example, *Le Reveil-Matin et mot du guet des bons Catholiques* by Jean de La Mothe, the *Dialogue du Francois et du Savoysien* by René de Lucinge, the *Responce à L'Anti-Espagnol*, the *Dialogue auquel sont traitées plusieurs choses avenues aux Lutheriens et Huguenots de la France*, the *Histoire Tragique et Memorable*, de Pierre de Gaverston, the *Histoire des derniers troubles de France* by Pierre Matthieu and the *Contes et Discours d'Eutrapel* by Noël du Fail.

In the preface to *De La Puissance legitime du Prince sur le peuple et du peuple sur le Prince*, C. Superantius says,

> J'estime donc, Messeigneurs, que ces questions suffisent pour refuter les Machiavelistes et leurs écrits, qui par leurs conseils pernicieux sont cause que l'estat est divisé en tant de dissensions civiles, partialitez et remuements.

This divisive policy is linked with Machiavelli's supposed advice to rulers to ruin the nobility in *Le Theatre de France* (ed. cit., pp. 5-6) and in the *Remonstrance d'un bon Catholique François, aux Trois Estats de France* where the author (possibly Mornay), warns the nobles against

> ces meschans Machiavelistes estrangers, qui ne tendent qu'à nourrir les guerres civiles... Un Prince (disent-ils) qui par contrainte usera de douceur envers ses sujets avancera sa ruine. Un Prince qui maintiendra partialitez entre ses sujets se fera mieux obeir, Le Moyen de rendre les sujets obeissans, c'est de les faire pauvres, Mieux vaut un Royaume ruiné que perdu: et sur ces belles Maximes ils se baignent à nous faire entretuer et ruiner les uns les autres...

In the *Politiques Royales*, François de Gravelle says that French rulers have learned how to dispose of any powerful rivals to their authority and how to

> entretenir discordes entre les sujets, affin qu'ils n'ayent le loisir de se formaliser du gouvernement. Selon lequel malheureux conseil, plusieurs ont opinion que les troubles passés ont esté entretenus en ce Royaume, sous pretexte de religion, par l'advis d'aucuns des citoyens et compatriotes de Machiavel: craignans de perdre leur souveraine authorité: les oppresser par tailles ou corvées... Bref tenir les sujets pauvres et abaissez, à ce qu'ils n'ayent le pouvoir de se rebecquer.

(*ed. cit.*, ch. 11, p. 3).
D'Aubigné, too, blamed Machiavelli for the policy of encouraging divisions amongst one's subjects and links this with his belief that French rulers, in particular, Catherine de' Medici, were aiming to weaken the Reformers' party by dividing the French nobles into factions. Catherine's policy of tolerance and of keeping the balance between Catholics and Reformers, especially before the Saint Bartholomew's Day Massacres, made her an easy target for the accusation of encouraging faction. This charge is repeated over and over again in the Discours merveilleux (ed. cit., p. 31, 47). In the Journal du Règne d'Henri III, Pierre de L'Estoile gives a poem in which the policy of dividing to rule is attributed to Catherine.

...tu veux régner par la division,  
Comme enseigne aux tyrans ta nation maligne...  
(ed. cit., p. 93, No. vii).

In Misères this policy of keeping the balance between the two sides is depicted by D'Aubigné as peculiar to Italians and in particular to Florentines,

Ainsi comme eux /Catherine's ancestors, the Dukes of Florence/  
tu sçais te rendre redoutable,  
Faisant le grand coquin, haussant le miserable,  
Ainsi comm'eux tu sçais par tes subtilitez,  
En maintenant les deux, perdre les deux costez,  
Pour abreuver de sang la soif de ta puissance-  
Pleust à Dieu, Jesabel, que tu euss' à Florence  
Laisse tes trahisons, en laissant ton pais,  
Que tu n'eusse les grands des deux costez trahis  
Pour regner au milieu, et que ton entreprise  
N'eust ruiné le noble et le peuple de l'Eglise!  
(1. 753-762).

The anti-Machiavellian overtones in these lines are highlighted by a comparison with the Histoire Universelle. In this work, D'Aubigné links Catherine's supposed policy of dividing to rule specifically with Machiavelli - indeed it is this policy more than any other which is labelled as a 'Machiavelisme' in the Index.

After the massacres at Vassy in 1562, the Reformers held a meeting at Meaux. There, they discussed Catherine's policies under Francis II -
was she for or against the Reformers?

Les autres vouloyent qu'on courut à la personne du Roi, qui n'estoit pas encor à Paris, Cela sembloit doubteux et odieux: quelques uns asseuroyent que la Royne menoit à regret le Roi dans l'absoluë puissance des Guisars: quelqu'un respondit que toutes les regentes regnent precairement, et partant les plus fines, comme la Roine Catherine, obligent toujours le plus redoutable, et ne se bandent jamais contre l'Estat present qu'apres l'avoir affoibli.


This is specifically labelled 'Machiavelisme' in the Index.

Catherine continued the policy of keeping the balance between Reformers and the Guises till the death of Francis II, though towards the end of the latter's reign, she began to fear on the one hand, the tyranny of the Guises and on the other, a possible revolt by the Bourbon Princes after the death of the King. According to D'Aubigné, she wondered at one point whether to have the two Bourbons executed, but Michel de L'Hospital advised her to continue her policy of divide to rule. In D'Aubigné's account, L'Hospital argues that her subjects will only rebel if she executes the Bourbons and tells her,

Vous estes puissante de garder la balance entre les Grands et les faire debattre à qui mieux vous servira, ayant la science de regner et vostre maison pleine de Rois: Soyez Maistresse et non servue de vos mauvais conseilleurs...

(Tome I, B. II, ch. 22, p. 140).

In the following chapter entitled 'Jeu de la Roine', D'Aubigné presents Catherine as carrying out this policy of stirring up factions among her subjects in order to increase her own authority,

La Roine jettoit par fois de l'huile sur tel feu, par fois de l'eau, selon que l'eslevation de l'un de ses partis menaçoit la maison de France, et en cette maison son authorité. Elle creut pouvoir contenter ceux de Bourbon en les tirant hors de peine seulement, ceux de Guise en leur laissant l'administration en effect.

(Tome I, B. II, ch. 23, p. 141).

This policy is included in the 'Machiavelismes' referred to by D'Aubigné in his Index.
Often this divisive policy is linked by D'Aubigné to specific measures taken by Catherine against possible rebels, in particular the Reformers. For example, during Henry III's reign, Catherine is said to have used various ruses to prevent Alençon and Navarre (both being kept under close surveillance at that time) from banding together to collaborate against her and the King. According to D'Aubigné, she set them against each other by making them vie for the position of General Lieutenant. Thus, instead of working together to defeat Catherine, Navarre and Alençon became rivals in love and politics (due to Catherine's contrivance, they were both in love with Catherine de Sauves, one of her ladies-in-waiting). By this division, Catherine was able to keep two potential rebels in her power as they betrayed one another's plans to her. D'Aubigné classifies this as a 'Machiavelisme'

In the Histoire Universelle Tome II, Catherine is shown trying to turn the leaders of the Reformers against each other. She endeavoured to persuade Navarre to join up with Henry III in order to preserve his rights of succession, thus setting him at odds with the Prince of Condé,

This, too, comes under the heading of 'Machiavelismes' in D'Aubigné's Index. Catherine was supposedly behind Henry III's plan to ruin the League by placing himself at the head and so dividing it,

This action is labelled a 'Machiavelisme'.
These Machiavellian policies against the League are continued a little later on in the Histoire Universelle in the description of the advice given to Henry III by a State Councillor. Speaking of Alençon’s exploits in the Low Countries, the Councillor shows how Henry can indirectly fight Spain and the League through Alençon. Henry should allow Alençon and the King of Spain to continue fighting each other for as long as possible in the Low Countries, only coming to the assistance of his brother when

ses moyens et ceux du pays seroyent tellement affoiblis, qu'ils /the people of the Low Countries/ seroyent contraincts de se donner au Roi aux conditions que prescriroit sa Majesté.

(Tome II, B. V, ch. 18, pp. 1145-46).

In this way, the King will ruin his rival Alençon, a Machiavellian policy, and demonstrate that it is he who has the real power, not Alençon as people have been claiming.

At the same time, by delaying intervention, Henry will cause the King of Spain to lose money and standing in the Low Countries. Henry would thus easily be able to take over Spanish conquests there. Alençon would urge him to fight in the Low Countries, but Henry would pretend to do nothing until he had consulted the Estates. He would then appear to be reluctantly undertaking a war at the insistence of the Estates (who would therefore finance him). This manipulation of appearances is in itself Machiavellian. Henry would use the war as a pretext to get the Estates on his side against Spain and the League, thus dividing the opposition against itself. Small wonder that D'Aubigné classifies this advice as a 'Machiavelisme'.

Catherine continued her policy of dividing to rule as late as 1587 when she is shown playing off the League against Navarre. At this stage, having unsuccessfully attempted to persuade Navarre to change his religion, Catherine sided with the League for a while,
les plus subtils ont estimé que lors elle avoit perdu la balance et s'estoit faite entièrement partisane des Lorrains: non pas qu'elle eust perdu la crainte de leur ambition, mais elle voyoit les trois parts de la France bandée à porter un Roi nouveau sur les boucliers, et par ainsi tenant le juste pour le nécessaire, elle servit en ce voyage. Les Liguez fidellement en son infidélité, ne presentant rien au Roi de Navarre qui sentist la paix, mais le portant aux extremitez et au desespoir, et c'estoit ce que vouloyent ses ennemis. (Tome III, B. I, ch. 7, p. 41).

D'Aubigné classifies this specious reasoning and utilitarian argument as a 'Machiavelisme'.

In this way, D'Aubigné builds up a picture of Catherine as a follower of Machiavelli who attempts to divide her subjects in order to rule over them. There is a particularly vivid description of this policy (though not linked here specifically with Machiavelli) in the Histoire Universelle Tome II. Speaking of Catherine's close surveillance of Alençon and Navarre, D'Aubigné says,

chacun admiroit de voir une femme estrangere, née de condition impairelle à nos Rois, au lieu d'estre envoyée en sa maison, comme plusieurs Roines douairières, se jouer d'un tel Royaume et d'un tel peuple que les François, mener à sa cadene de si grands Princes: mais c'estoit qu'elle se savoit escrimer de leurs ambitions; bien mesnager les esperances et les craintes, trancher du cousteau des divisions: et ainsi docte en toutes les partialitez, employer pour soi les forces qu'elle devoit craindre: on pouvoir lors dire des François que chacun pour sauver sa vie et respirer une âme precaire se faisoit bourreau de son compagnon. (Tome II, B. II, ch. 6, p. 689).

Catherine's actions are linked in D'Aubigné's mind with the supposed advice given to her by Maurice Poncet. Part of Poncet's advice about nobles, as described by D'Aubigné, is that the King must make sure to


D'Aubigné describes the criticism of Poncet made by the author of the Lunettes de Christal de Roche,

il lui reproche aussi la pluspart des divisions qui paroissoyent entre les grands du Royaume. (Tome II, B. II, ch. 2, p. 672).
D'Aubigné depicts Poncet and Machiavelli giving the same advice on the necessity of stirring up one's subjects into factions and divisions, advice which, he says, is put into practice by their disciple, Catherine, to the detriment particularly of the Reformers whose leaders she frequently sets against each other in order to weaken the party.¹⁰¹

D'Aubigné's hostility to this supposedly Machiavellian precept has a political rather than a moral basis for he concentrates particularly on the harmful effects the policy has had on the leaders of the Reformers and it is the political opponents of the Reformers who are accused of acting in this Machiavellian way. The policy of divide to rule is never criticised in general terms: one feels that if the boot had been on the other foot and the Reformers had begun using this policy against their enemies, D'Aubigné might have been the first to applaud ...

d) That rulers should weaken the courage of the nobles by encouraging duels

In the Misères, D'Aubigné says,

...quand la frenaisie et fièvre générale
A senti quelque paix, dilucide/=clair/ intervalle,
Nos sçavans apprentifs du faux Machiavel
Ont parmi nous semé la peste de duèl.
Les grands, ensorcelez par subtiles querelles,
Ont remplis leurs esprits de haines mutuelles;
Leur courage employé à leur dissension
Les fait serfs de mestier, grands de profession.
(1. 1045-52).

This passage has often been quoted by historians but without any suggestion of why D'Aubigné thought the policy of encouraging duels was particularly Machiavellian. Indeed, at first sight, blaming Machiavelli for the popularity of duels in France seems just another one of the many odd views French writers attributed to him in their bias against him.

It will therefore be necessary to examine this topic in some depth, comparing passages in other of D'Aubigné's works.
In the *Misères*, D'Aubigné links the accusation that Machiavelli's followers have spread the fashion for duels in France, with the Machiavellian policy supposedly adopted by French rulers: that of weakening the nobles by dividing them in order to establish a tyrannical rule in France. Not content with divisions caused by the civil wars, rulers stir up factions in peacetime, D'Aubigné says, by encouraging duels between nobles,

> Un chacun estourdi a porté au fourreau  
> De quoy estre de soi et d'autrui le bourreau;  
> Et de peur qu'en la paix la feconde noblesse  
> De son nombre s'enflant ne refrene et ne blesse  
> La tyrannie un jour, qu'ignorante elle suit,  
> Miserable support du joug qui la destruit,  
> Le Prince en son repas par louanges et blasmes  
> Met la gloire aux duels...  

(1. 1055-62). 102

The danger of encouraging duels was emphasised by other French writers. In *Les Observations de diverses choses remarquées sur l'État, couronnement, et peuple de France, tant ancien que moderne*, Regnault Dorleans blames duels for destroying the traditional French respect for laws. Now, he says, Frenchmen take the law into their own hands through fighting duels. 103 In the *Essais* II, 27, Montaigne opposes duels as idle, Italian pastimes. 104 They divide and ruin French nobles,

> cet autre exercice est d'autant moins noble qu'il ne regarde qu'une fin privee, qui nous apprend a nous entreruyner, contre les loix et la justice, et qui en toute façon produit tousjours des effects dommageables.  

(ed. cit., p. 359).

Montaigne continues by describing the cowardice of tyrants who carry out the policy (also Machiavellian) of exterminating all those who might rival them in power. It is possible that, like D'Aubigné, Montaigne saw a link between duels ruining the nobles and the Machiavellian policy of disposing of any threat to one's power.

In the passage from the *Misères* (1. 1055-62) quoted above, Henry III is the Prince particularly connected with the allegedly Machiavellian policy of encouraging duels. 105 Henry's 'mignons' frequently fought duels
at Court against the followers of Alençon and of the Guises. D'Aubigné believed that this fashion for duels was sapping the courage of the French courtiers and there follows in Misères a long diatribe against duels being a cowardly way of fighting,

On appelle aujourd'hui n'avoir rien fait qui vaille
D'avoir percé premier l'espais d'une bataille,
D'avoir premier porté une enseigne au plus haut,
Et franchi devant tous la breche par assaut...
La voici pour ce temps: bien prendre une querelle
Pour un oiseau ou chien, pour garce ou maquerelle,
Au plaisir d'un vallet, d'un bouffon gazouillant
Qui veut, dit-il sçavoir si son maistre est vaillant.
(1. 1121-36).

He adds, disdainfully,

Le Francois aveuglé en ce siecle dernier
Est tout gladiateur et n'a rien du guerrier.
(1. 1167-68).

In addition, the Machiavellian policy of encouraging duels, is robbing France of nobles to fight in her defence because they are all being killed off in trivial combats,

Depuis que telles loix sur nous sont establies,
A ce jeu ont villain plus de cent mille vies;
La milice est perdue, et l'escrime en son lieu
Assaut le vrai honneur, escrimant contre Dieu...
Nous n'osons nous armer, les guerres nous flétrissent,
Chacun combat à part et tous en gros perissent.
(1. 1197-1206).

This theme of duels recurs in other parts of D'Aubigné's work. In a letter to Condé, just as he blames many for using the civil wars as a pretext for their own ambitions, so he puts the popularity of duels down to ambition,

Il n'y a que trop de testes relevées en France qui n'ont autel que leur ambition, témoin l'abus des duels.

Duels are seen as one manifestation of the Machiavellian self-interest which reigns at court. They are part of the corruption at court to which D'Aubigné himself succumbed when he first arrived. 108

In his satire Les Avantures du Baron de Faeneste, there is a chapter entitled 'Des braves, des r'affinez et duels'. In this, Faeneste (the Catholic courtier, probably representing Espenon, who looks only at
surface appearances) defends duels as maintaining honour and says,

Si ye poubois parbenir à estre contai entre les r'afinez,
ye serois vien contant.

Enay (the Protestant country dweller who seeks the truth beneath appearances and who echoes many of D'Aubigné's own views) asks him to explain the term 'r'afinez'. Faeneste replies,

Ce sont yens qui se vattent pour un clin d'œil; si on ne les salué que par acquit, pour une fredur, si un manteau d'un autre touche le lur, si on crache à quatre pieds d'ux.109

Enay pokes fun at this kind of 'honour'. He allows duels in certain cases, but in general disapproves of them as abortive, and detrimental to valour, being merely part of the general ostentation and display prevalent at court where life revolves around appearances. According to D'Aubigné, duels divide nobles against themselves, sap their courage and lead to the decline in the number of nobles willing to take part in wars - and all this he blames on the pernicious teaching of Machiavelli.

e) That rulers should eliminate those subjects who become too powerful

In Discorsi I, 29, Machiavelli speaks of rulers being 'obliged' to dispose of any subject whose reputation becomes so great as to be a threat to their own power,
This Machiavellian policy of eliminating one's rivals is applied to Henry III in the Histoire Universelle. According to D'Aubigné, Henry III wished to destroy the Duke of Joyeuse who was becoming too powerful. Like the 'capitano' mentioned by Machiavelli, Joyeuse had covered himself in glory through fighting for Henry, with the result that the latter became suspicious and jealous of him. D'Aubigné records how a prisoner taken from the King's army recounted Henry's plan,

le prisonnier qui disoit ces choses ne faisoit qu'arriver de la Cour, et contoit comment le Duc de Joyeuse ayant esté presché par toutes les chaires de Paris, selon son désir, et adoré du peuple, pour ses rudes exploits, courtisé des Jesuites, et visité de nuict par les Guisards, estoit pour ces mesmes causes desfavorisé du Roi, qui nonobstant lui avoit commis l'armee avec un absolu commandement de combattre le Roi de Navarre en quelque lieu et à quelque prix que ce fut. Ce discourece en savoit jusques là de faire vouloir au Roi de deux choses l'une, ou effacer les exploits des Liguez, par son creat /sic/ auparavant qu'on eut connu la disgrace du Maistre, et la defection de son Mignon; ou si la victoire tournoit en faveur des Ref. se voir défait d'un ingrat trop eslevé.

(Tome III, B. I, ch. 15, pp. 74-75).

Either way, Joyeuse's influence will be lessened. D'Aubigné classifies this plan as a 'Machiavelisme' in the Index. To some extent, Henry III is also pursuing another Machiavellian policy with regard to Joyeuse: that of putting responsibility for unpopular measures (here, the defeat of the League) on one's ministers. This was the policy adopted by Cesare Borgia with regard to Remirro de Orco (Il Principe ch. 7) and in Il Principe chapter 19, Machiavelli says,

1i principi debbono le cose di carico fare sumministrare ad altri, quelle di grazia a loro medesimi.

(p. 78).

In this way, it was largely Machiavelli's teachings which D'Aubigné held responsible for having weakened the French nobility and allowed French rulers to establish a tyranny over their subjects. We have seen that this anti-Machiavellian feeling is closely linked with political opposition on D'Aubigné's part to the concept of a centralised monarchy surrounded by administrators in the pay of the King. As usual, it is
D'Aubigné's political opponents who are accused of carrying out the Machiavellian policy of weakening the nobles, in particular, Catherine de' Medici and Henry III.

In many of the passages attacked by D'Aubigné, Machiavelli is speaking not about nobles, but rather about a ruler's subjects in general. For example, Machiavelli believed that all citizens, not just nobles, should lead a frugal life and that any subject, whether he be noble or not, should be eliminated if he becomes too powerful. D'Aubigné and other French writers such as Gentillet, apply Machiavelli's teaching on subjects specifically to the nobility. D'Aubigné believed that it was the nobles in particular who were being weakened by their rulers' Machiavellian policies and that if they were ruined, there would be no one left to oppose tyranny. For the French writer, there was no point in discussing the whole of the nation since without the nobles the populace had very little power. Indeed, when the leaders of the Reformers began to abandon their party under the Regency of Marie de' Medici, their cause was lost despite the loyalty of the ordinary people. Only the nobles had political influence and it was they, so D'Aubigné believed, who must be shown the harmful effects to themselves of Machiavelli's teachings.

6) Opposition to Machiavelli's approval of acts of cruelty

Machiavelli is sometimes blamed by D'Aubigné for inspiring acts of cruelty against the Reformers. In the Histoire Universelle Tome III, D'Aubigné describes the wholesale massacres of Reformers carried out by the Duke of Joyeuse during the siege of La Mothe-Sainte-Héraye. D'Aubigné himself met Joyeuse shortly after these massacres and taxed him with cruelty. Joyeuse's arguments in self-defence are labelled as 'Machiavelismes' in the Index.
Joyeuse tells D'Aubigné,

Le but de tant que nous sommes qui voulons avoir parti au debris du Royaume, est sur tout d'estre preschez par les chaires de Paris et autres notables, dans lesquelles le Duc de Guise fait ses affaires; or cet acte que je vous avoué m'avoir fait mal au coeur, est plus au goust de nos Prescheurs qu'une bataille gagnée avec beaucoup de peril, où l'on aurait usé de quelque douceur. (p. 71).

In this way, D'Aubigné associates Machiavelli with wholesale cruelty and bloodshed - and indeed, in the Discorsi II, 2, one of the reasons for Machiavelli's attack on Christianity is that he believes it has enfeebled men, making them less eager to take part in the bloody battles waged by pagans. The criterion of a successful battle according to Machiavelli, is the number of people killed (Istorie Fiorentine B. VIII). He prefers a short and vigorous combat to prolonged, bloodless struggles (Istorie Fiorentine B. VII), an attitude very close to that of the League preachers as described by Joyeuse in the above passage. In connection with this passage, there is also something Machiavellian about Joyeuse's bid to perform some striking action which will be preached about from the pulpits of Paris. 113

In the Histoire Universelle Tome I, B. III, ch. 17 (p. 243), D'Aubigné describes Monluc's cruel policy of hanging Reformers at Bergerac as an example to other rebels of the fate that awaited them. This action is classified as a 'Machiavelisme' in the Index, possibly because D'Aubigné has in mind Il Principe chapter 17 where Machiavelli argues that, to avoid confusion and disorder in his State, a Prince may make an example of some of his subjects as a warning to the rest. 114

Conclusion

D'Aubigné's reaction to Machiavelli is in many ways typical of the hostility towards the Italian's policies found in French writings in the latter part of the sixteenth century. D'Aubigné's arguments on the
subject of broken promises, providence and the use of dissimulation are found in other French authors as is his opposition to an absolutist rule and his wish to restrict the power of the monarch by increasing the influence of the nobles.

Yet his criticism of Machiavelli is also unique to himself in that we often have the feeling that he is opposing Machiavelli not so much on moral grounds as on political. He chooses to oppose Machiavelli's freeing the ruler from all religious and moral restraints and his teaching on keeping one's subjects in poverty and divided, largely because he had seen what harmful effects these policies had had on the party of Reformers in France. He insists that the Reformers themselves should keep their oath of allegiance to their party, not principally on moral grounds, but in order to prevent them from defecting to the King's side. In the end, we feel that D'Aubigné is opposing Machiavelli's utilitarian arguments for a utilitarian, political end - the defence of the Reformers. Unlike other French writers such as Louis Des Masures, he is not arguing from a different basis from Machiavelli (a moral one), but from the same utilitarian standpoint - D'Aubigné is concerned for the political interests of the Reformers just as Machiavelli concentrates on whatever he believes will result in a united Italy.

D'Aubigné's use of Machiavelli as a convenient stick with which to beat his political enemies, is interesting in that it undermines his statements in the prefaces to the Histoire Universelle where he says that he is going to write an unbiased history. In the preface to Tome I, he criticises those historians who are employed by rulers to flatter them. He, in contrast, will merely describe the truth of events and let his readers judge for themselves,

vous ne verrez ni digressions ni exclamations, n'estant mon mestier que d'escrire sans juger des actions, comme les praemisses d'un argument, duquel celui qui lit amasse la judicieuse conclusion.

(preface, p. 7).
In the preface to Tome IV, he says,

quand la vérité met le poignard à la gorge, il faut bayser sa main blanche, quoique tachée de nostre sang.\textsuperscript{116}

In a letter speaking of the Histoire Universelle, he says,

Vous verrez comment entre les loix que j'ai reçueës des meilleurs maistres, j'observe de ne descrire que les pures actions, sans donner ma sentence au lecteur. Je ne luy fais present que des premisses, et luy laisse la façon de la conclusion.\textsuperscript{117}

In the epistle 'Aux Lecteurs' of the Tragiques, D'Aubigné congratulates himself on writing a history,

en laquelle c'est chose merveilleuse qu'un esprit igné et violent de son naturel ne se soit montré en aucun point partisan, ait escrit sous louanges et blasmes, fiddle tesmoin et jamais juge, se contentant de satisfaire à la question du fait sans toucher à celle du droit.

These statements have usually been taken at face value by historians,\textsuperscript{118} but the Index to the history indicting the actions of Catholic leaders by classifying them as 'Machiavelismes' reveals that his Histoire is continuing, in a modified form, the type of political propaganda in defence of the Reformers which lies at the heart of the Tragiques. It is always Catholic leaders, for example, Catherine de' Medici, Henry III and the King of Spain, who are charged with implementing Machiavellian policies, usually against the Reformers. D'Aubigné thus deliberately builds Machiavelli up into an expression of Catholic mentality. In the introduction to the Histoire Universelle, D'Aubigné says that

\textit{le vrai fruict de toute l'Histoire...est de connoistre en la folie et foiblesse des hommes, le jugement et la force de Dieu,}

(p. 7),

but 'la folie et foiblesse' is all on the Catholic side, whilst 'la force de Dieu' is generally shown to be operating in favour of the Reformers. D'Aubigné's continual presentation of Catholic leaders as Machiavellian, particularly in the Tragiques and the Histoire, pervades the reader's imagination and succeeds in convincing us of the correctness of D'Aubigné's opposition to Machiavellian rulers and the harm they bring upon their
subjects, much more fully than if D'Aubigné had employed the more blatant methods of anti-Machiavellian pamphleteers.

The Histoire Universelle develops and illuminates themes in the Tragiques and provides a key to the correct interpretation of the latter since what enables us to say with confidence that certain passages in the Tragiques are anti-Machiavellian, is the fact that similar actions are labelled as Machiavellian by D'Aubigné himself in the Histoire Universelle.

D'Aubigné's opposition to Machiavelli is quite subtle since it is only when we bring together all the actions labelled as 'Machiavelismes' in the Histoire, as well as references to Machiavelli in his other writings, that we see how consistent is his use of Machiavelli to indict the Catholics. By comparing passages from different parts of his works, we can judge how persistently D'Aubigné classifies certain policies as Machiavellian. It is because such a comparative study had not been undertaken that D'Aubigné's knowledge of Machiavelli has been underestimated and indeed, ignored, till now.

2. The first edition of the Histoire Universelle (Tomes I and 2 published in 1619, Tome 3 in 1620) contains only a 'Table de Noms' which does not include these 'Machiavelismes'. The 1626 edition (the second edition) contains an 'Indice des Matières' which refers to these 'Machiavelismes'. This is the edition referred to throughout this chapter (BL 596 k 1). Presumably this Index has been added by D'Aubigné himself since this second edition is described as 'augmentée de notables histoires entières, et de plusieurs additions et corrections faites par le même Auteur'.

3. The context precludes any possibility that the reference to Machiavelli could be ironical since de Thou is the main source for D'Aubigné's Histoire and the latter frequently praises de Thou elsewhere for example, in the Letter to Simon Goulart (Oeuvres, ed. cit., Lettre XVII, pp. 871-872). For passages in other French writers where Machiavelli is praised objectively as a historian of Florence, see my chapter on Pierre Matthieu note 78.


6. In general knowledge of Machiavelli's life was limited in France in the sixteenth century - see the introduction to this thesis pp. 20-21.

7. Discours contre N. Machiavel ed. A. D'Andrea and P.D. Stewart, Florence, 1974, pp. 14-15 and see Part I, iii. See also the preface to Alençon's Declaration of 1575, often attributed to Gentillet (quoted in my chapter on La Jesse pp. 173-4). The author of this preface accuses Machiavelli of diverting the French from traditional ways of governing and builds up Alençon as an opponent of the 'Italian' methods of rule employed by Catherine and Henry III.


10. These can all be found in the Archives Curieuses de l'Histoire de France (ed. cit., Tomes 7-9).

11. N. Montand (probably a pseudonym for N. Barnaud), Paris, 1582 (BL 1059 b 20 (2)). See especially the preface.

13. Studies such as that by J. Héritier (Catherine de Médicis, Paris, 1939) are interesting for their comparisons between Catherine's policies and Machiavelli's ideas, but do not establish any direct influence of Machiavelli on Catherine's actions such as could be proved, for example, by a close examination of her letters.

14. D'Aubigné's satire is not the gentle Horatian satire of Joachim Du Bellay but the more stringent moral indignation of Juvenal and Martial. Unlike Du Bellay, he names the individuals he is attacking. His vivid imagination exaggerates their faults and the criticism takes the form of violent tirades rather than the gentle humour of Du Bellay's Regrets.

15. A reference to the Medici coat of arms (see the Garnier and Plattard edition of the Tragiques, p. 165, note 775).

16. In the Histoire Universelle, she is accused of poisoning both Jeanne d'Albret (Tome II, B. I, p. 531) and the Cardinal of Lorraine (Tome II, B. II, p. 718).

17. See Jugement (ed. cit., pp. 166-167 and note to line 783). In Journal du règne d'Henri III, Pierre de l'Estoile describes how hostility to Italians was linked with opposition to Catherine and gives a poem in which she is criticised for her use of poison (ed. L-R Lefèvre, Paris, 1943, p. 45 and see p. 58). An English pamphlet, Martin's Month's Mind (attributed to Thomas Nashe) links Machiavelli with the use of poison. See E. Gasquet, Le courant Machiavélien dans la pensée et la littérature anglaises du XVIe siècle, Paris, 1970, p. 148; and see pp. 155-164, pp. 215-220 for the link between anti-Machiavellianism and French hostility to Italians in general, especially Catherine de' Medici. The idea that Catherine and her court were followers of Machiavelli, penetrated into England via Protestant writings very soon after the Saint-Bartolomew's Day Massacres (see Gasquet, op. cit., pp. 164-168).

18. See my introduction to this thesis pp. 19-20.

19. See my chapter on Des Masures pp. 258-1 for discussion of this 'resistance' literature.

20. Princes 1.651-654. See also the description of the 'troisiesme rang d'enemies de l'Eglise' (modern tyrants) in Vengeances. They are described as faking religion,

Masquans l'amer courroux d'une douce feintise,
Satans vestus en Anges et serpens enchanteurs,
De Julian le fin subtils imitateurs.
Ils n'ont pas trompé Dieu; leurs frivoles excuses,
La nuict qui les couvroit, les frauduleuses ruses,
Leur feinte piété, et masque ne put pas
Rendre seche leur mort, ni heureux leur trespas.
(p. 75).
21. Discorsi I, 14 and see also Il Principe ch. 18 where Machiavelli advises his Prince to feign religious zeal. Gentillet attacks this advice in the Discours contre N. Machiavel. He believes that a ruler's lack of religion will soon be detected, resulting in a general abandoning of religion by his subjects, leading to social chaos,

> Car il est tout certain que les hommes, qui sont naturellement plus enclins à mal qu'à bien, dès qu'ils verront leur Prince suyvre ce chemin, voudront faire comme lui, parce que ordinairement les sujets se conforment aux meurs et conditions du Prince.

(Part II, Maxime I, pp. 156-157).

22. S.l., 1619, (BN Lb36 1264), ch. 29, pp. 127-128.

23. But for Lysander as a key figure in attacks on Machiavellianism, see my chapter on Pierre Matthieu note 60.

24. In Response de F. Portus Candiotti, aux lettres diffamatoires de Pierre Carpentier Advocate, s.l., 1574, (BL 804 a 2 (2)), another Reformer puts responsibility for the Massacres onto the type of teaching given by Machiavelli to his Prince about ignoring the demands of religion,

> la Religion n'est autre chose, sinon une certaine police extérieure tenant les hommes en quelque devoir. C'est ainsi que ce meschant Florentin Machiavel façonne son Prince.

(p. 29).

25. D'Aubigné is here berating those 'lukewarm' Reformers who gave their allegiance to Louis XIII thus bringing about the demise of their party in France, but it should be remembered that Machiavelli was likewise accused of writing Il Principe in exile in order to gain employment with the Medicis.


27. See also Oeuvres Complètes ed. Réaume and De Caussade, T. II, Le Caducée ou l'Ange de Paix and Traité sur les guerres civiles where D'Aubigné similarly criticises compromising Reformers.


29. Machiavelli frequently uses the argument of necessity of State for example, in Il Principe ch. 18,

> Spesso necessitato, per mantenere lo stato, operare contro all' fede, contro all'acarità, contro alla umanità, contro alla religione. E però bisogna...non partirsi dal bene, potendo, ma sapere intrare nel male, necessitato.

(pp. 73-74).

30. Advertissement au Roy, ou sont deduites les Raisons d'Estat, pour lesquelles il ne luy est pas bien seant de changer de Religion, s.l., 1589, (BN Lb3589), pp. 3-4.
31. Le Vray Catholique Romain contre le ligueur couvert, s.l., 1591, (BN Lb 33791), Aiiv.


33. Pagan writers often presented Fortune as capable of being tamed by men, for example, Virgil, Seneca and Cicero. See the chapter on 'Fortuna and Virtù' in S. Anglo, Machiavelli: a dissection, London, 1971.


35. In The History of the World (London, 1614), Walter Raleigh says, whom the poets call Fortune we know to be God. (p. 5).

When Montaigne was criticised by the Papal censors for using the word 'fortune' so frequently, he replied that he was using it in the sense that poets use it. For Montaigne's concept of Fortune as caring for and controlling man's destiny, see Essais, ed. A. Micha, Paris, 1968, B. I, ch. 24, p. 174; B. I, ch. 34; B. III, ch. 8.

36. See the passage cited on p. 225 of my chapter on Des Masures. Incidentally, if Henry III was as devoted to Machiavelli as his opponents claimed, it seems courageous of Pasquier to send this anti-Machiavellian letter to the King's secretary.


41. In the preface to the Histoire Universelle, D'Aubigné says,

le vrai fruict de toute l'Histoire...est de connoistre en la folie et foiblæse des hommes, le jugement et la force de Dieu.

(p. 7).

42. Although the portrayal of tyrants coming to a bad end is traditional and found in many classical and Renaissance writings, yet it was also specifically used in the sixteenth century to oppose Machiavelli by showing the results of rulers following his (merely human) advice. See Gentillet, Discours contre N. Machiavel (ed. cit.), Part III, xv. Claude de Rubys in his pamphlet entitled Le Bouclier de la Reunion des Vrais Catholiques François, contre les artifices de Bearnos, des Heretiques et leurs fauteurs et adherents, describes the bad end of Louis XI,

que les Machiavelistes disent avoir esté le premier qui meist les Roys hors de page parce que ce fust le
premier qui introduisit la tyrannie en France.
(Paris, 1589, BL 3900 aa 47, p. 67).

43. See my chapter on Garnier pp. for French writers' knowledge of Machiavelli's views on perjury.

44. See also Sa Vie (ed. cit.), p. 422 for another mention of this episode.


46. Ibid., p. 77. D'Aubigné is here speaking of religion but his opinion could equally apply to the sphere of breaking promises.

47. See my chapter on Des Mases p. 4.

48. François de Gravelle was another Reformer who was worried about the dangers of Machiavelli's teaching for his co-religionists - see his Politiques Royales where he says,

Mais les Machiavelistes ne font nul cas de la Religion, sinon autant qu'elle leur est commode, et pour tromper ceux avec lesquels ils ont affaire: et d'eux et de leurs maistres et compatriotes est venue la maxime: que l'on n'estoit point tenu de garder la foy aux heretiques.
(Lyons, 1596, BNME 3289, pp. 213-214).

The Council of Constance had rendered promises made to heretics null and void (see above p. 42 for the quotation from the Histoire Universelle Tome II, B. I, ch. 1, p. 534). In the Supplément à l'Histoire Universelle d'Agrippa D'Aubigné (ed. J. Plattard, Paris, 1925, Tome IV, B. V, ch. 1) Arnoux, the Jesuit adviser of Louis XIII, cites the Council of Constance's edict when encouraging the King to persecute Reformers in Navarre,

Et pource que Sa Majesté et quelques vieux conseillers faisoient difficulté de rompre les promesses si fraîches et jurées si expressément, fut tenu un conseil de conscience, où il fut résolu de mettre le concile de Constance en pratique et vigueur.
(p. 12).

The Council of Constance was held from 1414-1418 to discuss measures to eliminate heretics.

49. Compare the Discours merveilleux where she is described as making war on the Reformers 'contre la foy publique de la parole du Roy, laquelle doit estre la vérité mesme...' (ed. cit., p. 39). The author says that promises must be kept, even to Reformers (pp. 41-42) and that Catherine has broken her promise so often that she is not to be trusted by Reformers. (p. 51).

50. For example, in Tome I,

ceux de Mommoranci et l'Amiral de Chastillon insistoyent à garder la foi à l'empereur, disans là dessus ce qui se peut dire de la foi publique. Ceux de Lorraine au contraire
pretendoyent cause de rupture, et poussoyent à la
defense du Pape, avec les specieuses raisons de ceste
puissance qui peut disposer de tout serment.
(B. I, ch. 10, p. 15).


52. For Francis I as an anti-Machiavellian figure in French literature
of the sixteenth century, see my chapter on Pierre Matthieu, note 59.

53. Three other writers discuss the breakdown of social relations which
would ensue if Machiavelli's teachings on broken promises were
adopted - Gentillet, Discours contre N. Machiavel (ed. cit., Part III,
xxi); Montaigne, Essais (B. II, 18; B. III, 1) and Estienne Pasquier,
Les Recherches de la France (B. IV, ch. 3).

54. Princes 1.892. Compare Les Recherches de la France B. IV, ch. 3
where Pasquier says that promises have become so devalued that noone
can rely even on relations' promises any longer, let alone those of
enemies.

55. The actual page number given in the Index is p. 704, but there is
nothing Machiavellian on p. 704 and I have taken this as a printer's
error for 703.

56. See my chapter on Pierre Matthieu p. 61 for other French writers
who linked Machiavelli with the use of ruse.

57. He says for example,

Voilà comment le Diable est fait par eux un ange,
Au chantre et au chanté vergongneuse louange!
Nos princes sont louez, louez et vicieux.
(1.149-151).

These lines are an echo of II Corinthians XI, 12-15 and see also
Du Bellay's Regrets no. 5, ed. M.A. Screech and J. Jolitfe, Geneva,
1966.

58. Compare the attack on Mohammed in chapter 29 (p. 131) of this work.

59. Histoire Universelle Tome II, B. II, ch. 22, p. 786. Historically,
D'Aubigné has his facts wrong: Catherine hoped for Alençon's
marriage to Elizabeth I in order to have England as an ally against
Spain and extreme Catholic opposition in France. The Reformers
naturally wanted the alliance with Protestant England and D'Aubigné
puts the breaking off of the marriage preparations down to Catherine's
alleged policy of ruining the Reformers in France. In fact it was
Elizabeth I who prevaricated over the marriage. (See Histoire de
208-209).

60. This accusation is also mentioned by D'Aubigné's imitator in L'Enfer
ed. C. kead, p. 58.

61. See the warning letter to Coligny quoted above p.29).
62. See also Discorsi I, 55. Discorsi I, 9 describes Cleomenes killing off all the ephors at Sparta because he wished to reorganise the constitution.

63. It may be significant that many of the French nobility were Reformers but very few of the members of the 'parlements' were.

64. See the Discours merveilleux where Catherine is depicted as deliberately trying to ruin the French nobility in accordance with Machiavelli's principles (ed. cit., p. 61, 64, 76, 78, 101) and see also Pont-Aymery's Académie ou Institution de la Noblesse de France where he points out the dangers of Machiavelli's ideas for the nobility (Paris, 1599, EN R 4/246, 40v-41v, quoted in my chapter on Pont-Aymery p.253).

65. See Discorsi II, 19.

66. See Discorsi III, 16.


68. Histoire Tragique et memorable, de Pierre de Gaverston by P.H.D.T. (a pseudonym for Jean Boucher), s.l., 1588, (BL 806 a 35), p. 50. I have found only one French author, Jacques Hurault, who agrees with Machiavelli on the question of whether a Prince should be liberal or avaricious, see Trois Livres des Offices d'Estat avec un sommaire des stratagèmes, Paris, 1596, (BL 521 c 18), B. II, p. 259 and 303.


71. It is entitled Remonstrance de la Noblesse de France, de l'utilité et repos que le Roy apporte à son peuple; et de l'Instruction qu'il doit avoir pour le bien gouverner, Paris, 1572, (BL 1193 h 30).

72. La France-Turquie, c'est à dire, Conseils et Moyens tenus par les ennemis de la Couronne de France, pour reduire le Royaume en tel estat que la Tyrannie Turquesque, Orléans, 1576, (BL 285 e 11). The BL has another copy of the Preface du Florentin catalogued under the heading France and entitled Discours Traduit d'Italien en François, contenant auncuns moyens pour reduire la France à une entiere obeissance à son Roy, Augsburg, 1575, (BL 8050 b 11).

73. Lyons, 1596, (BN%E 3289), pp. 26-27.

74. Poncet is alleged to have told the King,

   Il sera besoing qu'elie /Sa Majesté/ prenne bien garde à ne donner rien pour bien faicts ne recompanse en faveur desdicts grands seigneurs ne d'autres que ceux qui leur seront confidens et qu'ils voudront eslever en leur place; et si possible est que ceux qui recevront ses liberalitez soient vez d'elle afin qu'ils entendent à qui ils en seront
principalement atténués... D'avantage que les corvées et charges ruineuses soient baillées auxdits princes grands seigneurs et nobles qui resteront attendant que l'heure pour s'en défaire soit venue.

(pp. 10-11).

In *Le Théâtre de France* (Paris, 1589, BN Lb. 34 707) the author, Charles de Boss, blames Poncet for influencing courtiers to encourage the King to keep his subjects poor, thus changing the French monarchy into a tyranny (see 5r-6r, quoted in my chapter on Des Masures p. 325). De Boss echoes the alleged speech by Poncet given above when he says,

Passons plus avant aux instructions du chevalier. Le Prince qui voudra assujettir ses sujets à la Turque, se doit bien adviser qu'il ne confère aucuns bien-faits aux grands seigneurs, et qu'il ne face aucune recompense en leur faveur: afin (dit-il) qu'ils perdent tous moyens de faire des serviteurs, et d'acquérir des amis...

(56r).

75. In the *Lunettes*, the author says of Italians,

Pleust à Dieu qu'ils ny eussent jamais mis le pied et encore moins que leurs beaux livres l'un qui est l'Aretin pour tourmenter l'âme et Machiavel pour tourmenter les corps ny eussent jamais esté portés ne leuz.

(p. 54).

It is perhaps significant that it is a Florentine who is chosen to recount Poncet's Machiavellian speech in the *Preface*.

76. Also under the heading of 'Machiavelismes' in the Index, is p. 960 of the *Histoire Universelle* Tome II, B. III where it is hard to see what D'Aubigné is classifying as Machiavelian unless it is Don Sebastian's threat to impoverish the Portuguese nobles if they do not follow him into battle - possibly another instance of D'Aubigné blaming Machiavelli for inspiring rulers to ruin the nobility in order to exert their own authority.

77. D'Aubigné is referring to the alleged speech by Poncet in the *Preface du Florentin*.

78. *Histoire Universelle* Tome II, B. II, ch. 2, p. 672. The author of the *Lunettes de Cristal de Roche* likewise believed that French rulers had followed Poncet's advice and in *Le Théâtre de France*, Charles de Boss says that once the King has adopted Poncet's advice to ruin the nobles,

il luy sera facile de... se faire en fin seigneur absolu des corps et biens de ses sujets. Et estant par ces moyens parvenus à ses desseins, il luy sera aïsi de faire recevoir telle religion qu'il voudra. Voila la conclusion des instructions tyrranniques. Je vous laisse à juger Messieurs de la noblesse, si les François ne sont pas à un pied pres de cette extrémité. Ce conseil n'a-il pas esté suvy de point en point?

(65v).
79. See S. Mastellone, Venalità e Machiavellismo in Francia 1572-1610, Florence, 1972 for a fuller account of the change in character of the French monarchy brought about largely through Machiavellian self-interest. For a description of the tasks of these administrators and their gradual growth in importance during the sixteenth century, see N.M. Sutherland, The French Secretaries of State in the Age of Catherine de Medici, London, 1962. In Les Meurs, Humeurs et Comportemens de Henry de Valois, the author blames the change in nature of the French monarchy on Henry III's plans 'pour bouleverser en une nuit toute la France, et la reedifier en une forme toute nouvelle à la Machiaveliste', (ed. cit., p. 28).

80. Reformers earlier in the century had foreseen this danger to their cause. In Histoire Universelle Tome II, B. III, ch. 4, D'Aubigné prints Condé's declaration of 15/6 warning that the King's councillors were trying to establish a tyranny by ruining French nobles. Condé says that 'les meschans Conseilliers du Roi' are aiming to

imposer sur les miserables testes des François le rigoureux joug de la plus barbare tyrannie qui fut onques: s'estans aussi proposer de ruiner par armes, par poisons et assassinats, les plus grandes et illustres familles de ce Royaume, mesmes celles de Bourbon et de Montmorenci...

(pp. 841-843).

81. After 1600, many Reformers had compromised their religious beliefs in favour of political unity. In his article on 'The Organisation of Revolutionary Parties in France and the Netherlands during the Sixteenth Century', (Journal of Modern History, XXVII, (1955), pp. 335-351), H.C. Koenigsberger states that the Reformers had lost most of their revolutionary ardour by 1588.


83. In the Lunettes de Christal de Roche, Catherine's policy of favouring Italians is seen to be a direct result of Poncet's advice to ruin the nobles (p. 46).

84. The anonymous author of the Discours Politiques de diverses puissances establies de Dieu au monde (in Memoires de l'Etat de France sous Charles IX, Middelbourg, 1578, (BL 283 b 7,8,9), p. 260) says that those who favour Turkish government, desire to ruin the nobility.

85. See M.J. Heath, Attitudes in French Writing of the Sixteenth Century towards a Turkish War, University of Wales Ph.D thesis, 1977, Part II.

86. See also Il Principe ch. 19 for a description of Turkish methods of rule.

As in the case of the theme of poverty, Machiavelli has in mind a republic where such divisions would be the result of a healthy disagreement of opinion between equal individuals. But again, French writers applied his ideas to their own situation in France under a monarchy, and believed that he wished rulers to encourage divisions amongst their subjects, manipulating their opinions in a way in which Machiavelli, speaking of a free republic, never intended.

94. B. III, 24v, cited in my chapter on Matthieu p.70.
96. S.l., 1581, (BL 521 b 11), unpaginated.
98. This was in 1574 just before Alençon's escape from court. D'Aubigné was at court at this time and so could have observed Catherine's behaviour at first hand. However, another contemporary observer, Estienne Pasquier, did not believe that Catherine really pursued a policy of dividing to rule. He says that there were rumours that,

mesme que quelque semblant qu'elle fist de pacifier toutes choses, quand les feux estoient allumez par la France, que c'estoit elle qui les y mettoit...ayant cette proposition empreinte en son ame, qu'une Princesse, mesmement estrangere, ne se pouvoit maintenir en grandeur, que par les divisions des Princes et grands Seigneurs...au récit desquels je ne prens plaisir, et ne les veux, ny ne puis croire.

99. In chapter 3, D'Aubigné continues his description of the quarrels Catherine and her ministers allegedly stirred up amongst the Reformers - between the Viscount of Turenne and the Prince of Condé, and between Turenne and the Duke of Rohan. A little further on in the Histoire D'Aubigné describes how she turned the division between Condé and Navarre to her own advantage,

On se servoit à la Cour de la division des Reff. pour en retenir plusieurs en leurs maisons, et en avoir moins à combattre.

(p. 1017).
In particular, it was

la Roine mere qui voulut mettre en usage la discorde
semée entre les deux cousins, et sur diverses esperances
attirer le Prince /Navarre/ à la Cour.
(Tome II, B. IV, ch. 12, pp. 1017-18).

100. See below, e). In Il Principe ch. 3, Machiavelli says that rulers
should ruin those who help them to power — as Alençon will help
Henry to power in the Netherlands. In the Discorsi I, 29, he says
that subjects who are too powerful will always be suspected by
their rulers.

101. The author of the Lunettes de Christal de Roche also accuses Catherine
of following Poncet’s advice in this matter of keeping one’s subjects
divided,

Ces trois paix dy-je qui ont ainsi germé floré et
fructifié servent de subjeÿ audit Poncet pour louer ladite
dame /Catherine/ jusques au ciel, et faire comparaison d’elle
au soleil, à la lune, et aux estoilles, pource quelle est
dextrement imitatrice de son pestifere discours /the
Preface du Florentin/ et aussi que tout ainsi que le soleil
la lune et les estoilles entretiennent et font vivre les
hommes, elle les divise et fait mourir tous les jours.
(p. 61).

102. Compare Pont-Aymery's Livre de la Parfaicte Vaillance (Paris, s.d.,
BN R 24892, ch. 4, pp. 111-112, quoted in my chapter on Pont-Aymery
p.356 ) where he links the policy of encouraging duels amongst the
nobility with the Machiavellian precept of divide to rule. In
Le Theatre de France, Charles de Boss regards the policy of encouraging
duels as one aspect of Poncet's advice to the King to ruin the nobles
and establish a tyranny,

bien vous puis-je dire que depuis quinze ou seize ans
on a entièrement practiqué en France les instructions qu'on
dit tyanniques, d'un certain garnement de chevalier Poncet:
lequel est premierement qu'un Roy tant qu'il pourra se
doit defaire des plus grans seigneurs de sa court...et
generalement de toute la noblesse file à file. N'avez
vous pas veu combien de fois cela a esté practiqué par les
duels qu'on a permis avec toute impunité, contre loix
divines et humaines...

(54r).

103. Venes, 1597, (BL 1058 h 2), p. 241. For an opposite viewpoint —
approval of duels — see Brantôme's Discours sur les Duels, Paris,
1887 where he defends duels as honourable.

104. Brantôme also says that duels originated in Italy, with the

grands capitaines italiens, qui ont esté les premiers
fondateurs jadis de ces combats et de leurs pointilles, et
en ont tres-bien sçu les theoriques et pratiques.
(Discours sur les Duels, ed. cit., p. 133).
105. This linking of Henry III with duels must have been quite common for Brantôme says,

...j'ay veu un livre fait contre nostre feu roy Henry III, par lequel l'autheur le taxe d'avoir esté introducteur premier de ces appels, et les avoir librement permis en sa cour et son royaume.

(Discours sur les Duels, p. 140).

But Brantôme says that duels were already popular during the reign of Charles IX and that in fact Henry III often forbade duels, a policy he attributes to Henry's desire to protect the nobility.

Quand à nostre roy Henry III, je sçay bien, et plusieurs gens de foy comme moy, combien de fois il en a fait d'ordonnances et deffenses de n'en venir plus là... car il aymoit sa noblesse, comme j'espere en alleguer des exemples en sa vie, par lesquels il a fait demonstration combien il l'aymoit.

(op. cit., p. 141).

In both D'Aubigné and Brantôme the attitude, either favourable or unfavourable, of a ruler towards duelling was considered to be connected with his attitude towards the nobility; and this is not surprising since only the nobility were allowed to indulge in duels.

106. Montaigne also believed that duels were a cowardly way of fighting. In Essais, II, 27, he says,

ces detours et mouvemens à quoy on exerce la jeunesse en cette nouvelle eschole, sont non seulement inutiles, mais contraires plustost et dommageables à l'usage du combat militaire.

(ed. cit., p. 359).


108. In Sa Vie (ed. cit., p. 394) we learn that D'Aubigné had to flee from Paris in 1572 because he had wounded a sergeant who had tried to arrest him for acting as a second in a duel. There is another mention of D'Aubigné being involved in a duel on p. 405.


110. As in cases of high treason, to defend women and orphans, or between two army leaders in order to avoid mass bloodshed.

111. D'Aubigné was not the only French writer to be aware of the fact that Machiavelli encouraged his rulers to eliminate their rivals: François de Gravelle mentions this policy in his Politiques Royales (ed. cit., ch. 30, p. 399 and ch. 3, p. 27). See my chapters on Jodelle (p. 119), Pont-Aymery (p. 357) and La Jessee (p. 191) for these writers' reaction to this Machiavellian precept.

112. Compare Le Theatre de France where Charles de Boss says,
Achevons le mémoire du chevalier. Après, dit-il, que le Roy se sera défaict des Princes, grands seigneurs, et plus saïne partie de la noblesse, il luy sera aisé de parvenir à tout le demeurant...Car le peuple n'ose rien entreprendre de soy, s'il n'a quelque grand chef qui le porte et le pousse...

(ed. cit., 65r).

113. For Machiavelli's approval of striking actions, see Il Principe ch. 8.

114. In Tome II, B. V, ch. 21, p. 1156, Philip II is likewise accused of Machiavellian behaviour. Rebel nobles had taken advantage of Philip's illness to rouse the Portuguese up against him. The rebels are defeated by Spanish troops and Philip pardons all but a few of the ringleaders whom he executes as an example to the rest. Similarly, in Discorsi III, 27, Machiavelli recommends killing the leaders of a rebellion in order to restore unity to a divided city by setting an example to the rest. Philip's behaviour is additionally Machiavellian in that by this action, he managed to have most of his worthiest opponents killed off, thereby weakening and dividing his subjects and enabling him to establish a tyrannical rule in Portugal.

115. See also Tome I, B. II, ch. 1, p. 51, for a declaration that he is writing in a non-partisan way to make up for his previous works of propaganda for the Reformers.


118. For example, by J. Plattard in the introduction to the Supplément à l'Histoire Universelle (Paris, 1925) and by J. Bailbé, Agríppa D'Auëbigné. Poète des Tragiques (Caen, 1968, p. 154).
Extremely little is known about Alexandre de Pont-Aymery; even the
date of his birth remains a mystery. A nineteenth-century editor of his
work, tells us that he was probably born around the middle of the
sixteenth century and died around the beginning of Louis XIII's reign.\(^1\)
However the date of Pont-Aymery's death can be established a little more
accurately since in *Le Parnasse des plus excellens poètes* published by
Matthieu Guillemot in 1607, there is a poem entitled *Hymne de l'Aumosne,
'De l'invention du feu sieur Alexandre de Pont-Aymery, Seigneur de
Fochera*.\(^2\) The last known publication by Pont-Aymery during his lifetime
is the collected edition of his *Oeuvres* which appeared in 1599. It is not
unreasonable to conclude that he died sometime between 1599 and 1607.

Pont-Aymery's works were all published during the 1590's and he
therefore escaped the attention of such sixteenth century bibliographies
as *Le Premier Volume de la Bibliothèque*, by Grude de la Croix du Maine
(published in 1584) and Antoine du Verdier's *Bibliothèque*, published a
year later. There is a section devoted to Pont-Aymery in *La France
Protestante*, but it is not very informative,

Alexandre de Pont-Aymery, seigneur de Foucheran, poète
français de la fin du seizième siècle, né à Montelimart ou dans
ses environs. On ne sait rien sur sa vie, et son nom et ses
écrits, tant en vers qu'en prose, sont depuis longtemps tombés
dans le plus parfait oubli. Tout ce qu'il nous apprend sur
lui-même, c'est qu'il voua ses services à Henry IV et assista
à plusieurs affaires dans le parti huguenot, notamment au
combat de Pontcharra (19 September 1591), sous Lesdiguières.\(^3\)

All Pont-Aymery's works reveal his loyalty to Henry IV and his hatred
of the Catholic League and Spanish intervention in France. The publisher
of the Lyons edition of his poem *Le Roy Triomphant*, speaks of

le zèle ardant qu'il porte à son pays, et le regret d'y
voir tant de lâchetés commises par l'Estranger.\(^4\)
He spent many years fighting under Lesdiguières in the South and in his native Dauphiné for which he retained a strong affection. In *La Cité du Montelimar*, a poem written whilst he was fighting in that region, he describes,

>Ces jours en Dauphiné, la province guerriere,  
Feconde en vins sucrés fertilement blediere.  
Le plus noble rempart de l'empire François.  

In his *Hymne sur La Rochelle*, he paints a charming picture of

...les peuples benins  
De l'estroicte Grenoble, en vignes foisonnuse,  
Mai où tousjours le ciel a la face pleureuse,

a description as relevant today as it was then.

In *L'Image du Grand Capitaine*, Pont-Aymery gives his qualifications for writing on military matters. He says that he comes from

l'estoc d'un des meilleurs capitaines de France, et fils de maistre, qui parmy le desespoir des guerres civiles s'est eslevé à autant de grades et d'honneurs qu'un gentil-homme bien nourry en sçauroit desirer. Et d'autre part j'ay suivy l'espace de cinq ans le sieur Desdiguieres, la seconde gloire des armes, et le patron des souverains Capitaines.

In *Le Roy Triomphant*, he says that he was present at battles in Provence where

Je suivroy /sic/ le bon-heur du Sieur de Lesdiguiere.

Pont-Aymery belongs therefore to the group of soldier-poets writing in the latter part of the sixteenth century, others of this group being Claude de Trellon, Saluste Du Bartas, Odet de La Noue, Agrippa D'Aubigné and Jean de La Jessee.

In *L'Academie ou Institution de la Noblesse Françoise*, Pont-Aymery tells us that he spent twenty-two months in Italy and returned from that country with a violently anti-Italian attitude which appears in his works and which will be examined later in this chapter.

He appears at some point to have been in the service of the Archbishop of Bourges, Grand Almoner of France, to whom he dedicated the *Hymne de L'Aumosne* mentioned earlier. In this poem, Pont-Aymery speaks of the
fact that he has enemies. Addressing the Archbishop, he says,

Voicy docte Prelat la fin de mon ouvrage,
Et le commencement de l'infini courage,
Que j'ay de te servir et de montrer à tous,
Que je suis de t'aimer et te cherir jaloux:
Et bien que ma fortune ait pour contre influence
Les maquignons d'Amour, qui trompent l'oeil de France:
J'espère un jour de voir que mon intégrité
Luira comme un Soleil d'immortelle clarté.

Similarly, in Le Roy Triomphant, he speaks of an incident which occurred whilst he was fighting in the Dauphiné region. Rather than referring to an actual wound in battle, Pont-Aymery appears to be describing calumnies against himself. Addressing Lesdiguières, he says,

Pour me faire approcher de toy, qui es honteux,
Du tort que j'ay receu, qui me fait despiteux,
Mespriser et ma vie, et maudire ceste heure,
Et ce jour qui me fait aborder ta demeure,
Demeure trop ingrate: ô Dieu! permettez moy,
Que je puisse oublier quelque-fois cest esmoy.


In the margin is the comment that 'l'Auteur écrit d'un inconvenient extreme, qui lui est survenu en Dauphiné. Il parle au sieur Desdiguières.'

The extreme hostility he displays in many of his works towards the Catholic League may have aroused people against him. On a more personal level, he seems to have been a somewhat conceited man: he often expresses his self-satisfaction in lines such as

Le trop d'intégrité me sera dommageable

(Le Roy Triomphant, ed. cit., p. 66),

and

Ame trop serieuse, Ame par trop, parfaicte,
En ce temps, où le temps une autre humeur souhaite...

(op. cit., p. 66).

He was fully convinced of the brilliance of his poetry, believing his Roy Triomphant to be a

...livret sur qui les ans,
Qui triomphent de tout, ne seront triomphants.

(p. 95).
Pont-Aymery seems to have felt bitter that he received no reward for his long and loyal service to the Reformers' cause. In the *Livre de la Parfaicte Vaillance*, he says of Henry IV,

... pour moy je ne l'ay jamais aymé que pour ses générales actions: car je n'ay receu ny bien ny faveur quelconque de luy, encore que je luy en aye donné autant d'occasion que Gentil-homme de son Royaume (selon mon pouvoir et le bonheur de son party és lieux de ma demeure) ayant perdu le mien pour son service sans avoir pour dessein que le dessein d'estre François, ayant disje abandonné ma fortune et ceux qui m'estoyent amis...\(^{12}\)

He appears to have borne a slight grudge against Henry IV, feeling that he had been passed over whilst former members of the League had been pardoned and their fortunes restored. He says that he desires the honour of Henry IV,

plus pour la publique nécessité que pour moy qui ne peulx esperer que du mal veu que l'on ne fait bien qu'à ceux qui nuisent...

(op. cit., p. 52).

Pont-Aymery's first known work is a long poem of 235 pages celebrating the victory of the Reformers at Montélimart, entitled *La Cité du Montelimar ou Les Trois Prinses d'icelle*.\(^ {13}\) The siege of Montélimart began in 1585 when Lesdiguières captured the town from Maugiron, the King's Lieutenant. In 1587, Lesdiguières was obliged to remove some of his forces to Grenoble and the Catholics took advantage of his absence to seize Montélimart. Lesdiguières retaliated by sending three captains to recapture the town, which they did at the dead of night, massacring all the Catholics. The dedicatory epistle 'Au Lecteur' describes the poem as 'esbauché parmy les feus des guerres civiles, le brazier des assauts, et la sanglante poussiere des combats,' (p. 5). He tells us that it took a month to write: probably this was not long enough, for one historian's verdict on this poem is that il n'y a aucune invention dans ce Poëme, et la versification en est extrêmement mauvaise.\(^ {14}\)

The poem is dedicated to Lesdiguières and praises the latter's bravery in the fighting,
Second Mars en valeur, race des dieux de France,  
Hercule Dauphinois, Lesdiguiere invaincu.  

In contrast, the League is depicted as rebelling against God and the King,

Excevable ligueur, infidele en ta foy,  
Tu maintiens les tyrans, et tu bannis ton Roy.  
(ed. cit., p. 17).

This volume also includes his poem entitled Le Triomphe des Victoires obtenues par le sieur Desdiguieres en toutes les provinces voisines du Dauphiné.

1594 saw the publication of Pont-Aymery's Discours d'estat sur la blessure du Roy, defending Henry IV against the Catholic League. Pont-Aymery criticises the Jesuits' disloyalty to Henry IV and Jean Chastel's assassination attempt. Henry IV, says Pont-Aymery, does not need absolution from the Pope before he can claim our obedience; France would be ruined if the country lost Henry at this time. The volume includes his Hymne au Roy in praise of Henry IV. In the Hymne, Pont-Aymery says proudly,

J'ai le premier de tous faict sçavoir à la France  
Dedans un livre d'or ta force et ta clemence...  
(ed. cit., Aiir-v).

He is referring to his poem Le Roy Triomphant which was published in the same year. This is a long poem praising Henry IV's victories over the League and Spain. Pont-Aymery attempts to destroy the legends of Spain's conquests and power by saying that their riches depend on the exploitation of Indians in the New World. All Spain's wealth is merely a fantasy, he insists, since it relies on slavery (p. 73). Spanish Jesuits do not convert the natives to Christianity but hang them and teach them violence. As a protest against Spanish exploitation of the New World, these passages can be compared with Montaigne's indictment of Spanish conquests in the Essais Book III, 6.
In *Le Roy Triomphant*, Pont-Aymery attacks the Guises and their followers for intriguing with Spain and the Pope against their own King. He advises Henry IV not to give back to members of the League their former positions in the 'parlements'. The poem was written before Henry's triumphal entry into Paris, but the Lyons edition (of which there are copies in the Mazarine Library 10859 and in the BN Rés Ye 552) appeared after the submission of Paris since it contains a note from the publisher (Thibaud Ancelin) to excuse himself for publishing a work in which Parisians are castigated. It is not intended, he says, to indict those Parisians who have now joined forces with the King. The Cambray edition (BN Ye 7459) contains no such note and was probably published earlier in 1594. The poem ends with a plea for peace and unity in France under Henry IV, identical to the ending of *Le Triomphe des Victoires* (1591) - Pont-Aymery has a habit of repeating lines in different works.

*Le Roy Triomphant* shows a genuine concern on Pont-Aymery's part for the plight of his country, though the prefatory sonnet by Calignon, the President of the Dauphine region, comparing Pont-Aymery with Ronsard and Du Bartas is, to say the least, generous. Contemporaries, however, appear to have appreciated the historical accuracy of Pont-Aymery's battle descriptions. For example, Thibaud Ancelin says,

\[ les victoires par le Roy obtenues et les batailles gaignées sont si au vif depeintes, que les plus grossiers les lisant s'en peuvent imaginer une idee, aussi bien comme si tesmoins oculaires ils y avoyent esté presens. \]

(p. 6).

Pont-Aymery's *Image du Grand Capitaine* was also published in 1594, slightly later than *Le Roy Triomphant* since the dedication is dated Paris, 15 October, 1594.\(^{17}\) It describes the qualities needed in an army leader and in particular, he praises the military leadership of Lesdiguières and Guillaume de La Noue. The same year saw the publication of *Le Tombeau du Tres-Illustre et Tresreverend Prince et Cardinal de Bourbon, Archevesque*
de Rouan, et Primat de Normandie, and the Hymne du Sacre and the Hymne... de La Rochelle mentioned earlier. The first edition of his Paradoxe apologétique, où il est fidèlement démontré que la femme est beaucoup plus parfaicte que l'homme en toute action de vertu appeared in 1594. This work was quite popular (presumably amongst women readers!) and a second edition appeared at Lyons in 1596. It was also translated into English.

In 1595 Pont-Aymery published his Discours d'Estat. Où la nécessité et les moyens de faire la Guerre en l'Espagne mesme sont richement exposé. It is dedicated to Charles, Count of Soissons whom Pont-Aymery hopes will be the new Scipio to lead France to victory against Spain. Again, we see Pont-Aymery's opposition to Spain and his defence of Henry IV. In this, he was closely following Henry's own policy. For in his Declaration of 17 January 1595, Henry had announced his intention of making war on Spain and this he proceeded to do in a series of campaigns against the Spanish in France and the Netherlands till the Treaty of Vervins was finally signed in May 1598.

The following year saw the publication of L'Academie ou Institution de la Noblesse Françoise, a work laying down guidelines for the education of young noblemen with the aim of restoring the French nobility to its former glory. It is violently anti-Italian, regarding Italian influence as one of the reasons for the present decline in the quality of the nobility. Pont-Aymery lists the authors whom he recommends for the education of nobles. This list includes Ronsard, Joachim Du Bellay, Du Bartas and Montaigne.

The Livre de la Parfaicte Vaillance appeared in 1596. In this work, Pont-Aymery again deplores the cowardice of contemporary Frenchmen and analyses the conditions favourable to the growth of valour. Pont-Aymery
was above all concerned with re-establishing France's power as a nation after the civil wars. The years 1596 and 1597 were particularly crucial ones for the French were being defeated by Spain and indeed, in the April of the year that the Livre de la Parfaicte Vaillance was published, the Spanish had taken Calais. Pont-Aymery believed that France's future lay with the nobility and concentrated on setting out guidelines for their education in order to ensure that worthy people would occupy the important posts in France. Part of his attitude consists of opposition to the middle class 'gens de la robbe' who surrounded Henry IV, taking over the key administrative posts. Nobles, he says, should be encouraged to bring up their children to be capable of administering the chief posts in the realm and he complains that most of the offices in the 'parlements' are held by the middle classes who lack the natural sense of honour and virtue which is the prerogative of the nobility (p. 146). He criticises the 'bourgeoisie' for their self-interested ambition and opposes the sale of offices (p. 173). Like that of D'Aubigné, Pont-Aymery's protest is out-of-date: there could be no return to the feudal ideal of a monarch surrounded by valiant and powerful nobles. It is interesting, however, to note the similarity of the views held by these two Protestant noblemen on the decline of the power and influence of their class under Henry IV. Both wish for a return to the old feudal system and both condemn the 'Machiavellianism' of the middle classes.

Finally, a poem by Pont-Aymery found its way into one of the collections which Pierre de L'Estoile drew upon as source material for his Journal. The poem is addressed to Henry IV's sister and strongly defends the Reformed faith. It remained in manuscript form till recently. The first collected edition of Pont-Aymery's works appeared in 1599. In his poetry, Pont-Aymery seems to have been very much influenced by the Pleiade poets, in particular Ronsard and Du Bellay. La France Protestante
refers to him as 'un misérable versificateur de l'école de Ronsard'.

Marcel Raymond sees the influence of Ronsard's *Franciade* in Pont-Aymery's heroic poem *Le Roy Triomphant*. His poems often echo those of Ronsard and Du Bellay. For example, in *Le Roy Triomphant*, there is an obvious echo of Du Bellay's description of Rome in the *Antiquitez*. Pont-Aymery is describing the desolation of Paris, abandoned by the Spanish and rebelling against Henry IV,

...cest ingrat Paris,
Paris dedans Paris, perdu sans esperance
D'estre plus le Paris, et paradis de France,
Paris desesperé, despeuplé, desuni
Qui n'est que d'Hespaignols, et de Lorrains muny,
Paris, qui de Paris a fait un corps de garde
D'ou l'Espagnol toujours en la France regarde,
Paris qui de Paris n'a que le bastiment.
Paris, qui de Paris a le nom seulement.

(ed. cit., pp. 41-42).

This is similar to many descriptions of Rome in the *Antiquitez*, particularly sonnet No. 3 where Du Bellay says,

Rome de Rome est le seul monument,

and No. 7 where he invokes the Roman ruins,

Sacrez costaux, et vous saintes ruines,
Qui le seul nom de Rome retenez.

(ed. cit., p. 280).

Pont-Aymery is of course a much lesser poet than any of the Pleiade group. His failure as a poet partly arises out of his concentration on subject matter to the detriment of style. In the dedicatory epistle to *La Cité du Montelimar*, he reveals his concern for historical accuracy,

je suis totalement historian contre la nature de tous les poètes.

(ed. cit., p. 5).

In the 'Advertissement au Lecteur' of *Le Roy Triomphant*, he stresses the didactic nature of this work and freely admits that he has not worried too much about the rules of prosody,
car je ne me suis point destiné à contraindre mes
conceptions en chose de si peu d'importance.
(ed. cit., p. 147).

Goujet remarked (op. cit., p. 99) that Pont-Aymery's 'goût pour la morale'
dominated his prose works and it is this overt didacticism which renders
his prose dry and uninspiring for the modern reader.

In one of his letters discussing French poetry, D'Aubigné places
Pont-Aymery in the third (and last) group of modern poets with writers such
as Malherbe, D'Urfé and Sponde. Amongst his poems, Le Roy Triomphant may
be worthy of a modern edition since it gives the atmosphere of the struggles
against the Catholic League by one who had actually been involved in the
fighting. His sincere loyalty to Henry IV and occasional evocative passages
such as the description of Paris under siege and strewn with corpses or
the image of the pilgrim travelling in Winter, make it an interesting
poem and one which does not deserve to be lost.

2. Paris, 1607, (BN Ye 11428), vol. I, 395r-403r. Also in this collection is another poem entitled Apprehension d'une veuve, d'entrer sous le joug d'un second mari peu aimable (vol. I, 199r-v). This poem by Pont-Aymery had been included in an earlier collection of poetry, Les Fleurs des Plus Excellents Poètes de ce Temps, Paris, Nicolas and Pierre Bonfons, 1601, BN Ye 11424, 82v-83r.


5. La Cité du Montelimar ou Les Trois Princes d'icelle, ms, 1591, (BN Rés p Z 357 (28)), p. 9.

6. Hymne sur ... La Rochelle, ed. P. Gaudin, La Rochelle, 1875, p. 20.


9. According to Paul Gaudin (op. cit., p. 12), Pont-Aymery was personally acquainted with Du Bartas and D'Aubigné.

10. In La France Protestante, we read that,

   Il avait passé près de deux années en Italie, et en était revenu tout scandalisé des moeurs de ses habitants: près de l'église et loin de Dieu.


13. This poem is preserved in manuscript form in the BN (Rés p Z 357 (28)). The BN possesses an edition of the manuscript published by La Boissière in 1845 (BN Rés Ye 1094). This nineteenth century edition can also be found in the Mazarine library (21702) and the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal (4° BL 11878).


   son livre pourrait être fort utilement employé dans l'application du système pénitentiaire, en imposant sa lecture comme peine afflictive aux infortunés coupables de délits de la presse.

   (p. 99).
15. Published Paris, 1594, (BN Lb$^{35}$ 582). There was another edition published in 1595. There are copies of this in the BN (Lb$^{35}$ 582A), the BL (10658 a 37), the Mazarine library (37294 pièce 1), Sainte Geneviève (Q 8° 35 Rés inv 817) and the Bibliothèque de l'Arbalen (8° H 5982 A). In 1595 also, there was an English translation, A state discourse upon the late hurt of the French King by E. A. (Edward Aggas) published in London. The Bodleian library has a copy of this (Vet Al e 75).

16. Lyons, 1594. There are copies of this Lyons edition in the BN (Rés Ye 552), in the Bibliothèque de l'Arbalen (4° B 3936) and in the Mazarine library (10859). The BN also possesses copies of the edition published at Cambray in 1594 (Ye 7459 and Rés Ye 1997).

17. There are copies of this 1594 edition published in Paris in the BN (R 24891) and in the Mazarine library (28046).

18. Paris, 1594 (EN Ye 3976 and Rés Ye 551). It seems strange, in view of Pont-Aymery's obvious loyalty to the Reformers' cause, that he should have written this poem in memory of the Cardinal of Bourbon, the League's candidate for the French throne. Another curious fact which does not fit in with what we know of the French writer's life is that in his Journal du Règne d'Henri III (ed. L.-R. Lefèvre, Paris, 1943, p. 400), Pierre de l'Estoile mentions a certain 'Aimery' joining the Catholic League in 1585. It is not impossible that Pont-Aymery did join the League for a short while in the 1580's before he began publishing his books affirming his loyalty to the Reformers' cause. His early acquaintance with the League may account for the later hostility revealed in his poetry and prose works.

19. Tours, 1594.

20. Paris, 1594. There are copies of this work in the BN (Rés R 2166 and R 24084), in the Bibliothèque de l'Arbalen (12° BL 2511) and in the Sainte Geneviève library (Z 8° 295 inv 290).

21. BN R 47247. The BL also possesses a copy of this edition (245 b 26).


23. Paris, 1595. There are copies in the BL (8050 aa 15 (2)), the BN (Lb$^{35}$ 612) and the Mazarine library (37294 pièce 10).

24. There is a copy of this 1595 edition, published at Paris, in the Mazarine library (32990).

25. The titlepage states that this work was published in Paris, but the date is missing. However the 'privilège' is dated February 1596. There are copies of this work in the BN (R 24892) and the Mazarine library (27959).

26. See my previous chapter on D'Aubigné, pp. 303-5 for another Protestant nobleman's opposition to the change in character of the French monarchy brought about largely through self-interest and Machiavellianism on the part of the middle classes.

27. See Fragment des Recueils de Pierre de L'Estoile, ed. I. Armitage, University of Kansas, 1976, pp. 81-87. The documents in the collection cover the period just before Henry III's assassination till just prior to the coronation of Henry IV.


THE INFLUENCE OF MACHIAVELLI

Like many other French writers influenced by Machiavelli, Alexandre de Pont-Aymery was deeply concerned about the troubles in France and the necessity of putting an end to them. His allegiance to Henry IV and his belief that only under Henry's strong rule would France be united and at peace, led Pont-Aymery to discuss in his works the role of a leader both in the political and military sphere. In the 'Advertissement au lecteur' of Le Roy Triomphant (his poem celebrating Henry's victories over the League), Pont-Aymery says that he aims to describe the wars in France and give instruction to his country's leaders, an aim which could equally apply to his other works,

Je te fay veoir en ce petit cayer la grandeur de ton Prince, et la miserable condition de la France, qui est ce jourd'huy l'unique eschaffaut de Mars, oü toute la rage du monde s'est transportée... Mon livre doit servir de miroir à l'estat de toutes les Monarchies du monde.

Given his involvement in the fighting to establish Henry IV as undisputed ruler of France and his concern to have the right kind of political and military leaders for his country, it is natural that Pont-Aymery would be interested in Machiavelli's writings.

OPPOSITION TO MACHIAVELLI

1) Direct Opposition to Machiavelli's Ideas

We know that Pont-Aymery spent twenty-two months in Italy and returned to France profoundly marked by his stay there and violently critical of the Italians. His anti-Italian attitude and in particular, his criticisms of Machiavelli, appear most clearly in L'Academie ou Institution de la Noblesse Françoise. In this work, he is concerned with the task of restoring the French nobility to its former valour and glory, untainted by
the influence of 'Italian' vices. There is traditional anti-Italian satire when he describes the dangers of sending young noblemen to Italy as part of their education - they might, for example, contract venereal disease. He says,

le bon naturel du François se pervertit, voire se change du tout en Italie.

(ed. cit., 5r).

Pont-Aymery criticises Italian writers such as Francesco Guicciardini. In *L'Image du Grand Capitaine*, he complains that Guicciardini passed over the military skill of the French King Charles VIII in his writings,

Guicchiardin qui ne fut jamais homme d'honneur, a obscurcy au possible ses victoires, et s'est rendu ennemy de sa reputation chez les Italiens: Mais il ne s'en faut que moquer, et luy respondre que comme l'Italie a commencé de malfaire depuis long temps, elle continuera de mesme à mal parler n'estant rien de plus naturel à homme lasche et failli de courage que la mesdisance...

In *L'Academie*, in a criticism which could equally have applied to Machiavelli, Pont-Aymery says,

Guicchiardin ayme trop le vice de son pais, et suit le temps et les hommes de son aage.

(ed. cit., 44r-v).

These accusations could be merely the result of the French writer's xenophobia and desire to display his patriotism by exalting his country above all others, but in the *Academie*, Pont-Aymery is also concerned with the specific dangers of the influence of Machiavelli's writings on the education of the young nobility. Discussing the type of books young French nobles should be encouraged to read, Pont-Aymery regrets that there are very few suitable, and he embarks upon a long tirade against Machiavelli's works. Virtuous rulers, he says, used to seek guidance through reading the Scriptures,

Aujourd'hui nous sommes composez d'autre humeur, car si le Prince est enflammé nous attisons sa cholere: s'il est addoucy, nous l'irritons: s'il ayme la paix, nous luy faisons
un Evangile de guerre: s'il veut le pardon, nous luy desguisons la vengeance en une vertu, et de la vertu nous faisons une poupée qui n'est belle que dans une boëtte, et ne se remue que par le mouvement d'autruy.

'Elle /la vertu/ ne plaist que pour faire paroïstre Cil qui se fait autre qu'il ne veut estre.'

Je ne desire pas que mon Escholier estudie en Machiavel qui ne requiert en un Prince que l'apparence de la chose /la vertu/ et non la chose mesme (je dy qui est bon et honnestë:) mais pour les actions meschantes, il veut que l'ame du Prince en soit l'arsenac /sic/, le magazin, et la forge, La foy ne luy est rien qu'un simple commerce lequel se peut rompre et dissoudre, suyvant que le Prince verra qu'elle luy est utile ou dommageable: c'est le principal artifice et le premier instrument de son estat imaginaire, où il fait maistre avec ses conseils desordonnez une perpetuelle malediction sur le Prince qui le suit, et donne creance à ses maximes ageëes, et plus que barbares. Puis il donne Alexandre Borgia pour un patron formel, et un parfaict modele de Chevalerie, d'honneur, de Majesté, il nous offre, dis-je, un monstre qui de son regard espouvante les Sénateurs, et fait mourir le simple peuple, un monstre conceu en inceste,10 nay au scandale commun des hommes, eslevê et nourry à la derision de l'Eglise, instruit à la perfidie, au meurtre, et à la rage: malheureux en tous ses desseins, et finalement pendu et desesperé,11 à la consolasion de l'Italie, et au bien general de l'Europe, et ses Princes,

'La perte d'un homme meschant,
Est un glaive qui va tranchant,
D'une Province infortunée
Une mauvaise destinee,
À tousjours un homme malin
Nous donne exemple de sa fin,
Sa mort est l'Eschole muette,
Où le sage apprendre souhaitte.'

Il semble à Machiavel que l'on ne puisse regner sans estre meschant, et que le meschant ne puisse estre sans le Roy: il luy semble que le vice est de la substance de la Royauté, que la vertu en est la maladie, voire la mort.

(40r-41v).

This anti-Machiavellian passage reveals a rather superficial knowledge of the Italian author. Pont-Aymery's objections to Machiavelli are commonplace. He criticises Machiavelli for advising a Prince to simulate virtue, to break promises when necessary and to spurn religion. Many sixteenth century French writers attacked Machiavelli's choice of Cesare Borgia as a model for his Prince and often in terms not dissimilar to those of Pont-Aymery in this passage. See, for example, Innocent Gentillet's Discours contre N. Machiavel, ed. A. D'Andrea and P. D. Stewart, Florence,
1974, Part III, vii. In the Discours politiques et militaires, La Noue says that Borgia

...a eşgalé les tyrans du passé en exécrables meschancetez. Et c'est le beau patron que Machiavel propose, pour enseigner aux Princes comment ils doivent regner. Cestui-ci remplit l'Italie de sang, et de vices, et ne trouva que trop de satellites et d'adherans pour luy assister.12

Like Pont-Aymery, writers emphasised Borgia's failure to retain his power and hence the inappropriate nature of the model proposed by Machiavelli. In the preface to Les Six Livres de La Republique, Jean Bodin says,

...il...met pour un Parangon de tous les Roys, le plus disloyal fils de Prestre qui fut onques, et lequel neantmoins avec toutes ses finesse, fut honteusement precipité de la roche de tyrannie haute et glissante... comme il est advenu depuis aux autres Princes qui ont suivy sa piste, et pratiqué les belles reigles de Macciavel...13

Compare François de Gravelle, Les Politiques Royales (Lyons, 1596, (BNM 3289), chapter 30, p. 399), Matthieu Coignet, Instruction aux Princes pour garder la foy promise (Paris, 1584, (BL 854 g II), p. 184) and Brantôme, Oeuvres complètes (ed. L. Lalanne, Paris, 1882, vol. II) who all criticise Machiavelli's choice of Borgia by pointing out that he failed in the end. Whilst it is true that Machiavelli praises Borgia in Il Principe, this must be balanced against the more critical descriptions of his behaviour found in the reports (unknown to sixteenth century French authors) written by Machiavelli when he was on diplomatic missions to Borgia, as well as against his praise in Il Principe of men who were more acceptable heroes to the Renaissance reader - Moses, Cyrus, Romulus and Theseus.14

Pont-Aymery continues his attack on Machiavelli in the Academie with a description of Machiavelli's reliance on fortune, ruse and brute force. The Athenians, he says, burned Homer's works because they regarded them as irreligious,
Ils [les Atheniens] seront les Juges des Magistrats de l'Italie, et de la France, qui permettent la vente de la mercerie de Machiavel, qui ne reconnoist point Dieu que l'occurrence, point de vertu que la ruse, point de foy que l'inconstance, point de loy que la tyrannie, et pour legitime Prince, le plus fort. La Chréstienté en est esmeuë, le Christianisme scandalisé, les opinions divisées, les Rois y sont ensorcelez, les familles particulières en bute, la désolation en sera universelle.

(Académie, ed. cit., 41v).

Again, these are traditional accusations against Machiavelli though Pont-Aymery does exaggerate the extent of Machiavelli's threat to France, Italy and the Christian religion: he seems to be unaware that Machiavelli's works were in fact banned in Italy (they were put on the Index Librorum Prohibitorum as early as 1559). Pont-Aymery's lack of real knowledge of Machiavelli and his influence in France, is revealed by the list of books he recommends for the instruction of French nobles. He includes the Instructions sur le faict de la guerre (1548) which he attributes to Guillaume Du Bellay, and La Noue's military writings, Both of these authors borrow heavily from Machiavelli and indeed the Instructions sur le faict de la guerre are described as 'extraictes des livres de Polybe, Frontín, Vegece, Cornazan, Machiavelle, et plusieurs autres bons auteurs.'

It is possible to define Pont-Aymery's anti-Italian attitude as specifically anti-Machiavellian in a way it is often impossible to do for other French authors. Thus in Le Roy Triomphant when he speaks of 'un accord Florentin' and contrasts it with the trustworthiness of a French treaty, we can conclude that he is specifically attacking Machiavelli, the Florentine writer notorious in France for allowing his Prince to break treaties.

In L'Académie, we have seen that Pont-Aymery regarded Machiavelli's teachings as especially harmful for French nobles, an attitude shared by other Reformers such as D'Aubigné and Gentillet. The fact that it was
Reformers in particular who saw the threat of Machiavelli’s writings to the traditional status and power of the nobles is probably partly explained by the fact that many of the French nobility belonged to the Reformers’ party. In *Le Livre de la Parfaicte Vaillance*, Pont-Aymery laments the loss of valour amongst French nobles,

> C'est un malheur pour la France, qu'il s'y treuve aujourd'hui peu ou point de Seigneurs qui se plaisent à imiter ceste valeur ancienne.

He suggests ways in which the nobility could be restored to their former glory: valour, he says, is no use unless linked to moral actions. In chapter 4, he says that tyrants have always encouraged duels in order to weaken their most courageous subjects by dividing them,

> Les Princes tyrans estoyent bien ayses d'introduire ceste peste entre les hommes ambitieux, afin que les querelles privées feissent oublier l'inimitié commune, et que le soucy de vaincre un particulier privast d'autre consideration tous ceux qui pouvoient s'opposer à ceste nouvelle magistrature, qui s'estabilissoit tousjours par la ruyne de plusieurs particuliers, lesquels s'entretuoyent ainsi par les secrettes pratiques du tyran soupçonneux et vindicatif.

*(ed. cit., pp. 111-112).*

There are several things in this passage which indicate that Pont-Aymery is particularly attacking the Machiavellian Prince:–

i) Although Machiavelli never advises his Prince to encourage duels amongst his subjects, this policy was attributed to him by some French authors such as D'Aubigné.

ii) As here, this policy is often linked in French writings with the method of dividing to rule attributed (erroneously) to Machiavelli. Tyrants introduce duels, they say, in order to reduce opposition to their rule ('afin que les querelles privées feissent oublier l'inimitié commune').

iii) The idea of distracting one's nobles in any way possible from giving trouble to the ruler is recommended by Machiavelli. In *Il Principe*
chapter 21, he praises Ferdinand of Spain for using foreign wars to divert his nobles' attention from troubles at home. In the same way, says Pont-Aymery, duels are used to occupy the nobles' energies 'afin... que le soucy de vaincre un particulier privast d'autre consideration tous ceux qui pouvoient s'opposer à ceste nouvelle magistrature'.

iv) From speaking of France (a hereditary monarchy) Pont-Aymery has suddenly switched to a description of a new ruler ('ceste nouvelle magistrature'), a change inexplicable unless Pont-Aymery has in mind the Machiavellian Prince who has to use extraordinary methods to strengthen his newly-acquired position.

v) The fact that Pont-Aymery is thinking of the Machiavellian ruler is confirmed by the next phrase which describes how this new Prince establishes his power 'par la ruyne de plusieurs particuliers'. Machiavelli frequently advises his Prince to eliminate all possible opposition at the start of his reign. 24

vi) There is a direct attack on Machiavelli's followers in a later chapter of this work. In chapter 6, Pont-Aymery warns that a ruler should take care to surround himself with virtuous people who fear God,

O que je veux de mal à quelques Machiavelistes, qui soustienent que ceux qui sont attachez à la conscience, à la raison, et aux loix, ne sont pas idoynes serviteurs des Princes: mais que la flaterie loge au dessus des loix, et de nature.


While it is true that Machiavelli sought to free his Prince from all moral and religious restraints, he never approved of flatterers. Indeed, Il Principe chapter 23 ('Quomodo adulatores sint fugiendi') warns of the danger of flatterers. It is of course a debatable point whether or not Machiavelli wrote Il Principe in a spirit of flattery.
in order to gain employment from the Medici.

Pont-Aymery thus makes open, though rather superficial, attacks on Machiavelli in his prose works *L'Academie* and *Le Livre de la Parfaicte Vaillance*, and regards the Italian's ideas as harmful to the French nobility.  

2) *Use of Machiavelli as a political scapegoat*

In all his writings, Pont-Aymery reveals his violent opposition to the Catholic League and to Spanish ambitions in France. He spent many years fighting against the League in the South and in the Dauphiné region. In the latter part of the sixteenth century, a useful way of attacking one’s political opponents, was to imply that their behaviour in politics was Machiavellian. This is the method used by Pont-Aymery to criticise the League and the Spanish in his poem *Le Roy Triomphant*.

In this poem, the King of Spain, Philip II, is presented as having a Machiavellian attitude to religion. Pont-Aymery says,

```
Pour sa créance elle est qu'aucun Dieu ne preside,
Sur les Sceptres humains, que la prudence est guide
A toute chose née, et que tout nostre effort,
Ne despend que du bon, ou du malheureux sort:
Qu'il faut avoir un Dieu pour le bas populaire,
Qui ne fait que contraint ce qu'il doit de gré faire:
Qu'il faut tenir sa foi si la commodité,
Nous presche ouvertement ceste fidelité.
Mais si quelque avantage importe á la promesse,
Il faut rompre la Foy, qui lors sert de finesse.
```

(ed. cit., pp. 80-81).

The presence of several Machiavellian themes together in this passage implies that it is Machiavelli’s policies which the King of Spain is accused of following. Firstly, there is the idea that the ruler is not subject to religious restraints on his power ('aucun Dieu ne preside,/Sur les Sceptres humains') – an idea familiar to readers
of *Il Principe*. Instead, events are controlled by fate, an idea which
choked many sixteenth century readers of Machiavelli ('tout nostre
effort,/Ne depend que du bon, ou du malheureux sort.') However,
Philip II is said to believe that religion can be useful for holding the
populace in check ('Il faut avoir un Dieu pour le bas populaire'). This
idea is repeated many times in Machiavelli. The notion that the
populace will only act well when forced to do so ('qui ne fait que contraint
cé qu'il doit de gré faire') implies a belief that men are naturally more
inclined to evil than to good, an idea found in *Il Principe* chapters 17
and 18, and in *Discorsi* I, 3. Indeed in *Discorsi* I, 3, Machiavelli says,

\[ \text{gli uomini non operono mai nulla bene se non per necessitá.} \]

(p. 136).

The last four lines of the passage quoted accuse Philip II of
following the well-known Machiavellian policy of keeping one's promise
only as long as it is in one's own interest to do so. The presence of so
many Machiavellian themes in one passage ensures that Pont-Aymery's
readers do not miss the intended comparison between the King of Spain and
Machiavelli's Prince. A little earlier, Philip II has been accused by the
Prince of Parma of stirring up rebellion in France whilst firmly
quenching it in his own country,

\[ \text{Phillippe qui se met du peuple à la traverse,} \]
\[ \text{Y preschant la revolte aux subjects de l'autruy,} \]
\[ \text{Revolte qu'il punit et chasse de chez luy.} \]

(p. 57).

There is a hint of Machiavellianism in this policy.

Pont-Aymery continues his description of Philip II's cynical use of
religion to preserve his power,

\[ \text{Il honore les Saintcs pour suyvre la commune,} \]
\[ \text{Mais il tient que leur ayde est à tous importune.} \]
\[ \text{Que ce n'est qu'une fable, et qu'un nombre de dieux} \]
\[ \text{Ministres de son bien: le peuple curieux} \]
Par superstition (dit il) apprend de craindre
Les rois, et de n'oser leurs mandemens enfraindre:
Car ils ont peur de choir en l'ire de ce bois,
Qui tousjours les menace, et si n'a point de voix.
Et tandis il se moque, et ne crois pas qu'au monde,
Il y ait aucun Saint qui son pouvoir seconde...

(Sources citées, pp. 81-82).

Similarly the French League is shown as having a Machiavellian attitude to religion. In *Le Roy Triomphant*, Pont-Aymery says,

Ne croy pas que le vieil, et nouveau testament,
Bien, ou mal entendu causent le fondement
Des civiles fureurs...
Ils [the members of the League] desdaignent le presche,
ils mesprisent la messe,

Et leur religion n'est que pure finesse,
Qu'un appas journalier dont ils s'aydent rusez,
Pour endormir nos sens, en leur sens abusez.


Pont-Aymery also accuses the Jesuits of using religion for political ends,

Or ne croyez en rien ces bavards Jesuistes,
Qui se doivent nommer proprement Judaîstes...
Ils ont toujours meslé, l'Estat et la prestrise...


He attacks them for spreading impiety in the New World. Despite the varying shades of opinion amongst Jesuits which makes it almost impossible to speak of them as a homogeneous group, writers of this period often insisted on treating them as such and frequently charged them en masse with following Machiavelli's policies. One modern historian remarks how hostility to the Jesuits in France created a sort of myth around them,

Tous ceux qui présentaient des caractères semblables,
or tout au moins qui se fixaient les mêmes buts, c'étaient aussiitôt des 'jésuites', des 'jésuites déguisés'... Et ce symbole, commode, les adversaires des jésuites l'entourèrent d'un mythe, un mythe de duplicité, d'intrigues tortueuses, de fourberies, de cruautés.

Part of this myth-building was to accuse the Jesuits of being followers of Machiavelli. See, for example, Estienne Pasquier's *Le Catechisme des Jésuites: ou l'Examen de leur Doctrine* or David Hume's *Le Contr'Assasin*, ou *Response à l'Apologie des Jésuites*.
Sometimes the Jesuits were accused of favouring the edict of the Council of Constance that promises made to heretics need not be kept. Approval of this edict was occasionally linked in French minds with Machiavelli's advice to break promises when necessary (see my chapter on D'Aubigné on p. 221). The link between the Jesuits and Machiavelli was claimed only by their enemies: there is no proof that the Jesuits as a group did actually support Machiavelli — indeed, it would be difficult to prove that the Jesuits as a group ever supported anyone.

Like D'Aubigné, Pont-Aymery indicts his enemies by presenting them as followers of Machiavelli — a more subtle method of opposing the Italian writer than the direct opposition he uses in his prose works. Pont-Aymery may have known D'Aubigné personally and it would be interesting to be able to ascertain whether Pont-Aymery borrowed this technique actually from D'Aubigné's own use of Machiavelli in his propaganda against the Reformers.

**APPROVAL OF MACHIAVELLI**

Like other sixteenth century writers who attack Machiavelli, such as Pierre Matthieu, Pont-Aymery was at the same time unable to resist using his ideas. Lacking the ability to think out an original and coherent political theory, Pont-Aymery obviously found it convenient to borrow some of Machiavelli's ideas. Once he even goes so far as to imply praise of Machiavelli's political works, when he says in the *Paradoxe Apologique*,

> La mere de Coriolan sauva la ville de Rome au berceau même de sa puissance, et usa de tant de belles maximes d'Estat à l'endroit de son fils ennemey de la cité que les Xenophons, les Tacites, les Machiavels, et tous les Assesseurs des Princes de l'Europe auroyent dequoy y mendier perpetuellement les plus nobles resolutions de leurs plus legitimes desseings.34

Occasionally, he writes in the spirit of Machiavelli: in *L'Image du Grand Capitaine* chapter 3, describing Bajazet, Emperor of the Turks, defeated by Tamburlaine, he says,
Ce Prince, sur lequel Dieu a plus exercé de rigueur que sur nul autre des modernes: Aussi fut-il du tout Athée, et n'observa aucune religion, ayant la nostre en horreur, et la sienne en mespris: Neantmoins il estoit doué de je ne sçay quelle adresse qui le rendit admirable en ses victoires, et regrettable en sa perte, voire digne d'estre excusée à bon escient: car lors la fortune eut un extreme combat avec la vertu.

(ed. cit., 28r).

What could be more Machiavellian (and more shocking to sixteenth century French readers) than this excusing of an atheist and tyrant on the grounds of his extraordinary prowess? Machiavelli continually countenances extraordinary behaviour in his works (see Discorsi I, 27; III, 21) and in Discorsi, III, 21 he excuses Hannibal's excessive cruelty on account of his great 'virtú' and success,

Importa pertanto poco ad uno capitano per qualunque di queste vie e' si cammini, pure che sia uomo viruoso e che quella virtú lo faccia riputato intra gli uomini. Perché quando la è grande, come la fu in Annibale ed in Scipione, ella cancella tutti quelli errori che si fanno per farsi troppo amare /Scipio/ o per farsi troppo temere /Hannibal/... E tenere la via del mezzo non si può appunto perché la nostra natura non ce lo consente: ma è necessario queste cose che eccedono mitigare con una eccessiva virtú, come faceva Annibale e Scipione... Conchiudo dunque, come e' non importa molto in quale modo uno capitano si proceda, pure che in esso sia virtú grande che condiscia bene l'uno e l'altro modo di vivere.

(pp. 447-448).

In Il Principe chapter 25, Machiavelli praises those men who have sufficient 'virtú' to conquer fortune at least for a while. Bajazet, according to Pont-Aymery possessed such 'virtú' and is therefore worthy of being excused his atheism and tyranny - surely a Machiavellian argument, even if unconsciously so.

1) Adoption of Machiavelli's political ideas.

a) In Le Roy Triomphant, Pont-Aymery says that a Prince should never attack another ruler whose subjects are in revolt since this will cause the latter to unite together to fight the enemy,
... que désormais il soit à tous notoire
Qu'un Prince ne doit pas de tant s'avantager,
Que trouvant son voisin en extreme danger,
Aspirer son infortune, et redoublcer la source,
Du mal-heur qui le suit où son destin le pousse:
Et notamment au fait des civiles erreurs,
Où le peuple eschauffé de soudaines fureurs,
A loysir de reprendre, et repos, et haleine,
Jaloux de son bon-heur, au sur-croy de sa peine.
(éd. cit., p. 87).

He compares subjects acting in this way to a pilgrim who leaves home in the middle of Winter despite the bad weather, but who when he has gone so far, uses his reason and decides to return home before he is overwhelmed by disaster. Similarly, seditious subjects, when threatened by an external enemy, re-unite in obedience to their ruler. In the margin, Pont-Aymery says that,

Un Prince ne doit jamais courir sus à un Prince affligé par ses subjects.

Discorsi II, 25 is entitled 'Che lo assaltare una città disunita, per occuparla mediante la sua disunione, è partito contrario.' Machiavelli cites the example of the Veientes who sought to take advantage of the divisions in Rome between the plebeians and the nobles in order to conquer the city. However, the invasion of the Veientes caused the Romans to unite and defeat the enemy. Machiavelli concludes,

Vedesi pertanto quanto gli uomini s'ingannano, come di sopra discorremo, nel pigliare de' partiti; e come molte volte credono guadagnare una cosa e la perdono. Credettono i Veienti assaltando i Romani disuniti vincergli; e quello assalto fu cagione della unione di quegli e della rovina loro. Perché la cagione della disunione delle repubbliche il più delle volte è l'ozio e la pace; la cagione della unione è la paura e la guerra.

(p. 357).

The example of the Veientes is taken from Livy Book II, 44-45, but the political maxim is Machiavelli's own. Machiavelli, as is his habit, adds the modern examples of Pistoia, Siena and the Duke of Milan. In the passage from Pont-Aymery, the comparison with the pilgrim is the French writer's invention, but the political teaching is similar to that of Machiavelli.
b) In *Le Roy Triomphant*, Pont-Aymery frequently stresses the need for
a ruler to keep the ambition of his subjects, particularly the nobles,
in check,

> Vous roys qui présidez aux estats de ce monde
> Qui tonnez sur la terre, et tempestez sur l'onde,
> Qui pouvez tout icy, si vous desirez voir
> Vos sceptres asseurez contre un Civil pouvoir,
> Jamais n'advantagez de tant un petit Prince
> Qu'il se puisse mutin saisir d'une Province,
> Qu'armé de vostre nom, et de vostre credit
> Il vous soit puis après marque de contredit,
> Il s'apparie à vous, il affronte vos armes
> Et preste le collet à vos rudes gendarmes,
> Tenez-le par le flanc, et ne permettez pas
> Que sur vostre Couronne, il avance son pas,
> Mediocrez son ranc, et rendez asservie
> Au souverain pouvoir l'usure de sa vie.

(pp. 37-39).35

In the margin, in words which recall the Discours contre N. Machiavel by
that other native of Dauphiné, Innocent Gentillet, this is described as
a 'Maxime necessaire en tout estât.'

This passage in Pont-Aymery applies particularly to a leader of the
King's army who may acquire too great a reputation and has to be deprived
of his position by the King. In Discorsi I, 29, Machiavelli stresses
the importance of a ruler securing himself against any general whose
reputation may become a threat to his own power,

> ... quello capitano il quale virtuosamente ha acquistato
> uno imperio al suo signore superando i nimici e riempiendo sé
> di gloria e gli suoi soldati di ricchezze, di necessità e con
> i soldati suoi e con i nimici e con i sudditi propri di quel
> principe acquista tanta riputazione che quella vittoria non
> può sapere di buono a quel signore che lo ha mandato... Talché
> il principe non può pensare a altro che assicurarsene: e per
> fare questo ei pensa o di farlo morire o di torgli la
> riputazione che ei si ha guadagnata nel suo esercito o ne' suoi
> popoli.

(p. 198).

This is very close to Pont-Aymery's description of the army leader who
'armé de vostre nom, et vostre credit' then makes war on his own King
who must take steps to reduce his power. 'Mediocrez son rang' advises
Pont-Aymery while Machiavelli tells his Prince to 'torgli la riputazione'.
Pont-Aymery continues with advice as to how a King is to keep his nobles in check,

Il faut cherir le noble, et luy donner adresse
L'eslever aux honneurs, tesoings de sa prouësse
Mais il se faut tousjours reserver le pouvoir,
De le remettre actif en son premier devoir,
Et le balancer tel qu'on puisse deffaire
S'il advenoit un jour qu'il se feit adversaire...
Tout ennemy peut nuire, et sur tout à ceste heure
Que Megere en nos coeurs establit sa demeure...

(p. 39).

In Discorsi I, 55 Machiavelli describes how a Prince aiming to set up a principality in a state which was formerly a republic, should create some of his subjects nobles, giving them wealth and privileges but keeping them dependent on his power,

... colui che dove è assai equalità vuole fare uno regno o uno principato, non lo potrà mai fare se non trae di quella equalità molti d'animo ambizioso ed inquieto, e quelli fra gentiluomini in fatto e non in nome, donando loro castella e possessioni e dando loro favore di sustanze e di uomini, acciocché, posto in mezzo di loro, mediante quelli mantenga la sua potenza ed essi mediante quello la loro ambizione...

(p. 257).

This is similar to Pont-Aymery's advice to give the nobles enough rewards to satisfy their ambitions ('Il faut cherir le noble, et luy donner adresse/L'eslever aux honneurs...') while at the same time ensuring that they realize where the source of their rewards lies and that the King still has enough power to dispose of them if necessary. In Il Principe chapter 9 (p. 46), quoted in my chapter on D'Aubigné p.44, Machiavelli likewise emphasises the importance of a ruler keeping his subjects dependent on him, and he concludes the chapter with the following words,

E però uno principe savio debba pensare uno modo, per il quale li sua cittadini, sempre et in ogni qualità di tempo, abbino bisogno dello stato e di lui: e sempre poi li saranno fedele.

(p. 48).

The political advice given by Pont-Aymery to Henry IV in the poem Le Roy Triomphant is thus similar to Machiavelli's often stressed point that the Prince must be completely in control of his subjects, not giving
them any opportunity to seize power from him. Pont-Aymery however applies this idea particularly to the situation in France where the house of Lorraine had built up so much support that it had become a serious threat to the hereditary monarchs, Henry III and Henry IV. There is a long attack on the house of Lorraine in Le Roy Triomphant in the section beginning on page 116 and entitled 'La Lorraine, où il est demonstré quelle elle est, quel en est le Prince, son ingratitude envers le Roy deffunct, l'obligation qu'il a à la famille des Valois, sa temerité, combien il est miserable, et comme le Roy a Triomphé de luy en sa propre Terre.'

Pont-Aymery stresses the Guises' lowly origins. They claim to be descended from Kings, he says, but they really owe their position to the Valois Kings who honoured them and bestowed French nationality on them. The Guises, he says, returned these favours with ingratitude as they built up power in Lorraine against the Valois rulers. Thus Pont-Aymery shows the result of a Prince not keeping his subjects in his control and dependent on his power. He concludes,

\[
\text{Jamais un Roy puissant ne doit souffrir un prince}
\]
\[
\text{Sur les bords de ses bords qui tiene une province,}
\]
\[
\text{Et de mesme langage et de pareil maintien,}
\]
\[
\text{Que le reste du corps qui est vrayement sien:}
\]
\[
\text{Autrement il fait veoir que ce mesme preside,}
\]
\[
\text{Sur une mesme gent, et que si l'heure le guide}
\]
\[
\text{Il rompra sa limite, et sous un mesme accent,}
\]
\[
\text{Aux peuples il ira ses raisons prononceant.}
\]

In the margin, Pont-Aymery writes,

\[
\text{Il n'est rien de plus a craindre à un Prince que de laisser un membre de son Royaume à un autre si ce membre est de mesme langage.}
\]

\[c\) Again on the subject of the League, Pont-Aymery reproaches Henry IV in Le Roy Triomphant for having made peace with the Catholic opposition, saying that through the truce, the League became even more seditious. He gives several examples of people who did not ruin their enemies when it was in their power to do so, such as Hannibal, Achilles and Porsena.\]
The Romans too, were almost destroyed by their failure to deal harshly with Sythia,

Vous l'aviez sceu defaire, et ne l'aviez destruit,
Sa ruyne a moytie, a vostre fin produit.
(p. 64).

In the margin, he comments,

Rome n'ayant ruiné qu'à demi les Septentrionnaux est perduë.

Similarly Machiavelli many times criticises half-measures. In Il Principe chapter 5 he says,

E chi diviene patrone di una città consueta a vivere libera, e non la disfaccia, aspetti di essere disfatto da quella.
(p. 29).

Discorsi I, 27 describes how Giovampagola failed to destroy his great enemy, Pope Julius II, when it was in his power to do so, proving that 'Sanno rarissime volte gli uomini essere al tutto cattivi o al tutto buoni.'

Like Machiavelli, Pont-Aymery is concerned with giving practical advice to his king rather than with discussing political theory in the abstract. It is therefore understandable that he would have been attracted to the very realistic political writings of the Italian author whose ideas he was able to apply to the French situation and so advise Henry IV. A comparison may be drawn with that other French poet and adviser of Henry IV, Jean de La Taille who in Le Prince Nécessaire gives Henry practical political guidelines akin to Machiavelli's ideas. There is no proof that Henry IV ever consciously adopted Machiavellian policies, though several of his contemporaries accused him of doing so.

2) Adoption of Machiavelli's military ideas.

Whilst Pont-Aymery makes use of Machiavelli's political ideas in his poem Le Roy Triomphant, it is in his prose work, L'Image du Grand Capitaine,
that he adopts some of Machiavelli's military theories. Although this is a thesis devoted mainly to poetry, it is important to examine Pont-Aymery's use of Machiavelli in his prose works in order to complete the picture of Machiavelli's influence on the French writer. In L'Image du Grand Capitaine, Pont-Aymery aims to give advice that will be useful to contemporary leaders.

a) One of the pieces of advice given by Pont-Aymery is that a captain should actually fight at the head of his troops in battle,

\[... \text{je ne donneroy pas un festu d'un general d'armee qui n'auroit que le commandement, et ne se pourroit ou voudroit aux coups.}\]

(\textit{ed. cit.}, chapter 4, 36r).

A captain, says Pont-Aymery, must be even braver than his soldiers and cites, amongst others, the bravery of Caesar, Alexander and Cyrus of the ancients and Charles VIII, Francis I, Henry IV and Lesdiguières of the modern army leaders.

In \textit{Il Principe} chapter 14, Machiavelli shows how a Prince should study the art of war above everything else and train for war in peace-time, implying, as Walker points out, that Machiavelli intended his ruler to lead his armies in person. In \textit{Discorsi} I, 30, Machiavelli says,

\[\text{Uno principe... debbe personalmente andare nelle espedizioni, come facevono nel principio quegli imperadori romani, come fa ne' tempi nostri il Turco, e come hanno fatto e fanno quegli che sono virtuosi.}\]

(p. 201).

It is perhaps significant that at the end of \textit{Il Principe} chapter 14, Machiavelli mentions Alexander, Caesar and Cyrus among leaders to be imitated for their bravery, that is, the very historical figures praised by Pont-Aymery in this passage.
b) Following on this advice, Pont-Aymery describes how the ancients used to give important political and military posts to quite young people,

Il ne se peut lire chez les Romains ny chez les Grecs que l'on ayt refusé les grandes charges aux jeunes hommes. (ch. 4, 36r).

He cites the examples of Scipio, Mark Anthony, Pompey, Hannibal, Alexander and Cyrus, and recommends this practice, arguing that there are many examples of people who conquered others older than themselves.

Discorsi I, 60 is entitled 'Come il Consolato e qualunque altro magistrato in Roma si dava sanza rispetto di età.' Machiavelli says,

Ei si vede per l'ordine della istoria come la Republica romana, poiché il Consolato venne nella Plebe, concesse quello ai suoi cittadini sanza rispetto di età o di sangue; ancora che il rispetto della età mai non fusse in Roma, ma sempre si andò a trovare la virtù o in giovane o in vecchio che la fusse... E quando uno giovane è di tanta virtù che si sia fatto in qualche cosa notabile conoscere, sarebbe cosa dannosissima che la città non se ne potessi valere allora, e che l'avesse a aspettare che fosse invecchiato con lui quel vigore dell' animo e quella prontezza della quale in quella età la patria sua si poteva valere; come si valse Roma di Valerio Corvino, di Scipione, e di Pompeio, e di molti altri che trionfarono giovanissimi. (pp. 269-270).

Again, two of the examples cited are the same in both authors - Scipio and Pompey. Moreover, on the following page of L'Image, Pont-Aymery remarks that,

la jeunesse est plus favorisée du hazard et de la fortune que la vieillesse. (36v).

This is reminiscent of the passage in Il Principe chapter 25 where Machiavelli says that fortune favours younger men because they act in a more daring way. 39

c) In Image du Grand Capitaine chapter 7, Pont-Aymery stresses the importance of liberality in a captain who, by rewarding his soldiers, binds them to himself. He gives the example of Alexander and emphasises
that it must be the captain himself who rewards his men,

Il est expedient au general d'armee qu'entous dons et loyers, ou titres d'honneurs, il n'y ait autre que luy qui les distribue... Par ce moyen la grace du bien luy demeure: autrement il y a danger que s'il permet à d'autres qu'ils recompensent du sien, ceux qu'il veut favoriser, qu'ils ne desrobent la faveur des soldats, et de simples capitaines ne se facent generaux et princes des armees.

(ch. 7, 48r-v).

He cites the example of Otho who was given money by the Emperor Galba to distribute to the army and who used it instead to increase his own power and overcome the Emperor, his master.

In *Il Principe* chapter 19, Machiavelli says,

*li principi debbono le cose di carico fare sumministrare ad altri, quelle di grazia a loro medesimi.*

(p. 78).

Like Pont-Aymery, Machiavelli does not wish to allow any subordinate the opportunity of seizing power. The principle is the same in both authors: reward one's subordinates enough to keep them satisfied but do it in such a way as to prevent them from becoming too powerful. There is an apparent verbal echo of Machiavelli's 'grazia' in Pont-Aymery's phrase 'la grace du bien'. Machiavelli mentions Galba in *Discorsi* I, 10 as an example of a good Emperor who was defeated due to the corruption of his troops. Both writers are concerned that troops should remain loyal and obedient to their army leader.

d) In chapter 10 of the *Image du Grand Capitaine*, Pont-Aymery again emphasises the fact that subjects should not be allowed to have too much power. As in *Le Roy Triomphant*, he attacks the Guises for their ambition and argues that because they were allowed too much power, the King's authority became lessened during the reigns of Francis II and Henry III. Pont-Aymery applies this principle to soldiers as well as subjects. Army leaders, he says, should be given absolute power in times of war in order that they will not be troubled by rebellious soldiers. He
approves of the example of the Romans,

Il est aisé à voir par l'histoire de Tite-Live que
les généraux d'armée avoient puissance absolue à la guerre.

(70v).

Although Pont-Aymery says that he has borrowed this idea from Livy,
it appears in Machiavelli who also says that he found it in Livy,

Io estimo che sia da considerare leggendo questa liviana
istoria, volendone fare profitto, tutti e' modi del procedere
del Popolo e Senato Romano. Ed intra le altre cose che
meritano considerazione, sono: vedere con quale autorità e
mandavano fuori i loro Consoli, Dittatori ed altri capitani
degli eserciti, de' quali si vede l'autorità essere stata
grandissima; ed il Senato non si riservare altro che l'autorità
di muovere nuove guerre e di confermare le paci; e tutte l'altre
cose rimetteva nello arbitrio e potestà del Consolo. Perché
deliberata ch'era dal Popolo e dal Senato una guerra verbigrazia
contro a' Latini, tutto il resto rimettevano nello arbitrio
del Consolo, il quale poteva o fare una giornata o non la fare,
e campeggiare questa o quell'altra terra, come a lui pareva.
(pp. 376-377).

Machiavelli approves of this procedure and wishes that modern republics
such as Venice and Florence would adopt it.

While Pont-Aymery had undoubtedly read Livy - he cites him several
times in the Image du Grand Capitaine - his memory of the Roman author
may have been jogged by his reading of Machiavelli. Like other French
writers, he may have preferred to give a prestigious classical author
as his source rather than to be seen to be in agreement with Machiavelli.

e) In chapter 3 of the Image du Grand Capitaine, Pont-Aymery describes
the qualities necessary in a captain. He must be continually on guard
for any eventuality; he must know how to 'apprehender l'advenir, et
s'accomoder du present,' (ch. 3, 17r). The idea of the necessity of
adapting oneself to the times is very important in Machiavelli. It is
found in Il Principe chapter 25 where he says,

Credo... che sia felice quello che riscontra el modo del
procedere suo con le qualità de' tempi.
(p. 99).
In Discorsi III, 8, he twice says that

gli uomini nel procedere loro e tanto piú nelle azioni grandi debbono considerare i tempi ed accommodarsi a quegli. (p. 415).

Note the use of the same verb ('s'accomodare' and 'accomodare') in both authors.

The following chapter (Discorsi III, 9) is entitled 'Come conviene variare co' tempi, volendo sempre avere buona fortuna.' He gives the example of Fabius Maximus whose dilatory tactics against Hannibal were exactly right for the situation in which he found himself,

Ciascuno sa come Fabio Massimo procedeva con lo esercito suo rispettivamente e cautamente discosto da ogni impeto e da ogni audacia romana; e la buona fortuna fece che questo suo modo riscontró bene con i tempi. Perché sendo venuto Annibale in Italia giovane e con una fortuna fresca, ed avendo già rotto il popolo romano due volte; ed essendo quella republica priva quasi della sua buona milizia, e sbigottita, non potette sortire migliore fortuna che avere uno capitano il quale con la sua tardità e cauzione tenessi a bada il nimico. Né ancora Fabio potette riscontrare tempi piú convenienti a' modi suoi; di che ne nacque che fu glorioso. (p. 417).

The fact that it is Machiavelli whom Pont-Aymery is imitating here, is confirmed when Pont-Aymery on the following page of the Image praises Fabius Maximus for being exactly the leader needed by Rome at that time. Fabius's tactics against Hannibal are described by Livy in Book XXII, but he does not draw out the rule that it is necessary to adapt to circumstances, nor that Fabius was the right ruler for that time.

Besides adapting themselves to the times, captains should also anticipate events, says Pont-Aymery ('apprehender l'advenir'). This is a quality required of a leader by Machiavelli as well, in fact he devoted a whole chapter to it in Discorsi III, 18 entitled 'Nessuna cosa à piú degna d'uno capitano che presentire i partiti del nimico.'

 Wars, says Pont-Aymery, should be fought over as short a period of time as possible,
Le Capitaine qui entreprend d'assailir une province ennemie se doit résoudre à la bataille dès la naissance de son dessein; principalement si ses forces sont composées de soldats estrangers, et s'il est esloigné des lieux et places où il a dressé son camp. Joint aussi que sa fortune depend de la premier ardeur des troupes qu'il meine, lesquelles mal instruictes de l'appareil et de la condition de l'ennemy peuvent rendre des combats et former des efforts desquels ils s'abstiennent si tant soit peu ils reconnoissent quelque superiorité ou avantage en iceluy.

(ch. 3, 10v-11r).

In Discorsi II, 6, Machiavelli praises the Roman policy of making war quickly,

Chi vuol fare tutte queste cose, conviene che tenga lo stile e modo romano: il quale fu in prima di fare le guerre, come dicano i Franciosi, corte e grosse; perché venendo in campagna con eserciti grossi, tutte le guerre che gli ebbono con i Latinii, Sanniti e Toscani, le espedirono in brevissimo tempo... Perché l'uso loro era questo: subito che era scoperta la guerra, egli uscivano fuora con gli eserciti allo incontro del nimico e subito facevano la giornata.

(pp. 294-295).

Even when making war far from home ('esloigné des lieux et places où il a dressé son camp'), the Romans believed in getting the fighting over as quickly as possible,

E benché i Romani dessino il soldo, e che per virtú di questo ei potessono fare le guerre piú lunghe, e per farle piú discosto la necessità gli tenesse piú in su' campi; nondimeno non variarono mai dal primo ordine di finirle presto, secondo il luogo ed il tempo.

(p. 295).

Pont-Aymery underlines the importance of not allowing one's troops to be intimidated by the enemy and this is a point frequently made by Machiavelli who constantly emphasises the necessity for a general to inspire confidence in his troops in face of the enemy. In Discorsi III, 33 he says that a general should make light of, or even conceal, dangers from his troops. In Discorsi III, 37 and 38, he suggests ways in which fear of the enemy can be reduced. In Arte della Guerra Book V, he suggests that an army leader can disparage the enemy in front of his soldiers (though without underestimating them in his own mind).
g) One way of making sure that it is the enemy who is afraid of your troops and not the other way round, says Pont-Aymery, is to maintain good military discipline. This is a commonplace in classical and Renaissance writings on military affairs, but it is worth pointing out that Machiavelli also gives this theory a prominent position in his works. Pont-Aymery says,

La grandeur du Capitaine ne consiste pas au mespris de son ennemy ny à l'esbauchement de plusieurs entreprises: mais au certain appareil de ses forces, où il ne se veoit rien de confus, rien de faible, rien de necessiteux; par ce moyen son adversaire l'admire, de l'admiration il vient à la crainte, de la crainte au desespoir, et du desespoir à la fuite.
(ch. 3, 12r-12v).

He laments modern lack of discipline, ...
... nos siecles corrompus, et nos Roys moins soucieux ont apporté...licence de malfaire à leurs armées.
(ch. 3, 12v).

In Discorsi III, 33, Machiavelli says that an army which is well disciplined has confidence in itself in face of the enemy. In Discorsi III, 36 he praises the discipline of the Roman army,

... in uno esercito bene ordinato nessuno debbe fare alcuna opera se non regolarlo; e si troverà per questo che nello esercito romano, dal quale avendo e elli vinto il mondo debbono prendere esemplo tutti gli altri eserciti.
(p. 484).

The chapter ends, as in Pont-Aymery's passage, with a lament for the modern lack of discipline - a complaint often repeated in Machiavelli. Pont-Aymery enlarges on the importance of military discipline later on in the Image du Grand Capitaine, in chapter 8 where he praises Hannibal for the good discipline he maintained in his army. Machiavelli, too, often stresses the importance of military discipline. In particular, he points to the success of Hannibal's methods of discipline, for example, in Discorsi III, 21, he says,

nel suo esercito, ancoraché composto di varie generazioni di uomini, non nacque mai alcuna dissensione né infra loro medesimi né contro di lui. Il che non potette dirivare da altro che dal terrore che nasceva dalla persona sua: il quale era tanto grande, mescolata con la reputazione che gli dava la sua
virtú, che teneva li suoi soldati quieti ed uniti.
(p. 448).

In the *Image du Grand Capitaine*, Pont-Aymery is concerned with giving practical advice which will be relevant to modern army leaders and he takes from Machiavelli those ideas which he believes will be most useful for the French situation. Even when he is not borrowing directly from Machiavelli, the spirit in which he exalts military valour, his emphasis on military discipline and his criticism of the lack of it in modern armies are very close to the works of the Italian author.

**Conclusion.**

Although Pont-Aymery is a minor author, the study of Machiavelli's influence on his works is useful in that it helps to confirm certain trends already noticed in the writings of other sixteenth century French writers, particularly the Reformers. In the *Académie* we see his concern for the harmful effects of Machiavelli's political principles on the position of the French nobility. Like D'Aubigné and Gentillet, Pont-Aymery blames Machiavelli for the policies directed against the French nobles which have resulted in a decline in their valour and influence. This seems to have been a criticism aimed against Machiavelli by the Reformers in particular. Like D'Aubigné, Pont-Aymery uses Machiavelli in his political propaganda against Spain and the Catholic League who are depicted as followers of Machiavelli. One wonders whether this was almost a semi-official campaign on behalf of Reformers to discredit their political opponents.

At the same time, Pont-Aymery was unable to avoid using some of Machiavelli's ideas when giving advice on political and military matters to Henry IV. He thus falls within the category of the Machiavellian advisers who, it was claimed, surrounded French Kings from Charles IX onwards, teaching their rulers to build up their power to the detriment
of their subjects, cynically manipulating the latter in order to preserve their position as absolute rulers.

As a soldier and a poet, Pont-Aymery's knowledge of Machiavelli is interesting because it points us towards that group of soldier-poets writing at the end of the sixteenth century which includes D'Aubigné, Du Bartas, Odet de La Noue, Claude de Trellon (the only Catholic) and Jean de La Jessee. Out of this group, D'Aubigné, La Jessee and Pont-Aymery have definite knowledge of Machiavelli's writings, whilst there are several passages in Du Bartas which reveal at least a passing acquaintance with Machiavelli. Claude de Trellon probably had some knowledge of popular ideas on Machiavelli (see chapter 10 of this thesis). Only Odet de La Noue's poems do not contain, to my knowledge, any reference to Machiavelli. Pont-Aymery thus completes the study of the influence of Machiavelli on French soldier-poets.
FOOTNOTES

1. See the works of Robert Garnier, Jean de La Taille, Agrippa D'Aubigné and Louis des Masures for examples of French writers whose concern for their country leads them to discuss the effect of Machiavelli's ideas.


3. He tells us this at the beginning of L'Academie ou Institution de la Noblesse Françoise in Oeuvres, Paris, 1599, (BN R 47246), 2 v. This is the edition of L'Academie referred to throughout this chapter.

4. See the article on Pont-Aymery in La France Protestante (ed. cit., pp. 295-297), cited in note 10 of the Life of Pont-Aymery. In the Académie, he says,

   Ceux de Milan nous apprennent la tromperie, le Boulognois nous enseigne le mensonge, le Venitien nous rend hypocrite et songeart, le Romain nous plonge en un Ocean d'atheisme et d'impiété ... J'avois oublié les Florentins ennemis jurez des bonnes moeurs.

   (ed. cit., 2r-v).

5. L'Academie, (ed. cit.), 2v. This was a traditional accusation against Italians made, among others, by Joachim Du Bellay in his Regrets, ed. M. A. Screech and J. Joliffe, Geneva, 1966, nos. 93, 94, 95 (pp. 166-168).

6. L'Image du Grand Capitaine, Paris, 1594, (BN R 24891), ch. 2, 6r. This is the edition of L'Image referred to throughout this chapter. Like Guicciardini, Machiavelli is critical of Charles VIII in the Discorsi and Il Principe.

7. It seems likely that Pont-Aymery had actually read Guicciardini's works in the original. He is not totally opposed to Italian writers for in the Académie (43v-44r) he praises Tasso.

8. Machiavelli is in good company: another writer rejected by Pont-Aymery as unsuitable for the education of noblemen is Homer ('Car les Dieux paillardent et sodomisent en ses escrits ...', 37v). His sole criterion for judging literature in this treatise is whether a work is morally useful - thus Virgil's sixth book of the Aeneid is recommended for its truthfulness (42v) and poetry is judged to be less useful than prose (53r).

9. Pont-Aymery makes a rather glaring mistake: Machiavelli's proposed model for his Prince is of course Cesare Borgia, illegitimate son of Pope Alexander VI.

10. Cesare Borgia, born around 1476, was the son of Cardinal Rodrigo Borgia (later Alexander VI) and his mistress Vannozza Catanei.

11. Cesare died in Spain in 1507 after losing most of his conquests through the death of his father. Although he may have died in despair, he certainly was not hung.


14. In Machiavellism: the Doctrine of Raison d'Etat and its place in modern history, transl. D. Scott, Yale University Press, 1957, ch. 1, p. 41, F. Meinecke says that Il Principe arose out of Machiavelli's longing to see Italy freed from the Barbarians. Cesar Borgia, with his rational exercise of cruelty and bad faith, must certainly have offered a model for the practical methods of power politics in the situation as it then existed. But the ideal and supreme pattern for the new princes in Italy must have been the great national liberators and founders of States, such as Moses and Cyrus, Theseus and Romulus.

These are the leaders praised in Il Principe chapter 6.

15. A common complaint in France, made especially by writers of political propaganda, see my chapter on Pierre Matthieu, pp. 47-50.

16. Brantôme makes the same mistake of criticising Machiavelli's writings on military affairs whilst praising Guillaume Du Bellay's book,

Le livre qu'a fait M. de Langeay de l'art militaire le fait cognoistre autrement capitaine que ne fait Machiavel, celuy qui en a escrit; qui est un grand abus de cet homme, qui ne sçavoit que c'estoit de guerre, en aller faire et composer un livre.


17. For example, Claude de Trellon, a French Catholic who at one time fought on the side of the League, criticises Italians for their perfidy, concentration on appearances, dissimulation, breaking promises and atheism without it being possible to say definitely whether he is attacking Machiavelli or merely mingling with traditional criticisms of Italians the watered-down version of Machiavellianism which was in general currency in France, see chapter 10 of this thesis pp. 572-4.

18. Le Roy Triomphant, ed. cit., p. 39. Compare in my preceding chapter on D'Aubigné pp. 275-7, D'Aubigné's frequent attacks on Florentine methods of governing. These criticisms of Florentine political behaviour are, as in Pont-Aymery, directed specifically against Machiavelli.

19. See my chapter on D'Aubigné, pp. 297-300.

20. Livre de la Parfaicte Vaillance, Paris, s.d. (the 'privilège' is dated February, 1596), (BN R 24892), p. 5.

21. Chapter 2 is entitled 'Que tous ceux qui n'ont eu pour vertu que la simple vaillance ont malheureusement fini leurs jours'. Contrast Machiavelli's exaltation of the amoral quality of 'virtù'.

22. See my chapter on D'Aubigné, pp. 315-2.
23. See my chapter on D'Aubigné for this erroneous attribution of the policy of divide to rule, to Machiavelli by French authors such as Gentillet, Matthieu and D'Aubigné himself.

24. See for example, Il Principe ch. 5, ch. 7 (where he praises Cesare Borgia for destroying all the families of the rulers he had despoiled), ch. 8 (where he says that the new ruler should inflict these injuries all at once at the beginning of his reign). In Discorsi I, 16, he emphasises the importance of killing 'i figliuoli di Bruto'.

25. Machiavelli's ideas were not the only ones Pont-Aymery considered harmful for nobles. In L'Image du Grand Capitaine, he criticises Xenophon for approving of Cyrus breaking his promise,

Il luy [Xenophon] semble qu'il soit permis de tromper ceux qui se fient en nous ... Il seroit excusable si son livre [Cyropaedia] n'estoit qu'une simple narration appartenant à la verite de l'histoire: mais il veut enseigner par tout, et estime son traité une legitime institution et instruction pour les Princes.

(ed. cit., 23r).

These words could equally have applied to Machiavelli's Il Principe.

26. See my chapter on D'Aubigné (passim). In the Tragiques and the Histoire Universelle, Catholic leaders are continually accused of following Machiavellian policies.

27. See my chapter on D'Aubigné, pp.274-27 for a discussion of French reaction to the absence of the Christian concept of providence in Machiavelli's works. Of course, the idea that events are in the hands of fate is not exclusively Machiavellian.


29. Compare Le Roy Triomphant (ed. cit., p. 96) where there is the following description of the League's activities in the margin,

Ceux de la Ligue se servent du nom de Dieu pour approuver leurs felonies.

This accusation of the League's Machiavellianism is also found in the anonymous play Le Triomphe de la Ligue (Leyden, 1607, BN Yf 6527) and in Claude de Trellon's work Le Ligueur Repenty (Lyons, 1595, BN Rés Ye 4936, p. 12 and p. 47) - see chapter 10 of this thesis, p.573.


31. Published Villefranche, 1602, (BL 4091 bb 28). See especially Book I, ch. 18, 101r and ch. 19, 102v where he says,

... tout ce que Massée et Ribadeneire ont escrit d'Ignace est faux, ... maintenant je me delibere vous discourir quels sont leurs voeux, esquels je vous verifiray une doctrine erronee et heretique, ensemble une infinité de Machiavelismes et Anabaptismes, qui y ont esté avec le temps annexe.

33. See for example, the anonymous collection of Aphorismes ou Sommairres de la Doctrine des Jesuites, et de quelques autres leurs Docteurs, s.l., 1610, (Bodleian library, 8° R44 (4) Art) and the Anticoton ou Refutation de La Lettre declaratoire du Pere Coton by P.D.C. (probably Pierre Coignet), s.l., 1610, (Bodleian library, 8° R 44 (7) Art).


35. These lines are repeated in L'Image du Grand Capitaine, ed. cit., ch. 10, 68v-69r.

36. See my chapter on La Taillle, note 32.

37. Compare the passage on 33v,

C'est pourquoi je dois conclure que non seulement il est honorable: mais qui plus est necessaire au grand Capitaine apres qu'il a dispose son armee, de combatre à outrance, et ne s'esparner non plus qu'un simple soldat,

and on 34v,

Anciennement les capitaines genereux combattoient à la teste de leurs armees ...


39. This passage was also echoed by Ronsard in his Priere à Dieu pour la Victoire in Discours des Misères, ed. Malcolm Smith, Geneva, 1979, p. 249, note to 1. 118-119.

40. See pp.364-466 of this chapter where we analysed the agreement between Pont-Aymery and Machiavelli on the necessity of keeping the nobles in check so that they cannot attempt to seize power, whilst at the same time giving them enough honours to keep them satisfied. This political principle is here applied to the military sphere.

41. This is from Discorsi II, 33 entitled 'Come i Romani davano agli loro capitanii degli eserciti le commissioni libere'. Compare L'Arte della Guerra Book I, where Fabricio says that Kings should be given absolute power only when they are leading armies.

42. For example, in chapter 8, p. 52 on military discipline.

43. See my chapter on Pierre Matthieu for this tendency to hide borrowings from Machiavelli behind the names of more 'respectable' classical authors.

44. 'Le grand Capitaine ne marche jamais sans soupçon, il est tousjours en eschauguette: non qu'il craigne ou que son coeur redoute quelque chose: mais il veut faire que son ennemy ayt sujett de le craindre'(17v).
45. Machiavelli also praises Fabius Maximus's tactics against Hannibal in Discorsi III, 10 and I, 53.

46. '... la Republique de Rome estant presque abandonnée et perduë fut remise en son entier par Fabius Maximus, lequel ayant jugé que les deportements de ses compagnons enuers Annibal, n'avoient pas bien reussi, se gouverna d'autre sorte, et attint la felicité qu'il s'estoit promise, triomphant de celle du Carthaginois, de qui l'armee ne pouvoit subsister sans combattre, ny aucunement se perdre et dissoudre que pour n'estre pas combatuë' (18r-v).

47. See his praise of a certain S. Ferriol who anticipated events during the siege of Montélimart (La Cité du Montelimar, ed. cit., p. 99).

48. See also Istorie Fiorentine Book VII and Machiavelli's letter of November 1526 to Cavalcanti in which he advises that the Pope should wage war quickly because delay will merely weaken his army and use up his resources.

49. See Discorsi II, 12; III, 33, 37, 38, and the end of L'Arte della Guerra Book IV.

50. Compare Discorsi II, 16; Arte Book VII, and the end of Istorie Fiorentine Book V.

51. Compare Discorsi II, 16; III, 14, 21, 31, 33, 36.

52. See chapter 10, pp.547-550.

53. I have examined his Poesies Chrestiennes of 1594 (BL 1065 f 26) and his Resolution claire et facile sur la question tant de fois faite de la prinse des armes par les inferieurs, Rheims, 1577, (BL 1193 c 5). His father, François de La Noue, was however certainly acquainted with Machiavelli's works - see Discours politiques et militaires, ed. cit., Sixième Discours.
Since the life of Robert Garnier is better documented than that of other authors dealt with in this thesis, it will only be necessary here to outline briefly the main facts. For more detailed accounts, I refer the reader to M-M. Mouflard's work on Robert Garnier 1545-1590 (La Ferté-Bernard, 1961) vol. I, 'La Vie', and R. Lebêgue, La Tragédie Française de la Renaissance (Paris, 1954).

Robert Garnier was born in 1544 or 1545 at La Ferté-Bernard. We know that he studied law at Toulouse from 1564 till 1566 and that prior to this, he pursued some preliminary study of law at Angers, Poitiers or Toulouse. Probably he also commenced his literary studies, either at Le Mans or at Paris. During this period at Toulouse he won second prize in the Jeux Floraux competition of 1564 with his poem Le Chant Royal Allégorique des Troubles Passés de la France and in 1566 he won first prize with Chant Royal en Allegorie. In 1565 he published some love poetry, Plaintes Amoureuses, now lost and he was involved in preparations for the entry of Charles IX into Toulouse in February of that year. He recited two eclogues and three sonnets in the presence of the King.

Toulouse was at that period a centre for cultural and literary activities. Etienne Forcadel was regent at the college and Du Bartas studied there at the same time as Garnier. The ideals of Ronsard and indeed of the whole Pleiade group had a profound influence on the literary circles at Toulouse and Garnier's literary ambitions could not have failed to have been awakened. In the preface to Marc Antoine he describes how he made the acquaintance of Pibrac who urged him to write drama. Thus his first play, Porcie, was written at Toulouse during the 1564 vacation and performed there in December. Possibly it was performed again during
Charles IX's visit to Toulouse.

In 1566, Garnier moved to Paris where he spent the next three years frequented Parisian literary circles. In 1567, he published the Hymne de la Monarchie, most probably a work of propaganda, and in 1568, Porcie, dealing with the civil wars in Rome under the triumvirs after the death of Julius Caesar. The play was so successful that there was a second edition in 1574. Belleau, Bailf and Ronsard all wrote prefatory poems for it. 7

In 1569, Garnier was appointed councillor at Le Mans and in 1573 he published Hippolyte, a tragedy about love written during the uneasy peace before the events of Saint Bartholomew's Day. With the renewal of hostilities, he returned to the theme of the Roman civil wars, this time between Julius Caesar and Pompey, in his third tragedy Cornélie published in 1574. Whilst living in the provinces, Garnier did not lose contact with his literary friends at Paris and he frequently returned there to supervise publication of his works. 8 The publication of Cornélie was celebrated by several Parisian poets, including Ronsard who praises Garnier above Jodelle as a writer of tragedy. 9 Amadis Jamyn also wrote a prefatory poem, in which he says that Garnier eclipses the best Greek and Roman tragic writers—

Entre Athenes et Rome incertain demouroit,
Qui la palme Tragique en fin possederoit:
Mais tu as assoupi ceste ancienne noise,
Te jettant au milieu de ce brave debat,
Et seul tu es resté maistre de ce combat,
Cachant en toy la Muse et Romaine et Gregeois.

This type of praise was frequently showered on Garnier by his contemporaries. 10

During his time at Le Mans, Garnier wrote lyrical works, discourses and some neo-Latin works. Most of these are now lost. Possibly he wrote other tragedies too. 11 Also belonging to this period of his life is the
story, doubtless apocryphal, that Garnier fled to Jersey just before the Saint Bartholomew Day Massacres in order to escape the wrath of Charles IX. Whatever the truth of this story, by 1574 he must have been back in the King's favour since he was made 'lieutenant-criminel' of the Maine area, a difficult job, for as King's representative he was regarded as an outsider and came up against much local opposition.

He was probably present at the assembly of the Estates General called by Henry III in December 1576.

In 1575, Garnier married Françoise Hubert, herself a poet, and they had two daughters. In 1578, he published Marc Antoine which takes as its subject the triumph of Caesar (Octavian) and the deaths of Anthony and Cleopatra. With La Troade published in 1579, Garnier begins to use Greek legend. In this tragedy, he depicts the suffering of the Trojans after the fall of Troy, and the Greeks' sacrifice of Polyxena and Astyanax. Garnier was most likely thinking of the troubled 'peace' in his own country where the aftermath of civil war brought great suffering to both sides. He continued with Greek subjects in his next tragedy, Antigone, ou la pieté, published in 1580 which tells of the war between Oedipus's sons and Antigone's defiance of Creon.

In 1582, Garnier published his only tragi-comedy, Bradamante, the subject of which is taken from Ariosto's Orlando Furioso. In Garnier's play, Charlemagne embodies many of the traits of an ideal ruler. He is appointed by God and rules justly and wisely over a land of noble and courageous warriors. Jondorf suggests that in thus praising France, Garnier was trying to boost the morale of his countrymen and to increase the prestige of the French monarchy (Henry III's reputation was by then very low). Garnier may, on the other hand, have wished to set before Henry III a model of what a good ruler should be. In 1583, he published his only Biblical tragedy, Les Juives, relating Nebuchadnezzar's punishment of Zedekiah and the grief of the Israelites who, having
disobeyed God, are made subject to foreign rule. Collected editions of Garnier's work appeared in 1580, 1582, and 1585. The latter edition had been extensively revised and is the edition used by most modern editors, including Lebègue.

In 1586, Garnier was elected 'Conseiller au Grand Conseil'. Scévole de Sainte Marthe describes his political career—

...comme il fut plus avancé dans l'âge et dans l'expérience des affaires, il fut pourvu par le Roy d'une charge honorables de Conseiller au grand Conseil. Et tant qu'il vésquit, il ne laissa couler pas un seul moment de sa vie... qu'il ne rendist quelque service au public.


His increasing involvement in politics probably ended his career as a dramatist, though one must also take into account his growing disillusionment with 'l'ingrat exercice des Muses' as expressed in his dedicatory epistle to Les Juives. His last published work was the Elegie sur le trépas de Ronsard (1586). Even before his appointment to the Great Council, Garnier had had many duties to perform and A. Baillet remarks,

les uns et les autres y ont également admiré cette grande facilité qu'il avoit pour la versification, sur tout lorsqu'on consideroit combien il avoit d'exercice et de distraction dans l'occupation penible de sa Charge.

During the years 1588 and 1589, Garnier was beset by troubles: servants nearly succeeded in poisoning himself and his family in an effort to steal his valuables. In 1588 his wife died. Around this time, he was drawn to the Catholic League and actually joined it for a few months in 1589. His adherence to the League is mentioned by De Thou in his Histoire Universelle, Basle, 1742, t. VII, p. 693 and in the extent fragment of Colletet's life of Garnier. His growing despair over Henry III's misgovernment as well as his Catholic faith and horror of seeing a heretic succeed to the throne probably combined to lead him into the League. In addition, Le Mans was one of the cities belonging to the League. But Garnier was never a fanatic: like his friends Ronsard,
Pibrac and Michel de L'Hospital, he preaches peace, clemency and patriotism in his works. It is therefore not surprising that he soon left the League which was on the whole fanatical and bigoted, and which supported Spanish claims to the French throne.

Garnier died in September 1590, his work never having been really appreciated at Court: Catherine de' Medici had a superstitious horror of seeing tragedies performed, and Henry III preferred Italian comedies. Garnier's bitterness over this neglect is revealed in the prefatory epistle of Les Juives dedicated to the Duke of Joyeuse:

Car combien que, ou par l'infelicité du siecle, ou par defaut de merites, ou par un malheur particulier, les peines que j'ay prises à les /the Muses/ caresser, m'ayent esté autant infructueuses jusques icy, que les assidus et desagreables labeurs de ma vacation: si veux-je, Monseigneur, vous regrcier des bienfaits que les lettres reçoivent journellement de vous...

(ed. Lebêgue, pp. 9-10).

He expresses the hope that

...ce Traitté pourra preceller les autres, et moins desagreer à sa Majesté, s'il luy plaist l'honorer de sa veuë...

(ibid.).

Nevertheless, Garnier's reputation as a dramatist was very high in the sixteenth century and continued into the early part of the seventeenth century, Corneille and Racine occasionally borrowing elements from his plays. Already Estienne Pasquier had described his tragedies as

poèmes qui à mon jugement trouveront lieu dedans la posterité.
FOOTNOTES

1. See Mouflard, op. cit., chapter 4.

2. Published in a modern edition by R. Lebègue, Les Juives, Bradamente, Poesies Diverses, Paris, 1949, pp. 209-211. All quotations from Garnier's plays in this chapter are taken from the editions by Lebègue.


4. In Robert Garnier, Sa Vie, ses poésies inédites (Paris and Le Mans, 1905, p. 39), Henri Chardon puts forward the hypothesis that Garnier later suppressed these juvenile love poems because they were an embarrassment to him.

5. In Premier volume de la bibliothèque (Paris, 1584, BL C 75 g 2, p. 444), La Croix du Maine remarks that Garnier was an excellent orator whose talent was much appreciated by French kings.

6. Addressing his prefatory epistle to Pibrac, Garnier speaks of 'le théâtre François, que vous m'avez jadis fait aimer au bord de vostre Garonne', (Marc Antoine, Hippolyte ed. R. Lebègue, Paris, 1974, p. 10).

7. Indeed, Ronsard's prefatory poem to Hippolyte (ed. cit., p. 102) has been interpreted as meaning that he had some hand in putting the finishing touches to this, Garnier's first tragedy.


9. In Jugemens des sçavans sur les principaux ouvrages des auteurs (Paris, 1686, BL 618 c 8, tome 4, part 3, p. 421), A. Baillet says that Ronsard 'ne mettoit personne au dessus de Garnier pour ce genre d'écrire'.

10. See Robert Estienne's liminary sonnet for Porcie, Ronsard's prefatory poem for La Troade and Antoine Du Verdier in La Bibliothèque (Lyons, 1585, BL 616 n 4, pp. 1098-1104).


15. According to Sainte-Marthe, Garnier wrote one more play after Les Juives, but Mouflard (op. cit., pp. 377-380) has shown that this is probably a mistaken reference to the royalist play, the Henriade, by Sébastien Garnier.

17. Published in Mouflard op. cit., pp. 489-490. The theme of the descent from Charlemagne in Bradamante had strong political implications (described in an unpublished paper by Ruth Calder), but the date of the play's publication indicates that Garnier was flattering the King rather than the Guises.

18. For relations between Pibrac, L'Hospital and Garnier, and the similarity of their political views, see Mouflard, op. cit., pp. 144-148.

THE INFLUENCE OF MACHIAVELLI

The similarity between the political ideas of Machiavelli and Garnier has been touched upon by two authors: Marie-Madeleine Mouflard in *Robert Garnier 1545-1590* (La Roche-sur-Yon, 1964, vol. 3, 'Les Sources'), and Gillian Jondorf in *Robert Garnier and the Themes of Political Tragedy in the Sixteenth Century*. But in both these works, the topic of Machiavelli's influence is peripheral to the main subject and only a very few themes from Machiavelli are discussed — indeed Mouflard sees no influence of Machiavelli on Garnier's thought before his fifth play, *La Troade*, and then she gives only two instances of Machiavelli's influence, one of which is rather dubious. These will be discussed later in this chapter. Jondorf deals with various themes in Garnier which she compares with Machiavelli's theories, such as his preference for foreign war over civil war, the importance of a King obeying his own laws and the necessity of cruelty for political reasons. However, she fails to distinguish between ideas unique to Machiavelli and those in general circulation in Renaissance times; nor does she separate Machiavellian themes in Garnier from Senecan themes. Therefore in neither author is the study of Machiavelli's influence thorough or complete, and it is necessary to re-examine Garnier's works more fully with the focus more particularly on Machiavelli's influence.

At first sight, the study of Machiavelli's influence on Garnier seems problematic in that Garnier never mentions Machiavelli by name, either in the plays (where such mention would obviously be anachronistic) or in his prefaces and poetry. However, it is quite likely, for a number of reasons, that Garnier read at least *Il Principe*. Firstly, he was very much interested in politics and, as Mouflard says,

Sauf ceux d'Hippolyte, tous ses personnages font de la politique; on peut donc parler d'une primauté de celle-ci dans son théâtre.
His characters are motivated by political passions such as patriotism, love of liberty, justice, power and revenge. It is the question of their political commitments which strikes us as most urgent when reading the plays.

Secondly, Garnier's own active involvement in politics meant that he was not merely theorizing in his tragedies but seriously concerned with finding a practical solution to France's troubles, as Machiavelli sought remedies for the situation in Italy. In the prefaces to his plays, Garnier stresses again and again the relevance of these Greek, Roman and Biblical stories to the political situation in sixteenth century France. For example, he says of La Troade,

...les passions de tels sujets nous sont si ordinaires que les exemples anciens nous devront doresnavant servir de consolation en nos particuliers et domestiques encumbres.

(La Troade. Antigone, ed. R. Lebègue, Paris 1952, p. 9)

In the preface to Marc Antoine he compares the disasters of the Roman civil wars with the horrors of the French wars, and in the preface to Les Juives, he remarks—

Or vous ay-je representé les souspirables calamitez d'un peuple, qui a comme nous abandonné son Dieu.

(ed. Lebègue, p. 10)

In poem no. XVI in Lebègue's edition, Garnier describes his role in the following way—

Tu me vois lamenter d'une tragique voix
Les desastres Romains, et les mal-heurs Gregois,
Pleurant nos propres maux sous feintes etranges. (p. 243)

Recent historians such as Lebègue, Jondorf and Mouflard have attempted to establish precise contemporary parallels in Garnier's plays, but it is sufficient for us to note that, like Machiavelli, Garnier is a writer passionately concerned with his country's problems and with analysing them in the light of historical examples.
Garnier's concern for practical solutions leads him to reject utopias and this is also in line with Machiavelli (see *Il Principe* ch. 15). Garnier realises that intransigent principles are often no use in practice - justice pushed to the extreme by Creon in *Antigone* is shown as ill-advised, in *Porcie* love of freedom has to be tempered by the need to avoid civil war. Garnier is concerned not with an ideal government, but with one as honest and just as possible. Thus, although he abhors all fighting, his plays advocate foreign war wherever it can prevent civil war, that is, he opts for the lesser of two evils. In his general distrust of theories and his concern for practical solutions, he comes close to Machiavelli's attitude and likewise to that of the Parliamentarians such as Pibrac and L'Hospital, whose views were later expressed by Pasquier and Bodin, two authors also well acquainted with Machiavelli.

It is unlikely that Garnier with his interest in politics, his concern to find a solution to his country's troubles and his wish to deal with political themes in his works, could have failed to read at least one work by the sixteenth century's most controversial political writer. Indeed, when we turn to examination of his plays in detail, we will find that the sheer frequency with which he broaches issues inalienably associated at that time with Machiavelli, and the terms in which he analyses these issues argues the case for interpreting his plays as being, often, a response to Machiavelli.

By the time Garnier's first play, *Porcie*, was published in 1568, there had appeared two French translations of *Il Principe*, a translation of the *Discorsi* and one of the *Arte della Guerra*. Interest in the Italian author's writings was thus already fairly widespread in France. It is more likely, however, that Garnier read Machiavelli in the original since, although he never visited Italy, he could read Italian and was familiar with the work of Petrarch and Tasso (he may have even met the latter). In *Bradamante* he often uses Ariosto in the original rather
than in translation, and Mouflard has found traces of Ariosto's influence on plays before Bradamante. Machiavelli's almost mathematical clarity of style would render his books attractive to a reader whose Italian was perhaps a little shaky, and the provocative tone of Il Principe may have appealed to Garnier's sense of the dramatic.

Nevertheless, generally speaking, Garnier's view of politics differs from that of Machiavelli, though of course this does not prevent him from putting the opposite, Machiavellian, view of politics into the mouths of some of his characters. For Garnier, politics is not a science but a morality, involving problems of conscience. What interests him, is not techniques for gaining and preserving power, as in Machiavelli, but the safe-guarding of certain moral values such as justice and one's duty to one's fellow human beings. Acts performed in the name of 'raison d'état' are seen as violent and tyrannical assaults on the dignity of man since for Garnier, natural law and the will of God come before the interests of State: in Cornélie Caesar is portrayed as a tyrant

Violant de nature et des hommes la loy.

(ed. cit., p. 185)

In Les Juives, Zedekiah is punished by God (through the agency of Nebuchadnezzar) for his alliance with the Egyptians, despite the fact that the alliance may have been politically opportune. The punishment is approved of by the choruses in the play since Zedekiah has put a nation's interests above God's will.

Another way in which Garnier differs from Machiavelli is that the former does not give a complete political doctrine; he merely examines certain problems which interest him and which are relevant to the French situation, such as whether one should take thorough revenge on defeated enemies or whether one should pardon them; whether laws should be obeyed if they go against one's religious beliefs (Antigone); what happens when
a ruler is diverted from looking after affairs of State by his private passions (Marc Antoine) as Henry III was accused of neglecting the State for his 'mignons'; whether the order established by the rule of one man is worth the loss of freedom when the struggle for freedom entails civil war (Porcie). Moreover, Garnier is not dogmatic in his plays — he very often presents both sides of the problem through the attitudes of different characters without coming down on one side or the other, for example, in Antigone we approve of the heroine resisting an irreligious edict but at the same time, we can sympathise with Creon's need to have his laws obeyed. In Porcie he argues, through the words of Portia, that a peaceful tyranny may be preferable to dragging an enfeebled nation through civil war in an effort to gain freedom. But love of liberty, as embodied in the memory of Cato and Brutus, is presented as also part of a concern for one's country and the question is never really resolved. This ability to see both sides of the question is very different from the deliberately dogmatic attitude of Machiavelli, especially in Il Principe.

Several Machiavellian themes are repeated in different plays but because of the need to disentangle Machiavellian influence from the various classical and contemporary sources used in each play, it will be clearer if the detailed examination of Machiavelli's influence on Garnier is dealt with play by play rather than according to theme.

**Porcie** (1564)

i) The temporary dictator

The classical question of the best form of government appears in two of Garnier's plays — Porcie and Cornélie. At first sight it seems rather superfluous for an author who published a Hymne de la Monarchie (in 1567) extolling the institution of monarchy above republics and oligarchies, to discuss the subject of the best form of government. Yet in the Hymne, Garnier is really extolling monarchy as a system because
it works rather than because he personally prefers it to the republican system, or because he believes it is an institution ordained by God. Monarchy is the best system, he argues, because it causes the least disorder. Garnier describes the strife and tumults which arise in republics—

Un chacun y commande, et n'y a Matelot
Qui ne face le maître à repousser le flot.
L'un dit qu'il faut encrer, et l'autre, du contraire,
Soutient obstinément qu'il ne le faut pas faire.
(ed. Lebègue, p. 226).

The adherence to monarchy is treated in purely practical terms in the Hymne and on this account, historians have concluded that the poem was chiefly intended as propaganda for the French monarchy. Garnier describes the disorders in Rome under the triumvirate—

Combien ces trois Tyrans, ces Tygres affamés,
Commirent-ilz d'horreurs par leurs sourds armés?
(p. 228).

Garnier may be intending to draw a parallel here between the Roman triumvirate and the French 'triumvirate' of 1562, composed of Guise, Saint-André and Montmorency. Guise had been attacked in 1560 in the famous Epistre envoyée au Tigre de la France attributed to François Hotman, and in these lines from Garnier there may be an intentional echo of Hotman's notorious pamphlet. Whatever the topical references, Porcie has as its subject Rome under the triumvirs and it is in this context of civil war and crisis that the traditional, Aristotelian debate on the best form of government is set. This background enables Garnier to give a Machiavellian slant to the Aristotelian theme, for in Il Principe, Machiavelli is likewise concerned with the best form of government in a crisis when a nation is feeble and corrupt.

The idea of giving the State over to the rule of one man in a time of crisis when the nation is weakened and divided, lies at the heart of Il Principe. Machiavelli devotes the whole book to giving advice to the leader who, he hopes, will unite Italy and restore valour to the nation. But in the Discorsi which often explain and enlarge on the ideas found in
Il Principe, we see that this rule by one man is envisaged merely as a temporary expedient for a period of crisis when no other method will succeed. In Discorsi I, 18, he says,

Oltre a di questo, gli ordini e le leggi fatte in una repubblica nel nascimento suo, quando erano gli uomini buoni, non sono dipoi piú a proposito, divenutí che ei sono rei...non basta usare termini ordinari essendo modi ordinari cattivi; ma ò necessario venire allo straordinario, come ò alla violenza ed all'armi, e diventare innanzi a ogni cosa principe di quella città e poterne disporre a suo modo.

(pp. 180-2).

In Discorsi I, 55, he argues that,

dove è tanto la materia corrotta che le leggi non bastano a frenarla, vi bisogna ordinare insieme con quelle maggior forza; la quale è una mano regia che con la potenza assoluta ed eccessiva ponga freno alla eccessiva ambizione e corruuttela de' potenti.

(pp. 256-7).

Machiavelli came from a family with strong republican sympathies and really preferred the form of republican government described in the Discorsi. Nevertheless, the solution he proposes in Il Principe reveals that he was prepared for the Italians to relinquish some of their freedom as a temporary measure to a leader who would restore order and power to the nation. We have seen that Garnier was an author very much concerned with the troubles in France, and he may have felt that Machiavelli's idea of a temporary dictatorship would be one way to restore order in France, divided by civil wars, and weakened by a succession of youthful Kings.

In Porcie, we are shown the disorders in Rome after the assassination of Julius Caesar. Through the speeches of Portia, Garnier describes the terrible proscriptions ordered by the triumvirs and the cowardice of the populace who have abandoned Brutus. Even though she is the daughter of Cato and the wife of Brutus, Portia laments the end of Caesar's rule,

Pleust au grand Jupiter qu'il /Caesar/ dominast encore,
Nous n'aurions pas les maux qui nous tenaillent ore,
Nous vivrions bien-heureux en repos souhaité,
Sans perte seulement que de la liberté:
Nous ne verrions sous luy la Ville pleine d'armes,
Commise à l'abandon d'un amas de gendarmes...
Or, je te plains, Cesar! Cesar, je plains ta mort!
Et confesse à present que lon t'a fait grand tort:
Tu devois encoir vivre, et devois encoir estre
De ce chetif Empire et le prince et le maistre:
Vraiment je te regrette, et cuide fermement
Que Brute et que Cassie ont fait injustement.

The rule of one man in this time of crisis is preferred to the 'freedom' of a republic. Portia's speech reveals that when a nation is too lacking in valour and patriotism to seize the chance of freedom offered by the death of a tyrant, those who try to establish a republic will bring disorder on a State and will inevitably be abandoned by the nation and thus defeated. Portia values peace above freedom and is willing to sacrifice liberty in order to avoid civil war ('Sans perte seulement que de la liberté'). She justifies her arguments on the grounds of expediency—

PORCIE
Je dy la verité.

LA NORRICE
De vouloir nostre mal?
PORCIE
Mais nostre utilité.

LA NORRICE
Utilité de voir un tyran nous contraindre?
PORCIE
Non, mais de plusieurs maus il faut choisir le moindre...
J'affecte plusost voir nostre dolente Romme
Serve des volontez de quelque Prince doux
Qu'obeir aux fureurs de ces Scythiques Lous,
De ces trois inhumains, qui n'ont en leur courage
Que l'horreur et l'effroy, que le sang et la rage.
Nous tuasmes Cesar pour n'avoir point de Rois,
Mais au meurtre de luy nous en avons faict trois.
(Act II, pp. 80-81).

Portia's views (which carry the main emphasis in the play and therefore probably reflect Garnier's own beliefs) are very much in line with Machiavelli's thesis that in times of crisis a temporary dictator is needed. I am the more inclined to believe that Garnier was thinking of Machiavelli when he composed Portia's speeches because the republican wife of Brutus and daughter of Cato seems an unlikely person to express the desire for a dictatorship unless this is conceived of as a temporary
measure. This is not praise of monarchy put into the mouth of a republican but a practical solution to a practical situation - indeed Portia's stress on the utility of this solution sounds Machiavellian and is very unlike the usual sixteenth century defence of monarchy as ordained by God (a belief which is expressed in Garnier's later plays). For both Machiavelli and Portia - Garnier, a republic is the ideal, but in a crisis monarchy is the most useful expedient.

As we have seen, Garnier had not yet resolved the problem of the best form of government and he may have been induced by his reading of Machiavelli to discuss the idea of a temporary dictatorship in times of crisis. But the problem was not merely a theoretical one for Garnier; France was going through a period of acute crisis and he may have felt that Machiavelli's concern with times of political change and movement in Il Principe was more relevant to the actual situation in France than was the analysis of static government found in traditional Prince literature.  

Mouflard suggests that the speeches where Portia prefers Caesar's dictatorship to the triumvirate may have been inspired by a sentence in Dio Cassius's Roman History Book 47, which is one of the sources mentioned by Garnier in his 'Argument' to Porcie. Dio describes the triumvirate in the following way:

They did not, to be sure, lay claim to titles which were offensive and had therefore been done away with, but they managed matters according to their own wish and desire, so that Caesar's sovereignty by comparison appeared all gold. (Loeb Classical Edition, vol. V, London and New York, 1917, p. 147).

However, Garnier develops the defence of Caesar far beyond this brief hint in Dio and adds the Machiavellian theme of the necessity of a strong ruler in times of crisis. The stress on the utilitarian nature of this compromise seems particularly Machiavellian.

ii) The Tyrant

The theme of the tyrant figures largely in Garnier's plays and here
the question of Machiavelli's influence on Garnier becomes linked with Garnier's use of Seneca. Seneca greatly influenced sixteenth century writers of tragedy and in particular his influence on Garnier has frequently been pointed out both by his contemporaries and by later historians. Jondorf emphasises the difficulty of disentangling the Senecan elements from the Machiavellian elements in sixteenth century French theatre. Nevertheless, it is obviously necessary to distinguish between Machiavelli and Seneca as far as possible in any study of the influence of Machiavelli on French dramatists, especially in the case of Garnier who probably read Machiavelli's works in the original, rather than relying on the popular idea of Machiavelli, and who could therefore be expected to grasp the distinction between the Machiavellian prince and the Senecan tyrant.

One common question involving both the Senecan tyrant and the Machiavellian prince is whether a ruler should be loved or feared. In Thyestes, Atreus does not avoid being hated by his subjects. His Attendant asks,

Fama te populi nihil
adversa terret?

ATREUS

Maximum hoc regni bonum est,
quod facta domini cogitur populus sui
tam ferre quam laudare.

SATELLES

Quos cogit metus
laudare, eosdem reddit inimicos metus...

ATREUS

Laus vera et humili saepe contingit viro,
non nisi potenti falsa. quod nolunt velint.

This attitude of not caring whether his subjects hate him is typical of the Senecan tyrant. In Machiavelli's Il Principe, however, a Prince is advised not to arouse the hatred of his subjects. In chapter 17, Machiavelli says,
The importance of gaining the goodwill of one's subjects is stressed in Il Principe chapter 19-

 uno principe debbe tenere delle congiure poco conto, quando el popolo li sia benivolo.

(p. 77).

Thus one basic difference between the Senecan tyrant and the Machiavellian Prince is that the former is not afraid of having his subjects hate him, whilst the latter definitely avoids being hated.

Another difference between the Senecan tyrant and the Machiavellian Prince is that the Senecan tyrant often acts out of passion and for private motives. Atreus seeks revenge on Thyestes for personal reasons and to satisfy his blood-lust, rather than for the good of the State or to establish his rule more securely (Thyestes has been thoroughly vanquished anyway by the time the play begins). Atreus delights in his bloody deed and his actions are not in fact depicted as political at all, but as inspired by passion. A modern historian has said,

 If one excepts the territorial ambitions of Lycus and of that aspiring tyrant Eteocles, it is apparent that Seneca's tyrants are concerned with the satisfaction of their private passions, not with the elaboration of a policy which affects the entire public weal...Atreus...is not primarily a tyrant, but a villain seeking revenge...Atreus wreaks his passion only upon members of his own family...there is no implication that his kingdom suffers because of his crime.17

Atreus frequently calls himself a 'villain' and his acts 'crimes'. This is very different from the Machiavellian Prince who destroys only political enemies and solely in order to maintain his position, an action which is presented as beneficial to the nation since it provides a stable rule. His acts are not described as 'crimes' since they are shown as necessary
for the welfare of the State.

In Discorsi I, 9, Machiavelli justifies the murders performed by Romulus because

quello che fece fusse per il bene comune e non per ambizione propria.

(p. 154).

He says,

Conviene bene che, accusandolo il fatto, lo effetto lo scusi; e quando sia buono come quello di Romolo, sempre lo scuserà: perché colui che è violento per guastare, non quello che è per racconciliare, si debbe riprendere.

(pp. 153-4).

Indeed, in Il Principe chapter 8, Machiavelli expressly condemns killing for private interest in order to get power for oneself. Oliverotto da Fermo who killed his uncle in order to rule, is criticised and specific limits are put on the use of cruelty. Acts of cruelty are

bene usate...che si fanno ad un tratto, per necessità dello assicurarsi, e dipoi non vi si insiste dentro, ma si convertiscono in più utilità de'sudditi che si puoS.

(p. 44).

This distinction between the self-interested motives of the Senecan tyrant and the political motivation of the Machiavellian Prince, involves such questions as the 'clemence/rigueur' debate which crops up so frequently in Garnier. If a Machiavellian Prince deals severely with his subjects, it is for political motives such as the security of the State; if a Senecan tyrant deals severely with his subjects or his enemies, it is not a deliberate policy but either from passion and self-interest, as in Thyestes, or because harsh action has been ordained by the gods, for example, the killing of Polyxena and Astyanax in Troades. Therefore, we would expect a Machiavellian character to display a pragmatic approach to the realities of ruling, whereas a Senecan figure would have an inordinate desire for revenge and bloodthirsty deeds.

In general, the Machiavels of Renaissance drama are on a more human scale than the towering Senecan tyrant, whose reason is dominated by his
outsized passions. The Machiavels in Webster and Marlowe are 'little' men who use cunning and opportunism to achieve their ends. In French Renaissance drama, they are often merely advisers to monarchs (see my chapter on Des Masures). The Senecan tyrant is ambitious on the scale of Lucifer but the Machiavels possess none of 'the fatal greatness of the ambitious man'. A Machiavellian figure would coolly do what was necessary for the State, whereas a Senecan character would be a larger-than-life villain, pursuing his ambition to exaggerated lengths.

In examining Garnier's plays, it should be possible to distinguish between the Machiavellian rulers and the Senecan tyrants, with the proviso that Garnier sometimes mingles Machiavellian and Senecan traits in the same character so that at one point he may seem Machiavellian and at another, too exaggeratedly tyrannical to be other than Senecan. Seneca's dramas are primarily philosophical and rhetorical rather than political and Garnier may have turned to Machiavelli as a writer fitting in well with the Senecan atmosphere of tyrants, ruthlessness and broken promises, in order to provide additional political material for his plays.

In Porcie, it is Octavian who in Act III is a mixture of the Machiavellian ruler and the Senecan tyrant. He is depicted as a new ruler, a specifically Machiavellian theme, who wishes to establish his position by thoroughly vanquishing his enemies. His argument with Areus against clemency contains such Machiavellian lines as-

Qui tient ses ennemis, les doit destruire tous.  
(p. 93).
La rigueur est tousjours aux Princes necessaire.  
(p. 93).
Un Prince trop humain ne regne seurement.  
(p. 94).

However, this dialogue between Octavian and Areus is imitated from the tragedy Octavia, thought in the sixteenth century to be by Seneca. In Act II of the Latin play, Seneca, Nero's adviser, urges clemency on Nero. But Nero replies,
Extinguere hostem maxima est virtus ducis.

He too wishes to establish his position securely,

nos quoque maneunt astra, si saevo prior
ense occuparo quidquid infestum est mihi
dignaque nostram subole fundaro domum.
(p. 450).

Yet in Porcie, the way Octavian expresses his desire to vanquish
his enemies seems more Machiavellian than Senecan. For example, Octavian
believes that Caesar's clemency led to his downfall since he should have
killed all his rivals. When Areus suggests that Caesar left a glorious
reputation behind him, Octavian replies,

Il est mort toutefois
AREE
Immortel est son los.
OCTAVE
Mais son corps n'est-il pas dans le sepulchre enclos?
(pp. 95-96).

Garnier seems to me to be portraying Octavian as a modern Machiavel with
a purely utilitarian attitude to rule: he believes that it is actions
which count rather than a concern to leave behind a glorious reputation
for posterity. In the debate between Octavian and Areus, it is revealed
that Octavian has a definite policy and his cruelty arises out of this.

In Octavia, the arguments between Nero and Seneca are much more concerned
with personal matters, such as Nero escaping the influence of his tutor
and wishing to marry whom he pleases.

Elsewhere in Porcie, Octavian is, however, closer to the Senecan
tyrant who wants revenge for its own sake rather than justifying it
through reasons of State. He even displays a hint of the Senecan tyrant's
bloodthirstiness. For example, he says to Anthony,

Donq' Cesar est vengé? donque si peu de morts
Serviront de victime à son funebre corps?
Donq' nos bras engourdis, et trop lasches à suivre
Le dos de l'ennemy, les voudront laisser vivre?
Et tant d'hommes tachez de son cruel trespas
Dans le sombre tombeau ne devaleront pas?
(p. 107).
This is modelled on Nero's speech in Octavia:

O lenta nimium militis nostri manus
et ira patiens post nefas tantum mea,
quod non cruor civilis accensas faces
extinguit in nos, caede nec populi madet
funerea Roma quae viros tales tuit.
(p. 474).

In the figure of Octavian, Garnier has thus mingled Machiavellian
and Senecan traits, though it is possible to distinguish when he is
speaking of revenge for political motives and when his desire for revenge
arises out of his own bloodthirsty and tyrannical character.

iii) Themes on war
a) In Discorsi II, 19, Machiavelli says,

quando non avessi il nimico fuora, lo troverrebbe in casa,
como pare necessario intervienga a tutte le gran cittadi.
(p. 335).

In Il Principe chapter 21, he describes how Ferdinand of Aragon used
this policy of foreign war successfully-

Lui nel principio del suo regno assaltò la Granata, e quella
impressa fu el fondamento dello stato suo. Prima, e'la fece
ozioso, e sanza sospetto di essere impedito: tenne occupati in
quelle li animi di quelli baroni di Castiglia, ei quali,
pensando a quella guerra, non pensavano a innovare...
(p. 89).

The policy of using foreign war to divert civil war was often
associated with Machiavelli in the sixteenth century, for example, in
Pasquier's Pourparler du Prince, the 'Curial''s political advice is
deliberately modelled on Machiavelli and at one point he tells his
Prince,

ne permet que leurs esprits s'abastardissent ou acasanent
en voluptez et exercices de nonprix, et qu'à faute de guerres
foraines, nous ne facions guerres civiles...il semble, qu'à
faute de guerres estrangeres, nous nous guerroyons nous mesmes...
Estans donques quasi necessitez à ce faire par une violence du
ciel, quel autre soing ou pensement doit il demourer en nos
Roys, sinon la puissance des armes contre les estrangers?20

There is a hint of the theme of the preference for foreign war over
civil war in Porcie, in the soldiers' chorus of Act III which has no
equivalent in Octavia. The theme is not presented in a very favourable light since the Roman soldiers' preference is due more to the desire for a good battle than to a wish to avoid the troubles caused to their country by civil war—

C'est aux estranges regions
Qu'il fait bon pour les legions:
C'est dedans ces terres barbares
Que faisant guerre nous pouvions
Souler nos courages avarés...

Il me desplaist que les Romains
S'entre-massacrent de leurs mains,
Et que nos guerriers phalanges
Ne vont en quelques lieux lointains
Combatre les peuples estranges.
(p. 116).

The implication is that foreign war is somehow less of a nuisance than civil war and there is a distinction made between the massacres of civil war and the glorious death of a soldier fighting in foreign wars.

However, the whole theme in Porcie is treated in too general a way for its appearance to be attributed to Machiavelli's influence. Foreign war is not preferred for the political reasons relating to internal security which Machiavelli gives. Moreover, the idea of foreign war being preferable to civil war was so commonplace in the Renaissance that the link with Machiavelli seems tenuous here.\textsuperscript{21} It was often used in sixteenth century politics, for example, by Coligny as an argument for sending an army to help the Reformers in the Netherlands and by those in favour of a crusade against the Turks.\textsuperscript{22}

b) Another potentially Machiavellian theme in Porcie connected with war is the idea that soldiers fight better when driven by necessity. This idea is found in Discorsi III, 12 and L'Arte della Guerra Book 6.\textsuperscript{23} In Porcie Act IV, the messenger recounting the battle of Philippi to Portia remarks that the triumvirs' army fought better than Brutus's army because their soldiers were desperate:
Alors nos ennemis, que la faim tenailloit
Et qui touchoyent leur mort si lon ne batailloit,
Animez de leur chef qui fier les accompagne,
Plus alaigres que nous sortent en la campagne.
(p. 121).

This sounds Machiavellian, but in fact it is an echo of Appian's account of the battle of Philippi in his Roman History Book IV, 1.104-105.

Thus the two themes in Porcie influenced by Machiavelli are the theme of the temporary dictator and the theme of the tyrant. As we move on to examine Garnier's second Roman tragedy (his third play) we will find these Machiavellian themes repeated.

CORNÉLIE. (1574)

i) The Temporary Dictator

The theme of the temporary dictator in Cornélie is centred around Julius Caesar who makes his appearance in Act IV. In the previous acts we build up a picture of him from the speeches of Cicero and Cornelia. In Act I, Cicero describes Caesar as a tyrant who has taken advantage of the weakness of the Romans in order to subjugate ther-

Revienne encore Brute et le hardi Scevole,...
Camille et Manie armez pour nostre Capitole:
Reviennent, et ardans comme ils furent jadis,
Voyons sous un Tyran nos coeurs abastardis
Laschement soupirer, voyent nos ames pleines
De vergoigne endurer mille hontes..vileines.
(p. 155).

This idea of Caesar taking advantage of the corruption of the Roman populace is found in many passages in Machiavelli's Discorsi for example, in Book I, 10-

E veramente cercando un principe la gloria del mondo,
doverebbe desiderare di possedere una città corrotta, non per guastarla in tutto come Cesare, ma per riordinarla come Romolo.
(p. 159).

In Discorsi I, 17, Machiavelli talks of the
corruzione che le parti mariane avevano messa nel popolo;
delle quali sendo capo Cesare, potette accecare quella moltitudine ch'ella non conobbe il giogo che da se medesima si metteva in sul collo.
(p. 178).
There is an apparent verbal echo of Machiavelli in Cicero's description of Caesar:

Et ores nous vivons despouillez par un maistre,
De la liberté franche où nous souilions tous naistre:
Ores le joug pesant dont nous faisions courber
La teste d'un chacun vient dessur nous tomber.
(p. 158).

In Act III, he says of Rome,

Tu es assujettie, et portes à ce coup
Sur ton col orgueilleux un miserable joug!
(p. 185).

Indeed the word 'yoke' is repeated twice more by Cicero to describe Caesar's rule.

However, this description of the corruption of the Roman people and Caesar's power over them may be compared with two previous plays by French authors - Marc-Antoine Muret's *Julius Caesar* (published in 1552) and Jacques Grévin's *César* (published in 1561). Both these plays were known to Garnier. In both, we find Caesar's government referred to as a painful 'yoke' for example, in Act II of Grévin's play, Brutus says,

Le lyon que Lybie eslève entre ses bras,
Le taureau, le cheval ne prestent le col bas
A l'appétit d'un joug, si ce n'est par contrainte:
Fauldra il donc que Ro^me abaisse sous la craincte
De ce nouveau Tyran [Caesar] le chef de sa grandeur...?

It is likely that here Garnier is echoing Muret or Grévin rather than Machiavelli, or indeed this view of Caesar may have occurred to him independently of other authors.

There is another pseudo-Machiavellian echo in Cicero's speech in Act I where he laments the fact that there is no longer any faith between rulers. This sounds like a criticism of Machiavellianism in politics but in fact, as Moufflard points out (vol. III, p. 131), it is a direct imitation of Lucan's *Pharsalia* I, 1.92-99:

nulla fides regni sociis omnisque potestas
impatiens consortis erit...
The description of Caesar is continued in Act III by Cornelia who points to Machiavellian implications in Caesar's behaviour. She accuses Caesar of feigning horror at Pompey's death—

\[ \text{Il plora mort celuy} \]

\[ \text{Qu'il n'eust voulu souffrir estre vif comme luy.} \]

(p. 191)

Tout le bien qu'il en dit n'est que desguisement.

(p. 192).

Caesar's compassion over Pompey's fate is described in Plutarch's *Life of Caesar* XLVIII (Loeb Classical Edition, vol. VII), but there is no suggestion that he was acting hypocritically and in fact his clemency to Pompey's followers is emphasised.

Cornelia continues by describing how Caesar's lust for power frees him from all religious, legal and moral restraints—

\[ \text{...Il n'est chose si sainte} \]
\[ \text{En l'ame des mortels qui puisse retarder} \]
\[ \text{L'indomtable desir qu'on ha de commander.} \]

(p. 193).

This may be imitated from Seneca, but it also fits in well with Machiavelli's *Prince* who is unrestrained by moral or religious scruples.

Cornelia touches upon the theme of the temporary dictator when she emphasises Caesar's need to make his rule secure at the beginning of his reign (1.928-930). This theme is elaborated on in Act IV where Caesar is presented as having seized power for a short time in order to end the wars in Rome and restore peace to the nation. This is not Machiavelli's view of Caesar, but in depicting Caesar as possibly having these aims, Garnier may be thinking, as in *Porcie*, of Machiavelli's idea of the necessity of a temporary dictatorship to restore order.

Thus, in Act IV, Decimus Brutus is unwilling to cause more wars by fighting against Caesar until it becomes clear whether Caesar has seized power permanently or only as a temporary measure—
Possible que luy mesme à l'exemple de Sylle,
Ayant déraciné la discorde civile,
Despouillera la force et la grandeur qu'il a.
(p. 202).

He tells Cassius,

Laissez finir la guerre, alors on cognostra
S'il veut tenir l'Empire, ou s'il s'en demettra.
(p. 205).

The historical source for this meeting between Brutus and Cassius is Appian's *Roman History* Book II, 113, but there is no mention of the possibility of Caesar having seized power temporarily. I can find no other literary source for Brutus's view of Caesar: the dialogue between Brutus and Cassius is imitated from Grévin's *César* Act II, part 2 where, as in Garnier, Cassius is portrayed as more eager for Caesar's death than Brutus. But there is no suggestion that Caesar may have seized power only temporarily. In Grévin's play Brutus, like Cassius, believes that Caesar is a tyrant and must be killed, though he wishes to delay acting for a while in order to hold a debate in the Senate. However, his moderation does not arise out of any questioning of Caesar's political aims: Brutus's description of Caesar in *Cornélié* seems therefore to have been invented by Garnier on the model of the Machiavellian Prince.

The possibility that Caesar intends only a temporary dictatorship is hinted at as he advocates clemency towards one's enemies and prefers to rely on the loyalty of his followers rather than having a strong bodyguard as Anthony advises. The Chorus to Act IV continues the presentation of Caesar in a sympathetic light as he is described as having taken up arms only in self-defence.

Analysis of *Cornélié* reinforces the theory that in discussing various forms of government, Garnier took into consideration Machiavelli's description of a temporary dictator. In *Cornélié*, the Roman populace is corrupt and has lost its desire for freedom, just as the Italy described by Machiavelli in *Il Principe* is weakened and divided. In Garnier's play,
Brutus and Cassius fail in their struggle against Caesar and, as in Il Principe, the implication is that it is better to endure the rule of one man than to drag people who have no concept of freedom, into civil war. The play had lessons for Garnier's contemporaries.

It is perhaps relevant here to mention the classical and Renaissance distinction between the poet, author of fiction, and the historian whose role was to record the facts faithfully. In his presentation of Caesar, Garnier was taking the liberties with history permitted by his role as a poet: history teaches us that Caesar wanted to establish a permanent rule and even a monarchy, but Garnier portrays him at the exact moment when he could be seen as a temporary dictator.

Recent historians such as M. Gras in Robert Garnier. Son Art et sa Méthode (Geneva, 1965) seem not to have noticed the essential ambiguity of Garnier's Caesar. If Caesar is seen merely as a straightforward tyrant, then his clemency in Act IV appears to be out of character: Gras says that the portrayal of Caesar as clement destroys the unity of the play—

César paraît et soutient la clémence contre les conseils de cruauté que lui donne Antoine. Cette attitude du tyran est surprenante après les imprécations que tout le monde a prononcées contre lui, et nuit beaucoup à l'unité de la pièce. (p. 85).

But Garnier's play is unified if one takes Caesar not as a tyrant, but as a Machiavellian Prince, that is, a temporary ruler.

During the period that he was composing Porcie and Cornélie, Garnier seems to have found the idea of a republican form of government attractive in theory, but not very practical, especially in sixteenth century France where a strong ruler was needed to unite the country. In his concern for practical solutions, he may have been interested in Machiavelli's temporary dictator. After Porcie and Cornélie, monarchy is seen as the best form of government and even as God-ordained, and the theme of the temporary dictator is no longer considered.
ii) The Tyrant

In Curiol, Anthony is a much clearer example of a Machiavellian figure than was Octavian in Porcie whom we found to be a mixture of the Senecan tyrant and the Machiavellian Prince. In Act IV, Caesar argues that clemency is the best policy but Anthony tries to persuade him to deal severely with his enemies in order to prevent any possibility of an uprising-

CESAR
Quoy? turoy-je tous ceux de qui j'ay deffiance?

ANTOINE
Vous n'aurez autrement la vie en asseurance.

(p. 215).

Anthony tells Caesar-

Mais je crains que trop bon vous en aillez sauver
Qui voudront contre vous traitrement s'eslever.

(p. 212).

Caesar is a new Prince who has just gained power and Anthony is trying to establish his rule on strong foundations, as Machiavelli advises in Il Principe chapter 7-

Di poi li stati che vengano subito come tutte le altre cose della natura che nascono e crescono presto, non possono avere le barbe e correspondenzie loro in modo, che 'l primo tempo avverso le spenga; se già quelli tali, come è detto, che sí de repente sono diventati principi, non sono di tanta virtù, che quello che la fortuna ha messo loro in grembo, e' sappino subito prepararsi a conservarlo, e quelli fondamenti che li altri hanno fatto avanti che diventino principi, li faccino poi.

(p. 34).

Machiavelli frequently warns the new ruler to exterminate all possible political rivals at the beginning of his rule. In Discorsi I, 16, he says,

...chi prende a governare una moltitudine o per via di libertà o per via di principato, e non si assicura di coloro che a quell'ordine nuovo sono inimici, fa uno stato di poca vita. (pp. 174-175).

Anthony's advice is thus very similar to that of Machiavelli. He tells Caesar,

Aux ennemis domtez il n'y a point de foy.

CESAR
En ceux qui vie et biens de ma bonté reçoivent?
ANTOINE
Voire mais beaucoup plus à la Patrie ils doivent.

CESAR
Pensent-ils que je sois ennemy du pais?

ANTOINE
Mais cruel ravisseur de ses droits envahis.

CESAR
Qui s'opposera plus à mon authorité?

ANTOINE
Ceux qui de force on fait vivre en captivité.

(pp. 213-214).

Anthony is here expressing the Machiavellian idea that a nation accustomed to freedom will only be conquered with difficulty. In II Principe chapter 5, Machiavelli says,

E chi diviene patrone di una città consueta a vivere libera, e non la disfaccia, aspetti di essere disfatto da quella; perché sempre ha per refugio, nella rebellione, el nome della libertà e li ordini antiqui sui, li quali nè per la longhezza de' tempi nè per beneficii mai si dimentican. E per cosa che si faccia o si provegga, se non si disuniscano o dissipano li abitatori, non sdimenticano quel nome nè quelli ordini, e subito in ogni accidente vi ricorrano. (p. 29).

Similarly, Anthony tells Caesar that the Roman Republic has been accustomed to freedom and however much clemency Caesar displays, they will never forget their former state.

Anthony continues with a statement of another Machiavellian theme—that benefits do not turn enemies into friends,

CESAR
On fait bien d'ennemis quelquefois des amis.

ANTOINE
On fait plus aisément d'amis des ennemis.

CESAR
On gaigne par bien faits les coeurs les plus sauvages.

ANTOINE
On ne sçauoient flechir les resolus courages.

(pp. 214-215).

This idea is hinted at in the passage from II Principe chapter 5 quoted above and it is also found in II Principe chapter 7 where Machiavelli warns the new ruler that,

chi crede che ne' personaggi grandi e'benefizii nuovi faccino dimenticare le iniurie vecchie, s'inganna. (p. 40).
In Discorsi III, 4, he says,

si può ricordare ad ogni potente che mai le ingiurie vecchie furono cancellate da' benefici nuovi...
(pp. 387-8).

Thus, in this scene, Anthony expresses three Machiavellian rules of statesmanship: that a new ruler should seek to establish a secure rule by dealing severely with his subjects at the beginning; that in a State accustomed to freedom, the new ruler will always be regarded as a 'cruel ravisseur de ses droits envahis'; and that benefits never cancel out injuries. In addition, Anthony possesses several personal characteristics reminiscent of Machiavelli's ruler. For example, he is presented as irreligious. When Caesar says,

Les Dieux et la fortune ont soin de nous garder,

Anthony replies,

Sur l'attente des Dieux ne se faut hasarder.

(p. 216).

He prefers to rely on human resources and advises Caesar to take his own precautions by having a bodyguard.

Therefore, in Garnier's play, Anthony, like the Machiavellian ruler, is concerned with ways of maintaining and preserving power, and is not at all the Senecan tyrant passionately seeking revenge for personal reasons. There is a similar scene between Anthony and Caesar in Grévin's César Act I where Anthony urges Caesar to make his power felt, but there is no detailed political advice as in Garnier, and the discussion is certainly not reminiscent of Machiavelli. Garnier's use of Machiavellian themes in Cornélie is thus original; it would be interesting to know whether Anthony is intended to represent any contemporary adviser of Charles IX.

MARC ANTOINE (1578)

1) The Tyrant

In Act III of Marc Antoine, Anthony and Lucilius hold a discussion about Caesar's (Octavian) future plans. A certain Lucilius is mentioned
in Plutarch's *Life of Anthony* LXIX as being a companion of Anthony but this scene between them is a total invention by Garnier.

Lucilius believes that Caesar will be clement towards Anthony since he is his brother-in-law and helped him defeat Brutus and Cassius. Anthony however has a clearer perception of the necessities of rule and the desire for power. He says,

L'alliance et le sang demeurent sans pouvoir
Contre les convoiteux, qui veulent tout avoir...
Toute chose est renverse, et tout droit est estint,
Amitié, parentele: et n'y a rien si saint
Qu'on n'aie violant pour se rendre seul maistre:
Et n'a-t'on soing comment, pourveu qu'on le puisse estre.
(p. 57).

This is perhaps closer to the picture of a Senecan tyrant and to the methods of acquiring power by crime condemned by Machiavelli in *Il Principe* chapter 8, but Anthony adds that Caesar will have to kill him in order to ensure the safety of his rule—

Son Empire asseuré jamais ne pensera
Tandis que Marc Antoine en ce monde sera.
(p. 58).

An exaggerated Senecan desire for revenge is placed within a Machiavellian framework of a policy of extermination of political rivals for the future stability of the State.

Anthony continues by describing the Machiavellian methods Caesar has used to gain power—

La fraude est sa vertu, la ruse et la malice,
Ses armes sont les arts du cauteleux Ulysse,
A Modene conneus par les Consuls, navrez
Tous deux de coups mortels par ses gens attitez,
Pour avoir leur armee, et en faire la guerre,
Contre sa foy promise, à sa natale terre.
Du triumvir Lepide à son secours venu,
Qu'il devoit honorer comme il estoit tenu,
L'empire il usurpa...
(p. 60).

Caesar is described as using ruse in warfare and Anthony, a brave warrior in the past, despises Caesar for this and calls him
Un homme effeméné de corps et de courage,
Qui du mestier de Mars n'apprist oncque l'usage.
(p. 59).

Machiavelli recommends using ruse in warfare in Discorsi III, 40.
However, waging war by guile rather than combat, was often recommended by sixteenth century humanists such as More in his Utopia, Rabelais in Gargantua, Ronsard (vol. VIII, p. 75 of the Laumonier 'critical' edition) and Joachim Du Bellay (vol. IV of the Chamard edition of his Oeuvres, p. 140). Anthony's scorn of Caesar's lack of physical prowess may be merely the traditional Roman preference for a straightforward combat.31

On the other hand, Caesar is also accused of breaking his promise not to wage war. This use of guile in statecraft was criticised by those humanists who supported the same quality in warfare, since in a political context, it was thought to undermine trust.32 Breaking one's promises was inalienably associated with Machiavelli in sixteenth century French writing and it does seem as if, in this speech by Anthony, Garnier wishes to depict Caesar as a Machiavel.

Caesar is a new Prince, a usurper, as is the Machiavellian Prince and moreover, it is Lepidus's empire he has usurped despite the fact that Lepidus had previously helped him. One can compare Il Principe chapter 3 where Machiavelli warns those who would help others to power that the distrust of the new ruler will ruin them,

Di che si cava una regola generale, la quale mai o raro falla: che chi è cagione che uno diventi potente, ruina; perché quella potenzia è causata da colui o con industria o con forza, è l'una e l'altra di queste due è sospetta a chi è divenuto potente.
(p. 25).

The picture of Caesar as a scheming Machiavellian ruler thus begins to form before we actually see him. He makes his appearance in Act IV where he argues against Agrippa's plea for clemency, saying that he must ensure his victory by massacring his political enemies,
Donc à fin que jamais aucun durant mes jours
Se voulant elever ne treuve du secours,
Il faut de tant de sang marquer nostre victoire,
Qu'il en soit pour exemple à tout jamais memoire:
Il faut tout massacrer, si qu'il ne reste aucun
Qui trouble à l'advenir nostre repos commun.

Like Anthony in Cornélie, Caesar is here expressing the Machiavellian policy of establishing a firm rule at the outset in order to secure the safety of the State. In Il Principe chapter 8, Machiavelli says,

Onde è da notare, che nel pigliare uno stato, debbe l'occupatore di esso discorrere tutte quelle offese che li è necessario fare, e tutte farle a uno tratto, per non le avere a rinnovare ogni di, e potere, non le innovando, assicurare li uomini e guadagnarseli con beneficiargli.

The argument about securing one's rule at the beginning of one's reign continues as Caesar says,

Des meurtres doit user qui s'asseurer desire.
AGRIPPE
On ne s'asseure point, des ennemis faisant.
CESAR
Je n'en fay pas aussi, je les vay destruisant.

Caesar is not afraid of being feared by his subjects. As in Il Principe, the nation is corrupt and needs a strong ruler. He says,

Que lon porte d'honneur à un Prince severe!

The whole debate between Agrippa and Caesar-Ocatavian is based, as is the discussion between Octavian and Areus in Porcie, on the dialogue between Nero and Seneca in Act II of Octavia. However, as in Porcie, the arguments in favour of severity are very much developed in Garnier and are motivated by political imperatives rather than personal passion (though Caesar's private grudge against Anthony for neglect of his sister is mentioned). Unlike Nero, Caesar has a definite policy of wishing to secure his rule against his political enemies.

Thus, the discussion between Agrippa and Caesar is not just an abstract debate but tied to a specific policy. Gras, in the work cited
above p. 409, sees Caesar as a typical Senecan tyrant (pp. 87-88) and criticises Garnier for making him lament Anthony's death. As with Caesar's clemency in Cornélie Gras finds this pity out of keeping with the character of a tyrant—

Au point de vue psychologique, la conduite de César est encore plus inconcevable que celle de Cornélie...Pour César il n'y a aucune raison pour cet attendrissement aussi soudain qu'inattendu, et surtout aucune tentative de la part de l'auteur pour mieux cerner la peinture de son caractère. Selon Garnier, émotion et raisonnement sont les deux pôles et les deux moteurs d'une tragédie et tout, jusqu'à la plus élémentaire logique dans un caractère, leur est sacrifié. (p. 88).

But if, in Marc Antoine, Caesar is a Machiavellian ruler carrying out a policy of 'rigueur' for political rather than personal reasons, his lament for Anthony remains in character and does not destroy the unity of the play. Gras has failed to seize the subtleties of Garnier's presentation of rulers in Porcie, Cornélie and Marc Antoine and therefore finds contradictions in the characterisation and indeed labels these tragedies as 'vides de psychologie' (p. 88). If we see Garnier's rulers as Machiavellian Princes, then the psychology in these three plays remains consistent and the characters are not merely abstractions as Gras maintains (p. 85) but are individualised through the addition of several traits of the Machiavellian Prince.

ii) Foreign War

The theme of foreign war as preferable to civil war recurs in the Chorus to Act IV of Marc Antoine. We have seen in our analysis of Porcie (pt. 9-10), that this theme was occasionally linked by French authors with Machiavelli's theories. However, in Marc Antoine, as in Porcie, there is none of the Machiavellian stress on foreign war being beneficial to the internal security and unity of a nation. It is simply seen as less futile and less destructive than civil war—
Aumoins si la guerre retourne,  
Qu'entre nous elle ne sejourné  
Pour nous occire mutinez  
De glaives ailleurs destinez:  
Que nos armes tourment les pointes  
Contre l'estomach des Germains,  
Des Parthes aux refuittes feintes,  
Et des Cantabres inhumains.  

This owes little to Machiavelli.

LA TROADE (1579)

i) The Tyrant

In Act II of La Troade, Ulysses tells Andromache that the killing of Astyanax is a political necessity, to ensure the future safety of the Greeks—

Je scay que la pitié, la pitié maternelle  
Vous peut faire trouver ma demande cruelle:  
Mais si considérez, vide de passion,  
Combien sa vie importe à nostre nation,  
Combien le Grec soudard, chenu dessous les armes,  
A crainte de rentrer en nouvelles allarmes,  
Franchir nouveaux dangers, après avoir le sein  
Par tant de durs combats de mille ulcères plein,  
VOUS MESME EXCUSEREZ CET ACTE NECESSAIRE,  
ET NE M'ESTIMEREZ POUR CELA SANGUINAIRE.  
Je ferois le semblable envers mon propre fils,  
Et jadis le semblable, Agamemnon, tu fis,  
Livrant ton Iphigene à Diane homicide,  
Pour sauver nos vaisseaux retenus en Aulide.  
Ne trouvez donc estrange et dur ce que je dis,  
Puis que ce Roy vainqueur l'a bien souffert jadis.  
(p. 49).33

This is very similar to Ulysses's speech in Act II of Seneca's Troades—

...est quidem iniusstus dolor  
rerum aestimator; si tamen tecum exigas,  
veniam dabis, quod bella post hiemes decem  
totidemque messes iam senex miles timet  
aliasque clades rursus ac numquam bene  
Troiam iacentem. magna res Danaos movet,  
futurus Hector. libera Graios metu.  
haec una naves causa deductas tenet,  
hac classis haeret. neve crudelum putes,  
quod sorte iussus Hectoris natum petam;  
petissem Oresten. patere quod victor tuit.  
As Mouflard points out (op. cit., vol. III, p. 316) Garnier has added the two lines in capitals to Ulysses's speech and these have the effect of making Ulysses sound Machiavellian. He echoes Machiavelli's idea that cruelty is necessary in order to restore peace to a State. For example, in Il Principe chapter 17, we are told,

Debbe per tanto uno principe non si curare della infamia di crudele...perché con pochissimi esempi sarà più pietoso che quelli e' quali, per troppa pietà, lasciano seguire e' disordini, di che ne nasca occasioni o rapine: perché queste sogliono offendere una universalità intera, e quelle esecuzioni che vengono dal principe offendono uno particolare. (p. 69).

It is impossible not to agree with Mouflard that the two lines added to Ulysses's speech are the result of a deliberate wish on Garnier's part to give Ulysses some Machiavellian traits.34 Once again, we see how well Machiavellian arguments of 'raison d'état' fit in with the portrayal of a Senecan tyrant, a coincidence which Garnier seems early to have seized upon and adapted for his own purposes.

An interesting footnote in connection with Garnier's portrayal of Ulysses, is the influence of Jean de La Taille's La Famine, ou les Gabeonites (published in 1573) on La Troade. After 1572, Garnier and La Taille became acquainted with each other's work and there was a mutual literary influence.35 Cornélie, Porcie and Marc Antoine reveal only a limited influence of La Taille, but La Troade and Antigone are heavily influenced by La Taille's conception of drama, in particular, the use of multiple sources. In the chapter on the La Taille brothers, we will see that the scene between Joabe and Rezefe in La Famine is, like that between Ulysses and Andromache in La Troade, modelled on Seneca's Troades. Interestingly, La Taille's Joabe also displays some Machiavellian traits such as his use of religion as a cloak for acts of policy, his dissimulation and his wish to eliminate all political rivals (see chapter 8, pp.172-7).
One wonders how much Garnier's knowledge of Machiavelli was deepened by reading La Taille's works and how far he was inspired by the example of La Taille to work Machiavellian traits into his Senecan characters. It is perhaps merely coincidental that the addition to Ulysses's speech in Garnier's play contains the words 'cet acte nécessaire' — or it may be an unconscious echo of La Taille's poem, Le Prince Nécessaire, based on Machiavelli's ideas.

Pyrrhus, who appears in Act III of La Troade is another potentially Machiavellian figure, but the debate between Agamemnon and Pyrrhus owes more to Act II of Seneca's Troades than to Machiavelli. As in the Troades, Agamemnon is weary of war and wants to pardon his enemies, whilst Pyrrhus wishes to exact revenge, more from personal motives (for the 'gloire' of Achilles) than from any valid political reasoning. Pyrrhus says,

Ce qui plaist au vaincueur est loisible de faire.

(p. 75).

But this is also in Seneca—

Quodcumque libuit facere victori licet.

(p. 150).

There follows a scene between Pyrrhus and Hecuba with Pyrrhus explaining to Hecuba the reasons for the sacrifice of Polyxena. This scene is modelled on that between Odysseus and Hecuba in Euripides's Hecuba but Pyrrhus invokes reasons of State for the killing, not found in Euripides. Thus, he argues that 'le salut commun de la Grèce' requires the death of Polyxena, in a way similar to Ulysses's argument on the political necessity of Astyanax's death. This addition by Garnier is perhaps the result of a wish to make Pyrrhus's revenge political as well as personal, Machiavellian as well as Senecan.

A final Machiavellian figure is Polymestor who appears in Act V of La Troade. This episode where Polymestor kills Polydorus is taken from Euripides's Hecuba. As in Euripides's play, Polymestor dissimulates
compassion for the Trojans' plight when he first appears. As in Euripides, he hides behind the pretext of reasons of State when his murder of Polydorus is discovered. He asks disingenuously,

...n'ay-je pas bien fait d'esteindre dans mes terres,
Pour nostre commun bien, la semence des guerres?
J'ay prudent redouté que cet enfant un jour
Repeuplast de bannis le Troïque sejour.
(p. 118).

This sounds like a Machiavellian desire to exterminate all possible political rivals in order to secure the peace of his kingdom but, as Agamemnon points out, Polymestor really killed Polydorus out of greed for his wealth. Moreover, the lines quoted above are imitated from Hecuba, 1. 1137-1144.

Thus in La Troade, although there are traces of Machiavellianism in Pyrrhus and Polymestor, the only character whom Garnier probably deliberately intended to portray as a Machiavel is Ulysses.

ii) Perfidy

The theme of perfidy in La Troade is centred around Polymestor who is condemned by Agamemnon in Act V for having broken his promise to Hecuba that he would protect Polydorus. The theme is announced by the Chorus to Act IV which bewails the treachery of modern times—

L'alme foy n'habite pas
Ici bas:
La fraude victorieuse,
L'ayant bannie, à son tour
Fait sejour
Sur la terre vicieuse.
(p. 106).

The Chorus continues by describing the kind of treachery prevalent now that 'la foy' has left the earth, together with Astraea. This Chorus is loosely based on Hercules Oetaeus (see Mouflard, op. cit., vol. III, pp. 59-60) but the development on perfidy seems to represent a personal comment on the times by Garnier. 36

It was hard to talk of perfidy in the latter part of the sixteenth century without one's readers thinking immediately of Il Principe chapter
18. There, Machiavelli states,

Non può per tanto uno signore prudente, né debbe, osservare la fede, quando tale osservanzia li torni contro, e che sono spente le cagioni che la feciono promettere...
Né mai a uno principe mancarono cagioni legittime di colorire la inosservanzia,

and

Quanto sia laudabile in uno principe mantenere la fede e vivere con integrità e non con astuzia, ciascuno lo intende: nondimano si vede per esperienzia ne' nostri tempi quelli principi avere fatto gran cose che della fede hanno tenuto poco conto, e che hanno saputo con l'astuzia aggirare e cervelli delli uomini, e alla fine hanno superato quelli che si sono fondati in su la lealtà.

In Discorsi III, 42, he says,

non è vergognosa non osservare quelle promesse che ti sono state fatte promettere per forza ... non si osservano ancora tutte le altre promesse quando e' mancano le cagioni che le feciono promettere.

Many political pamphlets in the sixteenth century linked Machiavelli specifically with the idea of broken promises, for example, the

Reveille Matin des François et de leurs voisins (1574):

une des leçons de Machiavel ... est de ne garder aucune foy qu'autant qu'on la cuidera turner à son advantage.


In Traicté de la Majesté Royale en France (Paris, 1597, BL 8050 bbb 28, p. 33), Pierre Poisson openly attacks Machiavelli and depicts the collapse of society which would follow on the disappearance of mutual trust between men. In the Recherches de la France (ed. cit., B. IV, chapter 3), Estienne Pasquier agrees that it is trust that holds society together and that even forced promises should not be broken. This theme of the collapse of the social order if perfidy were to become prevalent, is taken up by Montaigne in the Essais III, 1 (De l'utile et de l'honneste). In the Essais II, 17, (De la Praesumption), Montaigne clearly alludes to Machiavelli without naming him, obviously feeling that Machiavelli's views on broken promises were so well known that everyone would realise whom he had in mind.
Indeed, there is a good case for arguing that Machiavelli's enemies extended the scope of his advocacy of perfidy in order to make him sound more objectionable. In the Discorsi (which often expand and explain Il Principe) he mentions only promises extracted by force (Discorsi III, 42) and promises made to foreign powers (Discorsi III, 40). These, he says need not be kept. In Il Principe, Machiavelli does not explicitly state whether he is dealing with promises made by a prince to his subjects, or, as in the Discorsi, with promises extracted by force or made to foreign powers. His opponents, however, insist that he is advocating 'internal' perfidy.

The Chorus to Act IV of La Troade takes on an extra dimension if examined in the light of this polemic against Machiavelli and it was in fact probably intended as Garnier's contribution to the debate on broken promises.

ANTIGONE, OU LA PIETE (1580)

i) The Tyrant

When Creon first appears, in Act IV of Antigone, it is as a new ruler who wishes to establish his rule securely and stamp out any rebellion. He says,

Toute principauté en repos se maintient,
Quand on rend à chacun ce qui luy appartient.
Il faut le vicieux punir de son offense,
Et que l'homme de bien le Prince recompense.

(p. 201).

Garnier's portrayal of Creon is closely modelled on Sophocles's description in the Greek tragedy Antigone, but Creon's desire to establish his rule securely at the outset is an addition by the French dramatist, possibly inspired by Machiavelli. Creon wishes to deal out rewards and punishments fairly in order to preserve his rule. Machiavelli also makes respect for the law one of the basic factors in a strong rule (see Il Principe ch. 12; Discorsi I, 16, 58; III, 8).
There are other hints that Garnier is intending to portray Creon as a Machiavellian ruler. For example, Ismène believes that he is seeking to wipe out the former ruling family, a policy advocated by Machiavelli (1.1574-5, p. 193). This comment is not found in Sophocles's Antigone. Jocasta, in a passage not found in Garnier's model, Statius, calls Creon a usurper (p. 177) - the Machiavellian Prince was usually a usurper. Creon's fatal error lies in the way in which he sets about establishing his rule, for he has introduced a new edict which directly contravenes the religion of his subjects. In doing so, he genuinely believes that he is acting for the good of the State and to establish a peaceful rule. He seems to be motivated by the type of reasoning applied by Machiavelli in chapter 18 of Il Principe:

> uno principe, e massime uno principe nuovo, non può osservare tutte quelle cose per le quali li uomini sono tenuti buoni, sendo spesso necessitato, per mantenere lo stato, operare contro alla fede, contro alla carità, contro alla umanità, contro alla religione.

(p. 73).

When Antigone transgresses his edict, Creon regards her action as political rebellion and is determined to punish her because the insecurity of his position as a new ruler demands that he deal severely with all acts of political revolt. He persists in seeing her action as a political one, despite the fact that she tells him that it was motivated purely by her duty to God and to her brother. She says,

> Je n'ay rien entrepris que d'amour naturelle.

(p. 208). Because of Creon's blindness in continuing to see Antigone's action in a political rather than a religious light, the dialogue between them is conducted on two entirely different planes - Creon speaking in the vocabulary of politics, and Antigone in terms of piety and moral duty. The dichotomy is clearly expressed in the following two lines,

> CREON
> Vous avez l'inhumant mes edicts transgressé.
> ANTIGONE
> Mais la loy de nature et des Dieux est plus forte.

(p. 207).
Creon is so carried away with anger at the fact that his law has been broken that he becomes blind to the truth of the situation. Even when Ismêne tells him that Antigone's action was performed from religious motives he persists in thinking only in a political context:

ISMENE
Le crime qu'elle a fait n'est que de pieté.
CREON
Elle n'a qu'entrepris sur mon authorité.
(p. 211).

Although the scene between Creon and Antigone is very closely modelled on Sophocles, Garnier has suppressed everything in Sophocles which does not relate to the conflict of politics versus piety: so whereas in Sophocles, Antigone is seen partly as a woman in revolt against a patriarchal society, Garnier's Antigone is depicted purely as a political rebel. Creon acts out of passion in Sophocles, but in Garnier his personal feelings are suppressed and he is motivated by political principles alone. Thus Garnier illustrates the blindness of someone who, like Creon, is concerned only with establishing political order and in doing so, seems to indict Machiavelli's advice to the new ruler in chapter 18 of Il Principe quoted above.

Creon's blindness to religious imperatives continues in his discussion with Haemon-

C'est une audacieuse, une fille arrogante,
A qui nostre grandeur est au coeur desplaisante.
Si est-ce qu'il n'est rien qui soit tant perilleux
A l'estat d'un grand Roy, qu'un sujet orgueilleux,
Qu'un sujet contumax, qui sans fin s'evertue
D'estre contrariant à tout ce qu'il statue.
(p. 214).

Haemon agrees, but points out that Antigone's action was not politically motivated-

...souvent autre est l'intention
D'un sujet qu'il ne semble à nostre opinion:
Tel forfait griefement, qui forfaire ne pense.
(p. 214).

This dialogue between Creon and Haemon is closely modelled on Sophocles's Antigone, but again Garnier suppresses all that does not relate to the
political theme such as the discussion on the relative merits of men and women in Creon's speech (Antigone, 1. 676-680).

The Chorus at the end of this scene defines Creon's fault as being an excessive wish to secure political stability for his kingdom—

Car celuy mainte fois
Qui de cruelles loix
Une cité police,
Par sa rigueur mesfait
Plus que celuy ne fait
Dont il punist le vice...

...le crime n'est tel
Qu'il doive estre mortel.

(p. 221).

In this Act, Creon is depicted as a new ruler incapable of pursuing any other goal than political stability. Like other rulers in Garnier's plays, Creon seems to hold political views very much akin to those of Machiavelli, such as the importance of establishing one's position securely at the beginning of the reign, as well as a disregard for the religious beliefs of his subjects. If, as I believe, Garnier was deliberately depicting Creon as a Machiavellian Prince, then his attack on Machiavellianism in politics is at its most penetrating and subtle in Antigone.

For in Garnier's other plays, such as Marc Antoine and Les Juives, the ruler is faced with a genuine political rival and he has to decide how to deal with him (the 'clemence/rigueur' debate). In Antigone the debate of clemency versus severity takes on a new aspect since Creon's arguments in favour of severity are based on the mistaken belief that Antigone is a political rival. Thus the debate becomes not a discussion of political behaviour, but an illustration of someone's blindness to the religious impulse which animates men. It was well-known in the sixteenth century that Machiavelli separated politics from religion in Il Principe where he either regards religion merely as politically useful or warns the Prince that he must be prepared to act against religious principles when necessary. In his portrayal of Creon, Garnier seems to have been
attempting to describe the dangers of such a purely utilitarian attitude
to religion and in doing so, places himself at the heart of opposition to
Machiavelli's writings.

In Act V, we see Creon's pursuit of purely political goals has
brought failure. The Messenger's opening speech describes Creon's
unhappiness and Creon himself recognises that his excessive concentration
on the political aspect of his situation has brought ruin on his whole
family. He finally acknowledges that Antigone's action was not political,

J'ay enclose Antigone en une cave noire,
Pour un piteux office, et qui merite gloire.
(p. 240).

The final Chorus of the play, not found in Sophocles, emphasises that
Creon's fault arose out of the impiety of despising funeral rites—

Vos pertes, vos malheurs, que vous avez soufferts
Procedent du mespris du grand Dieu des Enfers:
Il le faut honorer, et toujours avoir cure
De ne priver aucun du droict du sepulture.
(p. 243).

This seems a lame and conventional ending until it is set in the
context of the whole debate of politics versus religion. Creon's
disregard for, indeed complete blindness to, the religious needs of his
subjects has ended in disaster. He has caused the deaths of his niece,
his wife and his son. What more complete comment could there be on those
who, like Machiavelli, advise a ruler to put politics before religion?
For Garnier, patriotism is not enough. The pivot of the play is the contrast
between Creon's impiety and Antigone's piety (indeed the subtitle is
La Pieté). Creon's irreligion is not presented as a deliberate flouting of
divine laws, but more subtly as an incomprehension of the religious
impulse in men, an incomprehension Garnier apparently believed was
implicit in the Machiavellian attitude to politics.

Another potential tyrant in Antigone is Polynices, but he turns out
to be more Senecan than Machiavellian. For example, he does not care
whether he is hated by his subjects, as long as he is feared and obeyed.
His desire for power quickly degenerates into the exaggeration and violence
typical of the Senecan tyrant and indeed his speeches are closely modelled on those of Eteocles in Seneca's *Phoenissae*.

ii) **Perfidy**

The theme of perfidy in *Antigone* centres around the two brothers, Polynices and Eteocles. In Act I (p. 145), Oedipus depicts his sons as disloyal, cruel and irreligious, but this passage is closely modelled on Oedipus's speech in Seneca's tragedy *Phoenissae* (of which only fragments are extant)-

\[
\text{Illis parentis ullus aut aequi est amor,} \\
\text{avidis cruoris imperi'armorum doli,} \\
\text{diris scelestis, breviter ut dicam-meis?} \\
\text{(ed. cit., II, p. 366)}
\]

Eteocles is frequently called 'un parjure' and a 'viateur de foy' for having broken his promise to share the rule of Thebes with Polynices. But in each case, Garnier is echoing Seneca. For example, Polynices says,

\[
\text{Quelle peine plus dure} \\
\text{Eussé-je deu porter si j'eusse esté parjure} \\
\text{Comme cet affronteur? Doy-je souffrir le mal} \\
\text{Que devroit endurer un coeur si desloyal?} \\
\text{Faut-il qu'il ait profit de sa fraude et malice?} \\
\text{(p. 162).}
\]

The source in Seneca gives-

\[
\text{quid paterer aliud, si fefellissem fidem?} \\
\text{si peierassem? fraudis alienae dabo} \\
\text{poenas, at ille praemium scelerum feret?} \\
\text{(p. 390).}
\]

Eteocles's use of ruse in his combat with Polynices is seen as part of his general perfidy (pp. 176-7) but again there is a classical source for Polynices's accusation: Statius's *Thebaid* XI 1.568-9-

\[
\text{ille autem: 'vivisne an adhuc manet ira superstes, perfide,} \\
\text{nec sedes unquam meriture quietas?'}
\]

Sö, the theme of perfidy in *Antigone* appears to owe nothing to Machiavelli's influence.
iii) The Preference for Foreign War

For the first time, Garnier links this theme with the desire to safeguard the internal security of the State, a link also made by Machiavelli. The political dangers of civil war are stressed, for example, in Act I where Antigone and Oedipus discuss the risk of foreigners overrunning Thebes. Similarly, in Act II, Jocasta emphasises the danger of the Greeks taking advantage of the civil war to conquer Thebes. She recommends foreign war to Polynices as a lesser evil than the civil war he has embarked on—

> Poussez de vos soldars les fieres legions  
> Dans les champs Lydiens, fertiles regions...  
> Là vaudra beaucoup mieux vos forces employer  
> Pour un sceptre nouveau que de nous guerroyer:  
> Vous y pourrez, sans crime, acquerrre un diadême.  
> (p. 163).

However, this speech is a very close imitation of Jocasta's speech to Polynices in the Phoenissae (pp. 390-394). Machiavelli is not the most obvious source for the theme of the preference for foreign war in Garnier.

**LES JUIVES** (1583)

i) The Tyrant

Mouflard cites Nebuchadnezzar's line

> Qui n'est cruel n'est pas digne de royautez

as an example of Machiavelli's influence on Garnier's portrayal of this tyrant.44 But it is rather a dubious instance since we have seen (pp. 399-400) that Machiavelli approves only of cruelty when it is necessary to restore order to a State and distinguishes between this kind of 'necessary' cruelty and cruelty used at random over a long period of time. True, in Act II, Nebuchadnezzar's revenge is seen as politically motivated (since Zedekiah has allied with Nebuchadnezzar's enemy). But even in Act II, Nebuchadnezzar seems to take an exaggerated delight in the thought of revenge and Nabuzardan has to warn him against the dangers of excessive anger. Nabuzardan agrees that a Prince has a
political duty to punish his enemies but highlights the difference between Nebuchadnezzar and the true Machiavel when he tells Nebuchadnezzar not to act out of passion—

Tout prince doit au crime attacher le supplice... 
...Mais gardez-vous de faire Que la punition excède le salaire.

Nebuchadnezzar is closer to the Senecan tyrant (this scene is modelled on Octavia and Thyestes) than to the Machiavellian Prince. In Act III, Nebuchadnezzar's bloodthirstiness develops as he becomes completely absorbed by the idea of revenge—

Je le tiens je le tiens, je tiens la beste prise, 
Je jouis maintenant du plaisir de ma prise.45

The 'political' act has turned into an action inspired by passion and personal malice. Unlike the Machiavellian ruler, he will not try to avoid being hated by his subjects. He tells his wife,

La haine des sujets nous rend plus glorieux,

and says that a King may rule according to his own whim—

Celuy ne regne pas qui son vouloir limite: 
Aux Rois qui peuvent tout, toute chose est licite.

This is not at all Machiavellian for in Discorsi I, 58, Machiavelli says, un principe che puo fare ciò ch'ei vuole è pazzo. (p. 265).

Part of this portrayal of Nebuchadnezzar arises out of Garnier's wish to show him as a self-idolater. Blasphemously, he compares himself to God—

Dieu fait ce qu'il luy plaist, et moy je fay de mesme.

Nebuchadnezzar is a Biblical as well as a Senecan tyrant.46

At the end of Act III, Nebuchadnezzar rejoices in the thought of killing the Jewish priests before Zedekiah's very eyes (this is imitated from Thyestes) and by Act V, he has become the complete tyrant, killing Zedekiah's children in front of their own father. Such bloodthirsty acts owe nothing to Machiavelli and highlight in fact the difference between a Senecan/Biblical tyrant and Machiavellian rulers such as Anthony
in *Cornélie*, Creon in *Antigone* and Octavian in *Porcie* and *Marc Antoine*.

ii) **Perfidy**

In *Les Juives* the Machiavellian theme of broken promises forms a background to the religious drama. Nebuchadnezzar broke his promise when he usurped rule of Israel and the Chorus of Jews in Act II says,

\[ \ldots \text{cet Assyrien, contre sa foy promise,} \]
\[ \text{Jerusalem pilla comme par force prise.} \]

The Jews also describe how the Egyptians have broken their promise by holding Amital's son hostage. This is an additional treachery invented by Garnier since according to *Kings* 14: 22, Joachaz died in prison.

In Act II the theme of broken promises is linked with the theme of idolatry since the Israelites have broken the Covenant, their promise to God, by worshipping other gods. This theme is found in the scene between Amital and the Jews.

In Act III, Nebuchadnezzar describes Zedekiah as 'un rompeur d'alliance' and 'un roy parjure'. In Act IV it is again Zedekiah's broken promise which is stressed as Nebuchadnezzar calls him 'un violeur de foy' and demands

\[ \text{Qui t'a mis en l'esprit de faulser ta parole,} \]
\[ \text{N'en faire non plus cas que de chose frivole?} \]
\[ \text{De parjurer ta foy?} \ldots \]

Nebuchadnezzar's accusation is found in Flavius Josephus's *Jewish Antiquities* X, from which this scene is taken, but the theme of perfidy is emphasised and developed by Garnier.

In a scene invented by Garnier where the Provost comes for Zedekiah's children, he asks Amital and her daughters-in-law to trust him. Amital replies,

\[ \text{Mes filles, vous voyez qu'il n'y a point de feinte,} \]
\[ \text{Que sa parole est vraye, et sa promesse sainte.} \]

Amital's reaction to the murder of the children is to emphasise the perfidy of Nebuchadnezzar and the Provost—
O Roy parjure! ô la déloyauté!...
Est-ce ainsi qu'ils devoyent demeurer en hostage,
Et le roy, le seigneur, délivrer de servage?...
O propos mensongers! ô promesse trompeuse!
O desloyal courage! ô fraude malheureuse!47

Nebuchadnezzar's final perfidy is to break his promise to Amital that Zedekiah will be pardoned.

It does seem as if Garnier has deliberately developed the theme of broken promises in Les Juives. In each case, a political motive for the breaking of promises is invoked, for example, Nebuchadnezzar claims that he has to punish Zedekiah to ensure the strengthening of his authority, Zedekiah broke his promise by forming an alliance with the Egyptians in order to make Israel powerful. In contrast with the Senecan tyrant for example, Atreus, who breaks his promise to Thyestes out of hatred, they all allegedly seek to gain some political advantage by breaking their promises. There is an implicit comment on this Machiavellian policy of breaking promises since it is shown to lead to disaster.48 By allying with the Egyptians, Zedekiah brings ruin on his family and his country. Nebuchadnezzar is not punished in the play, but the future wrath of God upon him is indicated by the Prophet at the end.

BRADAMENTE (1582)

i) Broken Promises

Even in this tragicomedy, Garnier's continuing interest in politics is revealed as he builds up Charlemagne as the ideal King. This is an addition to his model, Ariosto, as is his development of the theme of broken promises in this play. In Act II, Aymon wishes Charlemagne to change his edict concerning the marriage of Bradamente, but his wife replies,

C'est chose malaisee, un Prince ne viole
Les Edicts qu'il a faicts, il maintient sa parole.

Also in this Act, Renaud tells his father that Roland and Olivier have promised Bradamente to Roger and will not back down.
In Act III, Charlemagne assures Léon

N'ayez doute, mon fils, n'ayez point cette crainte,
Ma parole est toujours inviolable et sainte.

Thus one of the attributes of the ideal ruler according to Garnier is faithfulness. In Act III, sc. 5, in an addition to Ariosto, Roger has a painful debate as to whether he should keep his promise to Léon (though this is not in a political context). In Act V, the importance of the promise of marriage between Roger and Bradamente is stressed and for this reason, Roger intends to kill himself so that Léon can marry Bradamente without the previous promise of marriage being broken.

In Act V, the theme of promises is once more put into a political context as Roger promises his subjects that he will be a good ruler if, in turn, his subjects will obey him. Léon promises that Bulgaria will not be disturbed by the Greeks—

...je leur feray promesse,
Et sous foi d'Empereur, qu'ils seront désormais
De la part de mon pere assurez à jamais.

CONCLUSION

An examination of Garnier's works leads to the conclusion that Garnier was familiar with Machiavelli's ideas and had probably read at least Il Principe. It would be hard for any French dramatist writing on political subjects in the latter part of the sixteenth century to ignore the questions raised by Machiavelli and it seems that Garnier was no exception. He uses Machiavelli's theories both positively and negatively. He is interested in Machiavelli's idea of a temporary dictator in a time of crisis (Porcie and Cornélie) and in the advice Machiavelli gives to new rulers who have to establish their authority, generally after the State has passed through civil wars. So, he frequently up-dates the traditional Senecan tyrant by turning him into a more credible, Machiavellian ruler whose political pragmatism is more in line with French political behaviour in the latter part of the
sixteenth century than are the bloodthirsty acts of a Senecan villain. This holds good for Octavian in *Porcie* and *Marc Antoine*, Anthony in *Cornélie*, Ulysses (and possibly Pyrrhus) in *La Troade* and Creon in *Antigone*. As we have seen, Nebuchadnezzar remains true to his Senecan and Biblical sources.

Garnier uses Machiavelli in the debates about the necessity of dealing severely with one's enemies. What in Seneca was a debate between the bloodthirsty tyrant rejoicing in the idea of wreaking vengeance on his foes and the 'good' councillor, becomes in Garnier a more equally balanced discussion between someone who genuinely believes in the necessity of 'rigueur' for political reasons, especially at the beginning of a reign, and an opponent who believes in clemency, as for example, in the debate between Anthony and Caesar in *Cornélie*. The case is not so clear cut 'black and white' as in Seneca, for Garnier often gives powerful arguments against clemency and I think that this must be attributed to the influence of Machiavelli's theories on Garnier. This is not to suggest that Garnier did in fact agree with Machiavelli's ideas, but rather that he saw they could be argued in a lively way which would inject drama and greater political awareness into the traditional Senecan debates.

Garnier also develops the theme of perfidy, often far beyond the treatment of this subject in his classical and Biblical sources. He was probably led to do so by his knowledge of Machiavelli's controversial ideas on this subject; in many of his plays - *La Troade*, *Antigone*, *Les Juives*, *Bradamente* - he seems to be arguing against the Machiavellian policy of conducting politics through fraud and broken promises. He shows the disasters which inevitably follow from a King breaking his promise and in *Bradamente* his ideal King, Charlemagne, insists on keeping his word.
Mouflard declares (op. cit., vol. III, p. 136) that 'comme toute son époque, Machiavel l'a scandalisé,' but rather than shocking him, I believe that Garnier realized how much greater topicality and relevance could be injected into his plays if he dealt with controversial problems raised by a writer of his own century. He seems to have found in Machiavelli a valuable source of arguments for the political speeches of his characters, as did Marlowe and Webster in England (though their 'Machiavels' are less close to the original Machiavelli than are the ideas in Garnier's work). Garnier was probably attracted too by the provocative style of *Il Principe*. As a firm Catholic, Garnier must have disliked much in Machiavelli's work, but as a politician, he was probably interested in the novelty of Machiavelli's ideas and as a playwright he saw their potential as a source for dramatic conflict.

This incorporation of a Machiavellian, pragmatic and contemporary approach to politics into tragedies based on classical and Biblical stories has not been emphasised in previous studies of Garnier's work, but it is an important feature of his plays and one not wholly unexpected in an author so interested and involved in contemporary politics. Moreover, it is a feature which helps to counterbalance the frequent criticisms of Garnier's over-indebtedness to Seneca. Far from dealing in a traditional and safe way with, for example, the tyrant or the 'clemence/rigueur' debate, Garnier is bold enough to use the most controversial political writer of his day and in a subtle way blends ancient with modern, Seneca with Machiavelli.
FOOTNOTES

1. A similar problem has faced historians who have analysed Corneille's use of Machiavelli, cf. A. Stegmann's study in L'Héroïsme Cornélien, Paris, 1968, t. 2, ch. 3. Stegmann describes how Corneille discredits Machiavellian self-interest by portraying Machiavellian-type rulers as continually failing. Stegmann however admits that Corneille knew Machiavelli only through moralists' attacks on him, whereas I have aimed in this thesis to concentrate on authors who had first hand knowledge of Machiavelli (see my Introduction p.16).


4. See my chapter 9 for a further discussion of Machiavelli's contempt for utopias and for an echo of it in Konsard. Compare Montaigne's attitude in the Essais B. III, i, ix.

5. Cassandra in Act I of La Troade possibly expresses most clearly Garnier's own feelings on war—

   Toute guerre est cruelle, et personne ne doit
   L'entreprendre jamais, sinon avecques droit;
   Mais si pour sa défense et juste et nécessaire,
   Par les armes il faut repousser l'adversaire,
   C'est honneur de mourir la pique dans le poing
   Pour sa ville, et l'avoir de sa vertu tesmoing.

   (p. 33).

6 Mouflard op. cit., vol. III, p. 211.


8. The relevance of the subject matter of (Seneca's) Antigone to the French situation was noted by a contemporary of Garnier — Jacopo Corbinelli. In his letter of October 1572, describing the events of Saint Bartholomew's Day, he shows his support for Charles IX's action by quoting from Antigone,

   È lodevole la pietà: ma non è lecito trasgredire il volere di chi ha il comando.
   (P. Rajna, 'Jacopo Corbinelli e la strage di S. Bartolommeo', Archivio Storico Italiano, Quinta Serie, t. XXI, 1898, p. 79).

9. See Jondorf, op. cit., pp. 52-61. Jondorf does not point out that the theme of the best form of government is continued in Porcie and Cornélie.


11. Machiavelli's idea is reminiscent of the Roman practice of appointing a dictator in a time of crisis, though as far as I know, this parallel
has not been pointed out by any modern historian. The ancient
formula is described by Sallust—

...senatus decrevit darent operam consules ne quid res publica detrimenti caperet. Ea potestas per senatum more Romano magistratui maxima permittitur, exercitum parare, bellum gerere, coemere omnibus modis socios atque civis, domi militiaeque imperium atque iudicium summum habere; aliter sine populi iussu nullius earum rerum consuli ius est.


12. For the Republican traditions in Machiavelli's family, see Hans Baron, The crisis of the early Italian Renaissance, Princeton, 1955, pp. 385-6. Girolamo Machiavelli became a martyr to the Republican cause under Cosimo de' Medici. In 1424, Francesco Machiavelli condemned tyranny as destructive of civic virtue. Niccolò Machiavelli himself moved in Republican circles: he was on close terms with those Republicans who frequented the Orti Oricellari, Zanobi Buondelmonti and Cosimo Rucellai. He worked loyally for Florence under the Republic, as Secretary to the Ten and Chancellor of the Second Chancellory. L.A. Burd in his edition of Il Principe (Oxford, 1891) says,

It is impossible, however, not to feel that Machiavelli was at heart a republican.

(p. 177).

13. In Discorsi I, 17, Machiavelli also ascribes the defeat of Brutus to the corruption of a servile populace, see note 29, below.


15. In the sixteenth century, a debt to Seneca was not counted a demerit. Sainte-Marthe says of Garnier,

Comme la façon d'escrire de Seneque luy sembloit plus juste et plus reglée que celle des Creca, il tascha d'imiter cet excellent Autheur, en quoy il réussit parfaitement.

(Eloges des hommes illustres transl. G. Colletet, Paris, 1644, BL 1450 k 1, p. 351)


16. Op. cit., pp. 13-14 and see pp. 8-25 for reasons why sixteenth century dramatists were attracted to Seneca, and their transformation of Senecan themes. For more on the influence of Seneca on French Renaissance drama in general, see H.B. Charlton, The Senecan Tradition in Renaissance Tragedy, Manchester, 1946; P. Stone, French Humanist Tragedy, Manchester, 1974, especially pp. 66-83; Les Tragédies de Sénèque et le Théâtre de la


18. See Discorsi I, 16-

chi ha per nemico l'universale non si assicura mai, e quanta piu crudeltà usa, tanto piu debole diventa il suo principato.

(p. 175).


20. Pourparler du Prince, Paris, 1560, BL. 9200 a 29, 80v-81r.

21. It occurs for example, in Jean Bodin, Les Six Livres de la République, Paris, 1579, B. V, ch. 5. One of the few sixteenth century writers to argue against the policy of using foreign war to divert civil war is François de La Noue in his Discours Politiques et Militaires ed. F.E. Sutcliffe, Geneva, 1967, Neuvième Discours; and see Montaigne, Essais II, xxii.

22. See M.J. Heath, Attitudes in French Writing of the Sixteenth Century Towards a Turkish War, University of Wales Ph.D thesis, 1977, Part III.


26. There is a certain ambiguity about Appian's portrayal of Caesar in that he is shown as rejecting the title of King, whilst acting like a monarch – but this is not the same as the question of whether he intended only an interim rule.

27. The source is Plutarch's Life of Caesar, LVII.

28. This rejection of bodyguards would fit in with Machiavelli's disapproval of bodyguards (Discorsi I, 10) but in fact, the discussion between Caesar and Anthony on this topic is imitated from Plutarch's Life of Caesar, LVII.

29. See Discorsi I, 17, where Machiavelli says that the Roman populace was so corrupt that

non bastò l'autorità e severità di Bruto con tutte le legioni orientali a tenerlo disposto a volere mantenersi quella libertà che esso a similitudine del primo Bruto gli aveva renduta.

(p. 178).
30. Innocent Gentillet discusses Machiavelli's treatment of the theme of benefits (op. cit.) Part III, Maxime VI.

31. In contrast with the Carthaginians who, in Latin literature, are often scorned for waging war by ruse and contrasted with the Romans' traditional methods of warfare. See also Jean Debeaubrueil's tragedy, *Regulus* (Limoges, 1582, BL. 11737 aa 7) where we see Regulus's refusal as a Roman to break his promise to the Carthaginians.

32. The distinction between the two sorts of guile is well-expressed by Pierre Matthieu in his *Histoire de Louys XI. Roy de France*, Paris, 1610, BL.C.79 h 8,

> Autant est louée la fraude qui fait recevoir un affront à l'ennemy comme elle est blâmée quand'elle trompe celui qui n'est pas déclaré tel. Quand on dit que la tromperie est glorieuse à la guerre, cela ne s'entend point du violement des promesses, ny paroles données, mais des stratagèmes, ruses, feintises et artifices. (p. 187).

33. My capitals.

34. Mouflard believes that Garnier deliberately blackened his Ulysses, for the French writer omits the compassion shown by the Senecan Ulysses (vol. II, pp. 224-225).


38. I would not however agree with the extreme position Whitfield adopts in his *Discourses on Machiavelli* (Cambridge, 1969, ch. 8) where he says that Machiavelli never intended his Prince to break his promise to his subjects (and see also Whitfield, *Machiavelli*, Oxford, 1947, ch. 7, p. 154).


41. R. Thomas (op. cit.) believes Garnier intended to portray Creon as an out and out tyrant (pp. 36-37; 359-360) but others - Jondorf, Mouflard - have seen him merely as ill-advised. The latter interpretation seems to me to be correct.

42. The idea of natural duty - to one's family, country, subjects - is very important in Garnier and most acts of State are presented as violating natural laws. The only political imperatives Garnier allows are the preference for foreign war over civil war, and the sacrifice of a Prince's private life to the welfare of a nation (see Mouflard, op. cit., vol. II, p. 147).

43. As we have seen above (p. 294), an essential difference between the Senecan tyrant and the Machiavellian Prince is that the latter tries to avoid being hated and to some extent aims to base his rule on the goodwill of his subjects. Jocasta points out the necessity of this goodwill to Polynices and defends Eteocles's rule on the grounds that it is agreeable to the Thebans (p. 165). This is modelled on Seneca's Phoenissae.


45. The theme of the tyrant as hunter is borrowed from Seneca's Thyestes (see Mouflard op. cit., vol. III, p. 72).

46. See C. Frankish, 'The Theme of Idolatry in Garnier's "Les Juives",' BHR, XXX, (1968), pp. 65-83. The main Biblical sources are II Kings 24-25, and II Chronicles 36. But there are echoes of many other Biblical passages.

47. Jondorf (op. cit., pp. 118-119) discusses Nebuchadnezzar's deception of Amital through the Provost and concludes that it is not truly Machiavellian since Nebuchadnezzar does not gain any political advantage from it. However it is true that Nebuchadnezzar needs to lure the children away from Amital and that it is easier for him to employ Machiavellian cunning than force.

48. Compare Gentillet's attitude in the Discours contre N. Machiavel (ed. cit.), Part III, Maxime XXI, where he comments on Machiavelli's statement that 'Le Prince prudent ne doit observer la foy'. Gentillet says,

Ce ne seroit jamais fait qui voudroit raconter les grands maux et calamitez dont la perfidie et infraction de foy publique a tousjours esté cause.

(p. 383).
Most of our information about the lives of the La Taille brothers comes from the dedicatory epistle by Jean de La Taille published in the 1572 edition of his *Saul le Furieux*. His son, Lancelot de La Taille, wrote an *Extrait généalogique de la Maison de Bondaroy* published in 1608, but that is now lost. There exist several later accounts of their lives. Jean de La Taille's epistle does not give his date of birth but most historians have taken the year 1533 as the year when he was born. We know that his brother, Jacques was not yet twenty when he died of the plague in 1562. Jean and Jacques, along with two other brothers and a sister, were brought up at the château of Bondaroy in the Beauce region. Their father was a Protestant nobleman of moderate means. Around 1550, Jean was sent by his father to study at Paris, ‘nostre Athenes françoys.’ He tells us that he spent six years there studying under Marc-Antoine Muret for part of the time. Muret taught at Boncourt college from 1551 to 1553 and George Buchanan also taught there during the period when Jean was in Paris. Under these two teachers at Boncourt and together with Estienne Jodelle, Jacques Grévin, Jean de La Péruse and Rémy Belleau, Jean must have been greatly stimulated by the atmosphere of humanist learning. It is probable that it was here too that his interest in drama was first awakened. Muret’s *Julius Caesar* was published in 1553 and Buchanan’s *Jephthes, sive votum* in 1554. Buchanan’s other play, *Baptistes*, together with some translations, was circulating in manuscript. Buchanan and Muret opened up the way for historical and Biblical tragedies based on ancient models. Jodelle’s *Cléopâtre Captive* was performed at Boncourt college early in 1553. La Péruse’s tragedy *Médee* was published in 1566.
In such an atmosphere of renewal of artistic inspiration and creativity, Jean may have felt the beginnings of his literary vocation. Indeed when he moved to Orléans, probably in 1556, to study law under Anne du Bourg, he admits that,

... après avoir ouy là quelque peu ce sçavant Docteur Anne du Bourg, les Muses me vindrent tenter, et pour me sembler plus belles que les Loix, mieux peignées, et de meilleure grace, estant suyvies de Ronsard, et du Bellay, qui commençoient lors à voler par la bouche des hommes, me pleurent davantage ...6

Jean communicated his enthusiasm to his brother Jacques who was beginning to show signs of some literary talent,

Et moy retourné des estudes d'Orleans, voyant desja en Jacques mon second Frere, un entendement et sçavoir plus grand que le commun, et qu'aussi par son destín commengant à suyvre Apollon, et les Muses, il faisoit desja vers Latins et Françoys, je luy voulus ouvrir d'avantage l'esprit ...7

Around 1557 or 15588, Jean placed Jacques under Dorât's tuition at Paris, but Jacques' literary career was cut short in 1562 when the plague broke out in the house where he was lodging.9 Jacques, his cousin, and younger brother, Paschal, all died.

From several official poems published later by Jean, R. Lebègue deduces that between leaving Orléans and the outbreak of the first civil war in 1562, he had some employment at court, either with the King or with the Bourbons.10 During this first war, La Taille fought in the royal army. However, it seems probable that he saw little active service, spending most of the time in the camp at Blois.11 His service in the royal army was perhaps an expression of his loyalty to the King and his support for the policy of tolerance favoured by Catherine de' Medici and her Chancellor, Michel de L'Hospital.12 La Taille was a moderate man in an age of extremes and his works in general are a plea for tolerance.13 In his work we are often made more aware of his political than his religious beliefs. His love for his country and his desire to have it
unified under a strong monarchy are the themes which stand out most clearly, particularly in his poem *Le Prince Nécessaire* where we see his loyalty to Henry of Navarre and to the Bourbons.\(^{14}\)

In the third civil war (1568), La Taille enrolled in the Huguenot army. His decision to change sides is probably explained by the fact that with the resignation of L'Hospital in 1567, the power of the Guise family was increasing and Catherine's policies were moving away from her early tolerance. The extent of the Guises' power in Council was revealed on 28th. of September 1568, when Lorraine managed to have the repeal of the Edict of Longjumeau passed. The repeal forbade Huguenot worship and banned Reformers from holding public office. All ministers were to be expelled from France within two weeks. It could not but lead to war. It was very likely his disappointment at the failure of eirenic policies which prompted La Taille to take up arms against his King.\(^{15}\)

In his *Sonnets Satyriques du Camp de Poictou* dated 1568, La Taille has left a sensitive and sometimes humorous description of conditions in the camp and his own feelings about army life.\(^{16}\) He took part in the battle of Jarnac and the battle of Arnay-le-Duc where he was wounded in the face (25 June 1570) and, as he takes great care to tell us, was tended by Henry of Navarre's personal physician.\(^{17}\)

After the end of the third civil war and the publication of the Edict of Saint Germain, La Taille retired from the army and from court and went to live at Bondaroy, intending to devote himself to literature.\(^{18}\) His personal feelings of disillusionment are perhaps partly revealed in *Le Courtisan Retiré* (published in 1573), in the words of the 'vieillard,'

\[
\text{N'auront point quelque fin un tas de factions,}\nonewline\text{De scismes, de discors et de seditions}\nonewline\text{Qui entre les chrestiens aujourd'hui s'enracinent,}\nonewline\text{Et cependant, hélas! ainsi qu'ils se mutinent,}\nonewline\text{Amour, Bonté, Justice ont ce siecle quitté! ...}\nonewline\text{Mais pourquoi seul en vain me rompe-je la teste,}\nonewline\text{Puisque seul je ne puis appaiser la tempeste? ...}\n\]
Ne pouvant donner ordre à la commune erreur,
Il faut caler la voile; aussi je me retire
De la cour, vray séjour d'ennuis et de martire ...
(Oeuvres ed.cit., tome III, pp.xxiii-xxiv).

Although this poem contains themes typical of anti-courtier poetry and is influenced by Antonio de Guevara's Aviso de Privados, there is apparently much sincerity and personal feeling in the tirades against unscrupulous people who gain favour with the King.  

In 1572, the first collection of La Taille's works was published at Paris by F.-deric Morel (see note 1). One of his poems, Remonstrance pour le Roy Charles IX, had been published earlier, in 1562, and had already gone through seven editions. Included in the 1572 collection were some short poems by Jacques de La Taille addressed to rulers and nobles, and entitled Recueil des Inscriptions, Anagrammatismes, et autres Oeuvres Poétiques. Jacques had regarded this collection as a preface to the weightier works he had planned to publish. 

In 1573, a second collection of Jean's works appeared, containing La Famine, ou Les Gabeonites, Les Corrivaus, Le Négromant and various poems including Le Courtisan Retiré and Le Combat de Fortune et de Pauvreté. Separately in 1573, and as he had promised in the dedicatory epistle of 1572, Jean published his brother's two plays Daire and Alexandre, as well as his treatise on La Manière de faire les vers. In the 1572 epistle, Jean also mentions three other tragedies written by his brother, Athamant, Progne and Niobe, as well as a comedy and another tragedy Didon (already, in 1572, lost). These plays were never published, possibly because Jean thought their literary quality inferior (he admits that he suppressed some of his brother's youthful poems) or, more likely, because, as their titles suggest, they dealt with the type of romantic subject matter which Jean had condemned in De l'Art de la tragédie.

The two plays by Jacques he did publish are of a more political and philosophical character with meditations on the nature of power, similar
to his own tragedies.

In 1574, Jean published *La Géomance abrégée* and *Le Blason des pierres précieuses*. This was followed by a silence of over twenty years till 1595 when *L'Histoire abrégée des Singe iries de la Ligue* appeared in the *Satyre Menippée* under the initials I.D.L. There was a second and possibly a third edition in 1595 (see *Oeuvres cit.* , tome I, pp.1-2). The attribution of this work to La Taille has been disputed. However, the initials I.D.L., have traditionally been taken as indicating Jean de Lataille, despite the fact that for the 1562 and 1563 editions of his *Remonstrance* he used the initials I.D.L.T.D.B. (Jean de La Taille de Bondaroy), and for the 1580 edition he used the initials I.D.L.T.E. (Jean de La Taille, escuyer). It would certainly fit in with what we know of La Taille's desire for moderation to be writing against the League.

The *Discours notable des duels*, published in 1607, completes the list of works which appeared in his lifetime, but one very important poem remains, *Le Prince Nécessaire*. This was probably written between 1568 and 1572, for it contains echoes of La Taille's army experiences. It was definitely completed by 1572, since it is mentioned in the 1572 dedicatory epistle (73 r) and in the *Combat de Fortune et de Pauvreté* (published in 1573). *Le Prince Nécessaire* was not published till tome III of René de Maulde's edition of La Taille's works appeared in 1882— and even there it is given in an incomplete form with two passages from the third section omitted. These were published separately in 1925.

In 1575, La Taille had married Charlotte du Moulin, a Catholic, and they had three children. Around 1606, according to R. de Maulde, La Taille became destitute. The date of La Taille's death, as of his birth, has been much disputed, but most of the (rather inconclusive) evidence points to 1608 as the year of his death.
Leaving aside the success of the Remonstrance, Jean de La Taille was not a popular author. He early lost contact with the humanists in Paris through spending most of the 1560's fighting. When he returned, he seems to have found it hard to re-establish a reputation at court, as Le Courtisan Retiré testifies, and he then cut himself off completely from literary circles by retiring to Bondaroy. There is evidence that by 1562 he had written Saül Le Furieux, Les Corrivaux and Le Nêgromant, but he delayed publishing them for ten years, by which time they were no longer novel and were easily eclipsed by the plays of Robert Garnier.

A recent article has pointed out that the only genuine new editions of Saül and La Famine after 1573 were those produced in 1601 and 1602 by Raphaël du Petit Val- and then these carry only minor alterations. The other 'editions' were merely reissues. So far as is known, there were two performances of Saül in the sixteenth century, one in 1584 during a festival at Amiens and one at the Jesuit college at Pont-à-Mousson in 1599. La Famine was performed at Béthune in 1601.

It is perhaps a loss to the development of sixteenth century French tragedy that Jean de La Taille appears to have ceased writing drama after 1573. Indeed, after 1574, he seems to have lost interest in fictional writing altogether, not even troubling to publish his completed poem Le Prince Nécessaire. This drying-up of his literary powers was possibly due to lack of encouragement at court and his isolation at Bondaroy. He is a figure who stands a little apart from the mainstream of writers in the sixteenth century, not only because of the moderation with which he expresses his politico-religious views, but because of his pioneering role in the development and practice of French drama. Examination of his attitude towards Machiavelli helps to underline his independence.
FOOTNOTES.
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5. Lebègue gives Muret and Buchanan the title of 'parrains de la tragédie en langue française' and says 'dans les collèges où ils ont professé, dans les villes où ils ont vécu, ils ont éveillé des vocations dramatiques ...' (La Tragédie Française de la Renaissance, Paris, 1954, p.27). For a description of the circle of French dramatists at Paris under the influence of Muret and Buchanan, see Charlton (H.B.), *The Senecan Tradition in Renaissance Tragedy*, Manchester, 1946, pp.cii-cv and Jean de La Taille's *De l'Art de la Tragédie* ed.F. West, Manchester, 1939, introduction, pp.2-3. Like La Taille later, both Muret and Buchanan despised popular drama.


9. It was the custom amongst Reformers to have their children lodge in private houses in Paris. This enabled them to study in Paris without running the risk either of persecution, or of being influenced by their Catholic teachers. It is probable that both Jean and Jacques de La Taille were non-resident members of their colleges, see C.N.
4^8


12. In his review of Forsyth's edition of La Taille's tragedies (BHR, XXXII, (1970), pp.180-192), G. Spillebout puts forward the interesting, though purely speculative, theory that La Taille was delayed at court by the death of his brothers and so was too late to join Condé's army. Suspected at court of being a Reformer, he was obliged to 'whitewash' himself by fighting in the royal army.

13. Indeed, his lack of fanaticism has led some historians to class him as a Catholic or even as a free-thinker, see Daley (*op.cit.*, pp.87-88); and Baguenault de Puchesse (*op.cit.*, pp.310-313). R. de Maulde, following the theory of the editors of *La France Protestante*, believes that La Taille converted to Catholicism on the marriage of his son, Lancelot, with a fervent Catholic (*op.cit.*, p.33).

14. In the dedication of his *Discours notable des Duels* to Condé, La Taille speaks of his long service to the Bourbons,

   Ayant l’honneur d'estre aujourd'hui l'un des plus vieux serviteurs de vostre maison, du temps mesmes de ses plus grandes traverses ...
   
   (Paris, 1607, BN *E 2289, p.3).

At the time of writing, La Taille's son was in Condé's service.

16. His love poetry, too, is often set against the background of civil war, interweaving the themes of love and war in a way which reveals how directly affected the personal lives of the author and his contemporaries were by the troubles, see for example, Elegie II (Oeuvres, ed. cit., tome I, pp.xcvii-c).

17. See the preface to Jacques de La Taille's play, Alexandre ed. C.N. Smith, University of Exeter, 1975, p.83.

18. Though he may still have visited Paris after this date, see Lebègue (R.), La Tragédie Religieuse en France ed. cit., p.406 and note 1.


20. See the address to the reader, 74 r. Some of these poems are reprinted in Antoine Du Verdier's Bibliothèque, Lyons, 1585, BL 616 n 4, pp.624-626.

21. The BN has a copy of this edition at Rés Ye 1818-1822.

22. Paris, 1574, BL 1609/8002, BN V 8841. Both are reprinted in Oeuvres ed. cit., tome II.

23. In his edition of La Taille's Oeuvres, de Maulde prints the 1596 edition. The 1595 edition can be found in the BL (G 15439 (2) ) and in the BN (8 La 5 and 5a).

25. As Daley has pointed out: see op.cit., p.77.

26. By A. Chérel in his article 'Un fragment inédit de Jean de La Taille', Revue du Seizième Siècle, 12, (1925), pp.166-168. This article gives the two passages and some corrections to the third section contained in manuscripts belonging to the descendants of La Taille, not available to de Maulde.


30. See Lebègue (R.), 'Tableau de la tragédie française de 1573 à 1610,' BHR, V, (1944), pp.373-393.

31. In Saul we have the beginnings of the psychological portrait in French tragedy, and see Loukovitch (K.), L'Evolution de la tragédie religieuse classique en France, Paris, 1933:

avec La Taille, la tragédie régulière est née et la tragédie classique s'annonce.
(p.178).
THE INFLUENCE OF MACHIAVELLI

A. JEAN DE LA TAILLE

Recent years have seen a revival of interest in the drama of Jean de La Taille and there have been several editions of his plays.\(^1\) His poetry, however, has been neglected by modern editors since de Maulde's edition appeared in the late nineteenth century although in 1933, R. Pintard published an article analysing in detail Machiavelli's influence on Le Prince Nécessaire.\(^2\) His case that La Taille was using an author with whom he was fundamentally in antipathy has been reiterated by John Parkin.\(^3\) More recently, Ruth Thomas in her thesis on the theory of kingship in French Biblical tragedy has examined the theme of Machiavellianism in La Famine.\(^4\) There is clearly a need, therefore, to draw together these various assessments of Machiavelli's influence on La Taille's work and indeed to re-examine the whole of his writings, as well as those of his brother Jacques, in order to arrive at a definitive account of his knowledge of Machiavelli.

i Poetry

Remonstrance pour le Roy.

The earliest echo of Machiavelli I have found in La Taille's poetry occurs in the Remonstrance pour le Roy à tous ses subjects. This was first published in 1563 (the 'privilège' is dated 1562) and went through at least eight editions.\(^5\) Examination of the different editions reveals only slight modifications in the texts, mainly due to a wish to up-date the subject matter as Charles IX, ostensibly the speaker, grew older and was succeeded by Henry III. The only genuine new edition is the 1571 version where, as the subtitle suggests, the up-dating is more extensive.\(^6\) For example, instead of talking of a crusade to regain Constantinople, Rhodes and Jerusalem from the Turks, La Taille now speaks merely of

\(^{1}\) Poetry

Remonstrance pour le Roy.

The earliest echo of Machiavelli I have found in La Taille's poetry occurs in the Remonstrance pour le Roy à tous ses subjects. This was first published in 1563 (the 'privilège' is dated 1562) and went through at least eight editions.\(^5\) Examination of the different editions reveals only slight modifications in the texts, mainly due to a wish to up-date the subject matter as Charles IX, ostensibly the speaker, grew older and was succeeded by Henry III. The only genuine new edition is the 1571 version where, as the subtitle suggests, the up-dating is more extensive.\(^6\) For example, instead of talking of a crusade to regain Constantinople, Rhodes and Jerusalem from the Turks, La Taille now speaks merely of

\(^{2}\) Poetry

Remonstrance pour le Roy.

The earliest echo of Machiavelli I have found in La Taille's poetry occurs in the Remonstrance pour le Roy à tous ses subjects. This was first published in 1563 (the 'privilège' is dated 1562) and went through at least eight editions.\(^5\) Examination of the different editions reveals only slight modifications in the texts, mainly due to a wish to up-date the subject matter as Charles IX, ostensibly the speaker, grew older and was succeeded by Henry III. The only genuine new edition is the 1571 version where, as the subtitle suggests, the up-dating is more extensive.\(^6\) For example, instead of talking of a crusade to regain Constantinople, Rhodes and Jerusalem from the Turks, La Taille now speaks merely of

\(^{3}\) Poetry

Remonstrance pour le Roy.

The earliest echo of Machiavelli I have found in La Taille's poetry occurs in the Remonstrance pour le Roy à tous ses subjects. This was first published in 1563 (the 'privilège' is dated 1562) and went through at least eight editions.\(^5\) Examination of the different editions reveals only slight modifications in the texts, mainly due to a wish to up-date the subject matter as Charles IX, ostensibly the speaker, grew older and was succeeded by Henry III. The only genuine new edition is the 1571 version where, as the subtitle suggests, the up-dating is more extensive.\(^6\) For example, instead of talking of a crusade to regain Constantinople, Rhodes and Jerusalem from the Turks, La Taille now speaks merely of

\(^{4}\) Poetry

Remonstrance pour le Roy.

The earliest echo of Machiavelli I have found in La Taille's poetry occurs in the Remonstrance pour le Roy à tous ses subjects. This was first published in 1563 (the 'privilège' is dated 1562) and went through at least eight editions.\(^5\) Examination of the different editions reveals only slight modifications in the texts, mainly due to a wish to up-date the subject matter as Charles IX, ostensibly the speaker, grew older and was succeeded by Henry III. The only genuine new edition is the 1571 version where, as the subtitle suggests, the up-dating is more extensive.\(^6\) For example, instead of talking of a crusade to regain Constantinople, Rhodes and Jerusalem from the Turks, La Taille now speaks merely of

\(^{5}\) Poetry

Remonstrance pour le Roy.

The earliest echo of Machiavelli I have found in La Taille's poetry occurs in the Remonstrance pour le Roy à tous ses subjects. This was first published in 1563 (the 'privilège' is dated 1562) and went through at least eight editions.\(^5\) Examination of the different editions reveals only slight modifications in the texts, mainly due to a wish to up-date the subject matter as Charles IX, ostensibly the speaker, grew older and was succeeded by Henry III. The only genuine new edition is the 1571 version where, as the subtitle suggests, the up-dating is more extensive.\(^6\) For example, instead of talking of a crusade to regain Constantinople, Rhodes and Jerusalem from the Turks, La Taille now speaks merely of

\(^{6}\) Poetry

Remonstrance pour le Roy.

The earliest echo of Machiavelli I have found in La Taille's poetry occurs in the Remonstrance pour le Roy à tous ses subjects. This was first published in 1563 (the 'privilège' is dated 1562) and went through at least eight editions.\(^5\) Examination of the different editions reveals only slight modifications in the texts, mainly due to a wish to up-date the subject matter as Charles IX, ostensibly the speaker, grew older and was succeeded by Henry III. The only genuine new edition is the 1571 version where, as the subtitle suggests, the up-dating is more extensive.\(^6\) For example, instead of talking of a crusade to regain Constantinople, Rhodes and Jerusalem from the Turks, La Taille now speaks merely of
sending aid to the Hungarians against the Turks. This reflects the change in the French attitude in the 1570's when the ideal of recapturing the Holy Land was largely abandoned. The 1580 edition reverts back to the 1563 text, but with the changed political circumstances in France, the reader in 1580 would take a poem entitled (rather differently from the 1563 edition) Remonstrance pour le Roy à ses subiectz, sur la rebellion qui se faict en plusieurs endroictz de la France. Et à ceux qui ont pris les armes contre sa Majesté to be written against the Catholic League and in support of Henry III.

The poem's popularity was probably due to the fact that it was not overtly partisan but dealt in a rather abstract way, with peace and the strengthening of the French monarchy, themes which continually recur in La Taille's poetry and find their fullest expression in Le Prince Nécessaire. The tirades in the Remonstrance against civil war, in which Ronsard's influence is clearly discernible, are also typical of La Taille's poetry.

Throughout the poem it is La Taille's concern for his country's troubles which impresses us. One of the causes he gives for the troubles is the use of foreign mercenaries,

O que c'est grand erreur, que c'est grande misere
De vouloir s'aider aux guerres d'aujourd'hui
Du bras de l'estranger et des armes d'autruy,
Incognues à nous, qui sont ou trop gesnantes
Ou trop larges pour nous ou pour nous trop pesantes! ...
Comme sçeut bien David qui trouva trop pesant
Le harnois de Saül pour combattre un géant,
Aymant trop mieux avoir sa naturelle fonde,
Qui estoit propre à lui, que tout arme du monde.

(Oeuvres ed.cit., p.xx).

This is a comment on the French situation of the time, but it is also a clear echo of Machiavelli's criticism of mercenaries in Il Principe chapters 12 and 13. In chapter 12, Machiavelli says,

Le mercennarie et ausilarie sono inutile e periculose; e, se uno tiene lo stato suo fondato in sulle arme mercenarie, non starà mai fermo né sicura ...

In chapter 13, he concludes,
Uno principe, per tanto, savio, sempre ha fuggito queste arme, e voltosi alle proprie; ... Voglio ancora ridurre a memoria una figura del Testamento Vecchio fatta a questo proposito. Offerendosi David a Saul di andare a combattere con Golia, provocatore filisteo, Saul, per darli animo, l'armi dell'arme sua; le quali, come David ebbe indosso, recusò, dicendo con quelle non si potere bene valere di se stesso, e però voleva trovare il nemico con la sua fromba e con il suo coltello. In fine l'arme d'altri, o le ti caggiono di dosso, o le ti pesano, o le ti stringano.

(pp.59-60).

Criticism of the use of mercenaries is common in Machiavelli. Moreover La Taille, author of Saül and La Famine, may have been struck by this very rare example in Machiavelli of the use of a Biblical story to illustrate his point. This passage in the Remonstrance is an early case of the objective use of Machiavelli by a French writer and establishes La Taille's first hand knowledge of the Italian author since, as far as I know, this particular passage is not cited in any previous French work. Some of La Taille's other poems reveal a hostility towards the use of mercenaries similar to that of Machiavelli.

The Remonstrance contains praise of Louis XI who, according to La Taille, endeavoured to unite France under a strong monarchy,

Ha, Roy Loys unzieme! hé, que t'a profité
D'avoir eu tant de maux, d'avoir tant haleté
Pour ranger tes subjects en ton obeissance,
Pour les mettre en repos, pour aggrandir la France,
Asseurer ton estât, pourvoir de loing à toy,
Faire penser à tous que seul tu estois Roy,
Chastier les mutins, appointer d'un office
Ou d'un riche present les hommes de service?

(Oeuvres ed. cit., tome II, pp.xv-xvi).

In general, the wish for France to have a strong monarchy in a time of crisis and the approval of expansionist policies reveal that La Taille possesses a certain kinship with Machiavelli, particularly with the Machiavelli of Il Principe who is likewise writing at a time of crisis when Italy was troubled by conflicts between the various city-States and was, like France in La Taille's poem, an easy prey for foreigners.

Machiavelli's solution in Il Principe is to call for a strong leader who would have absolute power in order to unify the country and expel
foreigners (see especially chapter 26).

More especially, this praise of Louis XI is striking since most of La Taille's contemporaries were inclined to criticise Louis's absolutism and in doing so, to compare him disparagingly with the Machiavellian Prince. There grew up a certain tradition in French writing of Louis XI as an evil ruler to be contrasted with Francis I who is seen as the ideal King and one exemplifying all that was best in the French character (in contrast with Louis XI's 'Italianate' qualities). La Taille has been praising a King who was often depicted as a Machiavellian. In Le Prince Nécessaire, he confesses that he prefers a tyrant to a young King whose inexperience will cause wars and uprisings (p.cxii)-La Taille is presumably thinking of the examples of Francis II and Charles IX. In Henry of Navarre, to whom he had intended to dedicate Le Prince Nécessaire, La Taille believed he had found the ruler necessary for France. His description in Le Prince Nécessaire of a strong leader who would unite the country has its roots in the earlier Remonstrance. The Remonstrance thus foreshadows Le Prince Nécessaire by revealing La Taille's knowledge of Machiavelli's works and his awareness of their relevance to the French situation.

Le Prince Nécessaire

The period between 1568 and 1572 is the most probable date for the composition of Le Prince Nécessaire. La Taille is writing during a time of crisis in France, a crisis in which he was directly involved. We have seen (p.128 above) that his decision to fight in the Huguenot army may have arisen out of his disappointment at the failure of the eirenic royal policy and his fear of the growing power of the Guises. France urgently needed a strong leader, and in this poem La Taille sets out all the qualities he must possess. He planned to dedicate it to Henry of Navarre and had probably intended it for a wide audience.
In the article referred to (note 2, above), Pintard has given a very detailed analysis of the influence of Machiavelli on Le Prince Nécessaire. However there are one or two further points which need to be made. The poem is divided into three 'Chants': the first describes the qualities needed in a ruler, the second deals with domestic administrative details, the third with military affairs. The poem opens with a statement of La Taille's patriotism. He adopts the stance of an ordinary Frenchman commenting on the affairs of his day,

... voyant que parfois un simple gentilhomme
Qui n'est passionné, qui ne prétend, en somme,
Ny crédit ny grandeurs, voit plus clair que les grands ...
(Oeuvres ed.cit., p.xc).

Although not pointed out by Pintard, this attitude is similar to that of Machiavelli in the preface to Il Principe,

Né voglio sia reputata presunzione, se uno uomo di basso et infimo stato ardisce discorrere e regolare e' governi de' principi; perché, così come coloro che disegnano e' paesi si pongano bassi nel piano a considerare la natura de' monti e de' luoghi alti ... similmente ... a conoscere bene quella [la natura] de' principi bisogna esser popolare.
(p.14).

This similarity in the attitudes of the two authors points to an identification on La Taille's part with Machiavelli to an extent which is unusual in sixteenth century French literature (and see below for his preface to Daire).

In connection with usefulness to one's country, it should be pointed out that La Taille calls his poem Le Prince Nécessaire whilst Machiavelli uses simply Il Principe. Both writers appear to be adopting a utilitarian stance in contrast with other writers of 'speculi principum' who usually add adjectives carrying moral or religious overtones, for example, Ronsard in the Institution pour l'adolescence du Roy très Chrestien, Charles neuvième, Erasmus in his Institutio principis Christiani and Jean Brèche de Tours in Premier Livre de l'Honneste exercice du Prince. La Taille's picture of the prince is of someone who is 'nécessaire' to France at that time (the word 'nécessaire' recurs throughout the poem). This emphasis
on the right kind of ruler for the situation at the time of writing is similar to Machiavelli in *Il Principe* and differs from the more traditional literature to or about princes which is concerned above all with absolutes such as the moral qualities and the good character of the ruler, ideals which had survived into the sixteenth century from classical and medieval times.  

However, traditional ethical considerations do make their appearance briefly in this first 'chant' as La Taille says that the prince must be pious, well-educated and handsome (p.xci). He should spend time at college studying (p.xcii) and he should cultivate the art of self-knowledge (p.xciv). Rather than seeing this departure from pragmatic politics into a discussion of ethics as a lapse into the 'conservative idealism' of traditional Prince literature, as Pintard suggests (*op.cit.*, pp.400-402), it could be argued that La Taille's stress on ethics was prompted by a very practical concern with the situation in France. Nor does it necessarily imply that the French author was adopting an anti-Machiavellian stance in those passages where he discusses the ethics of ruling. My reasons are as follows: in *Il Principe* chapter 2, Machiavelli distinguishes between hereditary and elective monarchy and explicitly says that he is dealing with a new prince who has risen to power by his own efforts. In such a case, it can be taken for granted that the prince will have a strong character, be intelligent, self-controlled and possess good judgement. He will not need to be reminded about the necessity of occupying himself in matters of State rather than pursuing more pleasurable occupations. The nature of the French situation, however, obliged La Taille to describe a hereditary monarch who may not be naturally fitted to rule and who has to be carefully guided so that he does not spend his time idly nor neglect his kingdom. La Taille knew that, unlike Machiavelli, he had to dwell on details of his ruler's education. In this way, La
Taille's continuing concern with the actual political situation in France may have prompted La Taille's stress on ethics; in other words, his consideration of ethics springs from the same causes which inspired his use of Machiavelli and is not necessarily in conflict with his borrowings from the latter.

At the beginning of his *Institutio Principis Christiani* chapter 1, Erasmus distinguishes between a prince who achieves power through his own qualities and a hereditary monarch who requires a careful education,

When a prince is to be chosen by election it is not at all appropriate to look to the images of his forebears, to consider his physical appearance, ... most naturally the power should be entrusted to him who excels all in the requisite kingly qualities of wisdom, justice, moderation, foresight, and zeal for the public welfare ...

The more difficult it is to change your choice, the more circumspectly should your candidate be chosen ... There is no choice, however, in the case of hereditary succession of princes ... Under that condition, the chief hope for a good prince is from his education, which should be especially looked to. In this way the interest in his education will compensate for the loss of the right of election.17

La Taille's description of the education of a prince is not merely the remnants of a humanist ideal but arises out of a practical consideration of the French situation.18

Pintard points out several echoes of Machiavelli in this first 'chant' - the reference to Plato's writings (p.xci) which echoes *Il Principe* chapter 15;19 the prince drawing lessons from his study of history (p.xciii) in which there is an echo of *Discorsi* I, 10;20 the admiration for Roman political and military affairs (p.xciii) also found in *Discorsi* I, 10; the political utility of religion (pp.xciv-xcvi) from *Discorsi* I, 11, 12. Pintard notes (op.cit., p.388) that the lines in La Taille advising on the steps to be taken when the State religion has become corrupted,

Mais pour la reformer, rusé, il doit garder
L'ombre de la premiere et apres s'en aider,
(p.xcvi),

are an echo of Machiavelli's words in *Discorsi* I, 25,

Chi vuole riformare uno Stato antico in una Città libera,
ritenga almeno l'ombra de' modi antichi.
However, it is perhaps worth adding to Pintard's account that Machiavelli is referring not to religion, but to the reform of laws in a State. The vocabulary is the same, the priorities are different because both writers are concentrating on the problems of their respective countries.21

Other examples of Machiavelli's influence in the first 'chant' given by Pintard are: criticism of the Agrarian laws which led to Rome's ruin (p.c) from Discorsi I, 37; a warning that the prince should keep his own laws (p.c) from Discorsi I, 45; that he should be feared rather than loved (p.cii) from Il Principe chapter 17; that he should imitate the fox and the lion (p.ciii) from Il Principe chapter 18.22

Pintard also mentions that La Taille follows Machiavelli in advising his ruler to temporise if his subjects begin to rebel (p.xcvi). This is found in Discorsi I, 33, 37 (not 36 as in Pintard). The image La Taille uses to illustrate such rebellion (that of a river bursting forth from its banks), comes, however, not from the Discorsi but from Il Principe chapter 25,

```
Que si lors par malheur sedition arrive,
Comme une eau débordée elle sera sans rive,
Et nécessairement il faut qu'elle ait son cours ... (p.xcvi).
```

In chapter 25, Machiavelli is describing 'la fortuna',

```
la quale dimostra la sua potenzia dove non è ordinata virtù a resistere, e quindi volta li sua impeti, dove la sa che non sono fatti li argini e li ripari a tenerla. (p.99).
```

This reveals the extent of La Taille's familiarity with Machiavelli's writings, allowing him to take an image from one of his works and apply it with ease to another.23

Finally on the subject of Machiavelli's influence in the first 'chant', there is one echo of Machiavelli not pointed out by Pintard. La Taille says that if a prince keeps the laws he will have no need of a bodyguard,
... Un Roy donc qui s'exerce
En la justice ainsi et se fait regarder
Au peuple d'un bon oeil, n'aura pour se garder
Besoin d'un tas d'archers qui ne servent au Prince
Que de presse en sa cour, car ceux de sa province
Pour le bien, le voyans mesmes garder ses loix,
Le garderont assez; ...
(p.cii).

In Discorsi I, 10 Machiavelli says,

Consideri ancora quello che è diventato principe in una
repubblica quanta laude, poiché Roma fu diventata Imperio,
meritarono più quelli imperadori che vissero sotto le leggi
e come principi buoni, che quelli che vissero al contrario;
e vedrà come a Tito, Nerva, Traiano, Adriano, Antonino e Marco
non erano necessari i soldati pretoriani né la moltitudine
delle legioni a difenderli, perché i costumi loro, la
benivolenza del popolo, l'amore del Senato gli difendeva.
(p.157).

The link between the use of bodyguards and tyranny is of course found in
more ancient sources than Machiavelli, but it is likely that it is
Machiavelli whom La Taille is imitating here since he uses Discorsi I, 10
several times in this 'chant', in particular for Machiavelli's list of
'good' emperors (p.xciii). Again we see his ability to adapt different
passages in Machiavelli to his own use.

In the second 'chant' the echoes from Machiavelli continue. Pintard
gives as examples of Machiavelli's influence: the warning against
flatterers (pp.civ-cv) from Il Principe chapter 23; the theory of the
three types of brains formed by Jupiter (p.cv) from Il Principe chapter
22; that a ruler should not take sides in the conflicts between his
subjects (pp.cxii-cxiv) from Discorsi I, 4; the usefulness of occasionally
employing cruelty (p.cxv) from Il Principe chapter 8; the verbal echo
of Discorsi II, 23 (p.cxvi) on avoiding the middle way; the criticism of
calumnies (p.cxvi) from Discorsi I, 7, 8; the importance of not
encouraging discord amongst one's subjects (p.cxvii) from Discorsi III,
27; but at the same time being able to make a virtue of necessity and
reduce taxation when needed (p.cxx) from Discorsi I, 51.
There are a few points to be added to Pintard's list. In the second 'chant', La Taille frequently holds up Louis XI as a model for a good King (pp. civ-cvi). We have already seen (above, p460) that Louis XI's authoritarian rule was compared by many sixteenth century writers to that of a Machiavellian prince. By approving of Louis XI, La Taille seems to be implicitly favouring a Machiavellian style absolutism.

Another example of the desire for a Machiavellian type of government is the passage where La Taille says that the ruler should impress his subjects at the beginning of his reign by some great action,

Or mon Roy, surmontant son jeune âge et luy mesme,
Tache d'exequter quelque vertu suprême,
Pour estre craint de tous, aymé et honoré.
Car des siens s'il veut estre à: peu pres adoré,
Il faut par un grand fait ou par un dit notable
Que son sceptre d'entrée il face redoutable ...
(p.cviii).

A young prince having to surmount the obstacle of his youth is in a similar position to a new ruler having to overcome the fact of being new to power: both have to gain the confidence of their subjects. In Discorsi III, 34, Machiavelli advises the citizen who aspires to a high position in a republic to perform some striking act at the outset, rather than rely on the reputation of his ancestors or associates,

O veramente si acquista questa publica fama per qualche azione istraordinaria e notabile, ancora che privata, la quale ti sia riuscita onorevolmente ... Questo modo del procedere non è necessario solamente a quelli cittadini che vogliono acquistare fama per ottenere gli onori nella loro republica, ma è ancora necessario ai principi per mantenersi la reputazione nel principato loro: perché nessuna cosa gli fa tanto stimare quanto dare di sé rari esempi con qualche fatto o detto rado conforme al bene comune, il quale mostrì il signore o magnanimo o liberale o giusto, e che sia tale che si riduca come in proverbio intra i suoi suggetti.
(pp.478-480).28

In Il Principe chapter 21, Machiavelli gives the example of Ferdinand of Aragon who established his reputation at the beginning of his reign by attacking Granada and the Moors under the cloak of religion.

It is perhaps significant that La Taille gives the more edifying examples
of Solomon and David who began their reigns with a striking judgement and a striking combat, respectively. La Taille uses Machiavelli's political principle but turns it to more moral, though still practical, uses. His poem is not merely a 'verse adaptation' of Machiavelli for he does not accept the Italian author uncritically.

La Taille is probably also following Machiavelli when he recommends hunting as a training for the art of war,

Je ne luy /le Prince/oste aussi ny le tournoy paisible
Ny la chasse semblable à la guerre penible;
Mais qu'il n'en face point trop grand' profession,
De peur qu'il n'ait fortune ou devienne Acteon.

(p.cxix).

The idea of hunting as a training for war is found in *Il Principe* chapter 14 and *Discorsi* III, 39. It is more ancient than Machiavelli, being found in Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* (II, 4) and in his treatise *De Venatione*, but in view of La Taille's extensive knowledge of Machiavelli's work, it is probable that he has the Italian in mind rather than Xenophon. La Taille's recommendation to the prince is rather lukewarm compared with Machiavelli's enthusiastic praise of hunting. This may be because Charles IX (King at the time La Taille was writing) was obsessed with hunting to the extent that he neglected affairs of State, or because La Taille was aware of the traditional prince literature which looked upon hunting as an idle pastime, see for instance, Erasmus's *Institutio Principis Christiani*, chapter 10, where hunting is equated with dancing and gambling.

There may be an echo of Machiavelli's support for a mixed government in the passage where La Taille describes how the King should have both a council of noblemen and a popular council (p.cxxi). In *Discorsi* I, 2, Machiavelli describes how Rome came to have a mixed government when it was feared that the aristocracy (the Senate) and the rulers (the two consuls) might grow too powerful and so the populace was granted a share in
government. La Taille says,

Outre ce privé nombre élu de gentils hommes,
Qu'il face, entre le peuple élisant autres hommes,
Un conseil populaire en moindre auctorité,
Qui parle à l'autre, afin qu'estant tout rapporté
A mon Roy comme au chef, son seul Estât retienne
De trois gouvernements [monarchy, oligarchy, democracy] la façon ancienne.

(p.cxxi).

Machiavelli says,

E così nacque la creazione de' Tribuni della plebe, dopo la quale creazione venne a essere più stabilito lo stato di quella repubblica, avendovi tutte le tre qualità di governo la parte sua ... rimanendo mista, fece una repubblica perfetta ...

(pp.134-135).30

In the third 'chant' dealing with military matters, La Taille draws heavily on Machiavelli. Pintard (op.cit., pp.392-399) gives an extensive list of La Taille's borrowings (too numerous to be listed here). There is, however, a difference between the two authors in that for La Taille war should be defensive and should only be undertaken as a last resort: he says that he is describing,

La guerre qu'on ne peut par honneur éviter.

(p.cxxiii).

Machiavelli, on the other hand, urges his prince to wage war almost as a duty, for example, in Il Principe chapter 14,

Debbé adunque uno principe non avere altro obietto né altro pensiero, né prendere cosa alcuna per sua arte, fuora della guerra et ordini e disciplina di essa; perché quella è sola arte che si espetta a chi commanda.

(p.62).

In this way, La Taille sets a limit on the extent to which he can follow Machiavelli: he uses his practical advice on how to wage war, but rejects the philosophy behind the advice.

There are four echoes of Machiavelli in this 'chant' which are not mentioned by Pintard. La Taille advises the prince to consult God's wishes before embarking on a war, so that he does not undertake a war contrary to God's will,
Qu'il consulte un tel point avec les vrais ministres
De l'oracle de DIEU, de peur que contre luy
En pensant faire bien ne guerroye aujourd'hui ...
Car si contre raison, contre DIEU et tout droit
Entreprenoit la guerre, alors DIEU ne faudroit
De luy oster le sens, le pouvoir ou l'envie
De pratiquer mon art ou luy oster la vie.
(pp.cxxvi-vii).

In Discorsi I, 14, Machiavelli describes the Romans' use of auguries before battle,

Donde i Romani ne avevano più cura che di alcuno altro ordine di quella; ed usavongli ne' comizii consolari, nel principiare le imprese, nel trar fuora gli eserciti, nel fare le giornate, ed in ogni azione loro importante, o civile o militare; né mai sarebbono iti ad una espedizione, che non avessono persuaso ai soldati che gli Dei promettevano loro la vittoria.
(pp.169).

There is a difference, however, between La Taille's genuine wish for God's will to be done, and Machiavelli's approval of the Roman leaders ignoring the auspices if they were unfavourable and fighting anyway, that is approval of manipulating religion according to political exigencies,

Nondimeno quando la ragione mostrava loro una cosa doversi fare, non ostante che gli auspicii fossero avversi, la facevano in ogni modo; ma rivoltavanla con termini e modi tanto attamente che non paresse che la facessino con dispregio della religione.
(p.170).

Machiavelli enlists religion as an instrument to promote the cause of the prince; La Taille submits the cause of the prince to the scrutiny of God.

La Taille also advises his prince to use all his forces in a battle,

... il ne s'amuse gueres
A un tas de conflicts, d'écarmouches légères,
A garder un chasteau, une place ou un pas,
Ou toute sa puissance entièrre ne soit pas: ...
(p.cxxxviii).

Machiavelli says in Discorsi III, 37,

cominciare una zuffa, dove non si operino tutte le forze e vi si arrischì tutta la fortuna, è cosa al tutto temeraria
(p.486),

and

uno buono capitano ... si debbe guardare dalle zuffe piccole, e non le permettere se non con grandissimo vantaggio e con speranza di certa vittoria: non debbe fare imprese di guardare
passi dove non possa tenere tutto lo esercito suo; ...
(p.487).

La Taille warns the army commander not to drive the enemy to despair because then they will always fight better,

Que mon Prince au surplus enfermer ne se laisse
Es villes, se fiant en leur muraille espesse,
Mais en les assiégeantoste le desespoir
A ceux qui sont dedans, afin de les avoir:
Car il n'est rien qui mieux sur le rempart combatte
Que la nécessité, ny rien qui mieux l'abatte
Qu'espoir de courtoisie et lequel ne faudra
D'attirer autre ville alors qu'on l'assaudra.
(pp. cxxxviii-ix).

In Discorsi III, 12, Machiavelli says,

Sendo conoscuita adunque dagli antichi capitani degli eserciti la virtù di tale necessità, e quanto per quella gli animi de' soldati diventavano ostinati al combattere facevano ogni opera perché i soldati loro fussero constretti da quella
(p.425),

and

debbe adunque uno capitano, ... quando egli assalta una terra, con ogni diligenza ingegnarsi di levare, a' difensori di quella, tale necessità e per consequenzia tale ostinazione, promettendo perdano se gli hanno paura della pena ...
(p.427).

Finally, there is perhaps an echo of Machiavelli's advice to the army leader in the lines,

Qu'il chasse de son camp toute femme; il me semble
Que là Venus et Mars s'accordent mal ensemble.
(p.cxxxix).

Similar advice is found in the Arte della Guerra, Book VI, although of course it is impossible to prove on the basis of one quotation whether La Taille was familiar with this work.

Pintard's article lists very many examples (pp.397-399) where La Taille is paraphrasing the titles of chapters in the Discorsi. This is an interesting phenomenon and one not unique to La Taille: other chapters in this thesis examine the use both Jean de La Jessee and Du Bartas make of the titles of Il Principe. One of the reasons for using
Machiavelli's titles in this way may be that they are succinct, often summing up in one sentence the essence of a chapter. It is to La Taille's credit that he has attempted to state Machiavelli's ideas in the clearest possible form, and to put into some sort of order theories which are scattered throughout Machiavelli's works, occasionally even in contradiction with each other.

But La Taille is not merely copying Machiavelli. The main focus in *Le Prince Nécessaire* is always on the French situation and La Taille is not afraid to adapt Machiavelli's ideas to the exigencies of French politics. Moreover, La Taille retains some moral scruples - he wishes his king to have faith in God and a genuine desire to seek his will. He stresses the necessity of the prince keeping his promises if he does not wish to lose his credibility (pp.cxiv-cxv). *Le Prince Nécessaire* ends with a moral warning: the king must learn to correct his vices,

Ainsi, d'autant que nul n'ose punir un Roy,  
Que lui seul se punisse et qu'en gardant sa loy  
Craingne celle de DIEU et par lui se conduise  
Afin que la fortune icy le favorise.  
(pp.cxlii-iii).31

This is not merely utopian thinking, as Pintard and others have claimed, for La Taille continues by stressing his hope that the advice in his poem will have a practical effect in making the French king so strong that he will no longer fear 'un petit Roy d'Espaigne.' Pintard makes the unfortunate mistake of believing that because La Taille stresses the moral and religious qualities of his ruler he cannot really be concerned with practical politics in the way that Machiavelli is. Yet although La Taille, unlike the Italian author, refuses to separate politics and ethics, his poem does remain in the realms of reality and is not merely an idealistic portrayal of the traditional kind, as Pintard claims. Although he subscribes to the humanist idea of a moral, Christian king, La Taille is actually closer in spirit to Machiavelli than to writers...
such as Budé, Erasmus, Ronsard. He is not building up a picture of an ideal monarch, a rare phoenix as he says at the end of the poem, which will remain valid for all ages; he is very much concerned with the ruler required by the present French situation, "le prince nécessaire."

At the end of Le Prince Nécessaire, La Taille tells Henry of Navarre,

Ne fay qu'icy, Seigneur, un moqueur me replique
Que mon Prince ainsi feint est un rare phoenix,
Qu'à peine on le verroit en siècles infinis,
Tant le ciel en est chiche: ains fay luyre au contraire
Es tenebres de France un Roy si débonnaire,
Si juste et valeureux qu'il soit tout tel que luy
Et qu'il rompe la teste aux vices d'auijourd'huy!
(p.cxliii).

Moral or religious imperatives never preclude realism in La Taille's works, and a very deep concern for French affairs, but they do set a limit on the extent to which he can follow Machiavelli. He falls only partly into the category of a courtier instructing his king, or future king (Henry of Navarre), in Machiavellianism.

Le Prince Nécessaire reveals La Taille's remarkably close and extensive knowledge of Il Principe and the Discorsi. Pintard (op.cit., p.399) believes that he was working from the French translations of Machiavelli by Jacques Gohory and Gaspard D'Auvergne, but fails to demonstrate his case satisfactorily. It was not the first time that La Taille had used an Italian author: his comedy Le Negromant is an adaptation of Ariosto's Il Negromante; he wrote the first original French comedy to be inspired by an Italian source, Les Corrivaus which relies heavily on the fifth story of the fifth day of Boccaccio's Decameron.

His De l'Art de la tragédie shows knowledge of Castelvestro's work. He mentions Castiglione several times, for example, in Le Courtisan Retiré and Le Prince Nécessaire. With such an interest in Italian literature it is hard to believe that La Taille could not have read Machiavelli's works in the original.
Le Festin du Lion

An interesting little poem called Le Festin du Lion was published at Paris in the 1573 edition of La Taille's collected works (Oeuvres ed.cit., tome III, pp.xvi-xvii). This poem is, in my opinion, an allegory of the Saint Bartholomew's Day Massacres. As in Le Prince Nécessaire, La Taille makes use of the fox and lion symbols found in Il Principe chapter 18, the lion representing Charles IX and the fox possibly the Cardinal of Lorraine. The deer seems to be Gaspard de Coligny.

The poem opens with a description of the Lion ordering a celebration for his subjects,

Au temps jadis le Lion fit sa feste,
Où d' y venir il somma chaque beste,
Ayant partout publié qu'à leur Roy
Vinssent jurer service, hommage et foy.

This probably refers to the arrangements for the marriage of Henry of Navarre with Margaret of Valois, the king's sister, which preceded the Massacres. It was well-known that Margaret was reluctant to marry Navarre, being still in love with Henry of Guise, and was forced into marriage for political reasons by Catherine and Charles IX. The Lion issuing the invitations could be symbolic of the fact that the marriage was arranged by the king. Most of the religious disturbances of the time occurred on public holidays on saints' days and it was typical that the Massacres of 1572 should have arisen out of a wedding ceremony and its attendant festivities.

From the first, the Lion is determined to kill the Deer and eat its heart. Since all the animals are ambitious for this heart, it seems to be some sort of symbol of power or strength. The Lion attacks the Deer but fails to destroy him, just as the first attempt to shoot Coligny from the house of Cardinal Pellevé, wounded but did not kill him.

The Lion having failed, the Fox then takes over, true to Machiavelli's belief in Il Principe chapter 18 that a ruler needs the attributes of
both the lion and the fox to succeed. The Fox (probably the Cardinal of Lorraine) proposes his plan to catch the Deer

... par mainte belle excuse,
Par beau parler, par promesse et par ruse.
(p.xvi).

These are of course the tactics proposed by Machiavelli in chapter 18. The Fox lures the Deer and the Lion kills it: Coligny's death was probably the work of Catholic extremists such as the Count of Retz and Anjou, the king's brother, but La Taille may have believed the widely-held view that Charles IX was responsible. Indeed, two days after the death of Coligny, the king claimed responsibility in Parliament for the deaths of the Huguenot leaders.37

There follows a lurid description of the other animals preying on the body of the Deer, as indeed Coligny's body was desecrated by the mob after his death. They search for the heart, perhaps a symbol of power, in order to offer it to the king but are unable to find it since the Fox has already eaten it, that is, has gained power for himself at the king's expense - as indeed the Guises did return to power after the Massacres. The poem ends with a hint that La Taille wishes to warn the Reformers ('quelques Cerfs') of the danger of trusting the king, or more especially, the Guises,

Ainsi quelqu'un se deffiant des festes,
Par ce discours qu'il feinct du Roy des bestes,
Vouloit l'esprit à quelques Cerfs ouvrir
Rien dextrement, n'osant se découvert.
(p.xvii).

These lines strongly support the case for interpreting the poem as an allegory of the contemporary political situation.

La Taille criticises the Saint Bartholomew's Day Massacres, often regarded as the result of the pernicious influence on the King of Machiavellian advisers and his 'Machiavellian' (that is, Italian) mother. He puts his criticism of Machiavelli and the Massacres into allegorical form for safety, using the figures of the Lion and the Fox which were well-
known in France to have been employed by Machiavelli. La Taille could have expected his allegory to be interpreted correctly as a criticism of the Saint Bartholomew's Day Massacres since contemporary readers were well-attuned to the possible allegorical dimension of poems.

Examination of La Taille's poetry reveals an extensive knowledge and use of Machiavelli's works and, on the whole, a kinship between the two authors. Machiavelli trying to build up a new strong ruler to unite Italy has certain similarities with La Taille's aim of creating a strong monarchy from a youthful king so that he will no longer be led by ambitious nobles such as the Guises. Both writers have a deep awareness of the troubles of their times - Machiavelli believes that Italy has reached an extreme point of desolation (II Principe chapter 26); La Taille feels that there is a curse on France which sets a succession of young kings on the throne, causing civil wars and divisions (Le Tombeau du Roy François II and L'Epitaphe du Roy François II, Oeuvres ed. cit., tome II, pp. lv and lx). In his concern for the French situation, La Taille must have felt drawn towards Machiavelli's writings on government, especially to the Italian's advice on how to establish a strong rule in times of crisis. Yet, as certain passages in Le Prince Nécessaire and the allegory of Le Festin du Lion reveal, La Taille sets definite limits on his approval of Machiavelli. Turning to La Taille's plays, we would expect to find some continuity of themes and influences.

ii) Drama

Saul le Furieux

Jean de La Taille's first tragedy, Saül le Furieux, was written in 1562 but not, so far as is known, published till the first edition of his collected works appeared in Paris in 1572. La Taille's tragedies aim to combine humanist and Biblical subjects, and in the figure of Saul we have the beginnings of a complex psychological portrait of the tragic hero.
There is little trace of any reaction to Machiavelli in Saül but it is perhaps worth pointing out that the figure of the Amelkite soldier who appears in Act V (and briefly in Act III) has several traits of a dissembling, even Machiavellian, courtier. After escaping from David's wrath, the Amelkite attempts to regain favour by dissimulation. He will pretend that it was he who killed Saul,

... d'un parler menteur
Je me feindray du Royal meurtre autheur.\textsuperscript{42}

In the face of David's unexpected anger at the king's death, he then tries flattery which also fails. La Taille has enlarged on the figure of the Amelkite in 2 Samuel I: 1-16, giving him the characteristics of a dissembling, ambitious, scheming, perhaps even Machiavellian, courtier. It is interesting to compare the Amelkite with Doeg in Louis Des Masures's trilogy \textit{Les Tragedies Sainctes}. As we have seen in chapter 4, Des Masures largely invented the Biblical character Doeg, and in doing so gave him several Machiavellian traits. La Taille was familiar with Des Masures's work for there is a hostile reference to his trilogy in \textit{De l'Art de la tragiédie}.\textsuperscript{43}

It is perhaps significant that it is a courtier figure who is given Machiavellian traits. In dealing with the plays of Des Masures we have seen that it is very rare in the theatre that kings are portrayed as Machiavellian - perhaps the respect for kingship was still too deeply-rooted, perhaps it was not safe to depict a Machiavellian ruler on stage, perhaps it was due to a desire to satirize Italian advisers at court - but whatever the reason, Machiavellianism in sixteenth century French tragedies is in general confined to courtiers who present to the king a pattern of political behaviour which is opposed to the traditional ethical code.

Apart from Amelkite, there are in \textit{Saül} traces of the Christian humanist ideas which were to lead La Taille in \textit{Le Prince Nécessaire} to a critical interpretation of Machiavelli's philosophy. In Act V, 'le second
escuyer' opposes expansionist policies (p.82) and approves of keeping promises (p.86). As we have seen, offensive wars and the breaking of promises were two areas where La Taille was unable to agree with Machiavelli in *Le Prince Nécessaire*.

La Famine, ou *les Gabeonites*

Published in 1573, *La Famine* was probably written around 1572-3. Forsyth has pointed out the lessons for contemporary rulers which can be found in *La Famine*. He sees the play as a warning that the Saint Bartholomew's Day Massacres could bring down divine wrath on the house of Valois and by extension, on the whole of France, unless the Valois repent of their part in the massacres. This wish to give advice to the French rulers fits in with what we have seen of La Taille's concern over the troubles in France in his poetry (notably in *Le Festin du Lion*, possibly another attack on the Valois for permitting the massacres) - and as in his poetry, we might expect him to make use of Machiavelli.

Before examining the use La Taille makes of Machiavelli in *La Famine* however, it is perhaps worth discussing what the play owes to Seneca since, as has been pointed out, *La Famine* is influenced by Seneca's *Troades*. In Seneca's play, as in *La Famine*, human sacrifices are demanded: according to religious law, Polyxena must be sacrificed before the Greeks can sail away from Troy. Pyrrhus's words to Agamemnon arguing for the necessity of the sacrifice of Polyxena at the beginning of the *Troades* provide a model for Joab's speech urging David to sacrifice Saul's sons in Act III of *La Famine*. There is as well in Seneca's play a more politically motivated sacrifice. Astyanax must be slain to guarantee that the Trojans will not seek revenge on the Greeks in the future, much as in *La Famine* Saul's sons must be killed in order to secure the continuance of David's line. As Andromache tries to save Astyanax by hiding him in her husband's tomb, so Rezefe in Act III of *La Famine* hides her sons from Joab. The scene between Joab and Rezefe in
Act III is closely modelled on the scene in the *Troades* where Ulysses comes to claim Astyanax. Just as Andromache accuses Ulysses of sacrilege when he threatens to burn down Hector's tomb, so Rezefe charges Joab with impiety when he has Saul's tomb opened up. In both Seneca and La Taille, what is basically an action inspired by political motives (in La Taille, the killing of Saul's sons, in Seneca the sacrifice of Astyanax) is justified by invoking the claims of religion: in Seneca's play, Calchas the augur has demanded Astyanax's death, yet the political motive remains all-important, as Ulysses admits.

The outlines of Joab's character can be found in Seneca. However, close examination reveals that in portraying Joab, La Taille laid special emphasis on those traits in Seneca's Ulysses which could lend themselves to the portrayal of Joab as a Machiavel, such as dissimulation, his desire to eliminate all political rivals and his use of religion as a cloak for acts of policy. Although Joab is in many ways similar to Ulysses, La Taille may have been inspired to develop his character because he saw that certain traits in Ulysses could be enlarged upon to create a more topical and controversial figure, the Machiavellian schemer.

The earliest echo of Machiavelli in *La Famine* comes in fact in the dedication to Margaret of Navarre where La Taille discusses the theme of civil wars and Caesar's responsibility for beginning the civil war which led to Rome's loss of liberty,

... et ce gentil Caesar (dont depuis sont derivez tous les Tyrans) ravit la liberte à ses citoyens, qui soupiroient, et n'ozoient l'appeler meschant, en leurs histoires.

(p.95).

Likewise, Machiavelli, in *Discorsi* I, 10, blames Caesar for ending the Republic and inaugurating a series of governments by Emperors which left Rome prey to civil war and foreign attackers. He adds,

*Né sia alcuno che s'inganni per la gloria di Cesare, sentendolo massime celebrare dagli scrittori; perché quegli che lo laudano sono corrotti dalla fortuna sua e spauriti*
dalla lunghezza dello imperio, il quale reggendosi sotto quel nome, non permetteva che gli scrittori parlassono liberamente di lui. (p.157).

In the tragedy itself, the whole episode of the famine and the death of Saul's sons arises out of Saul breaking his promise to God to protect the Gabeonites (p.126). Forsyth (pp.lxix-lxviii of the introduction to his edition) sees in this theme of broken promises a topical reference to the Saint Bartholomew's Day Massacres, frequently attributed to Machiavelli's policies, when the king broke his promise to protect the Reformers. The theme of broken promises, often connected with anti-Machiavellian propaganda, is not however dwelt upon in the play in a specifically anti-Machiavellian way. But in the light of La Taille's opposition to Machiavelli's ideas on promises elsewhere (see above, p.(^7j), he would probably have regarded the punishment of Saul's sons as a natural outcome of a ruler breaking his promises and he perhaps had Machiavelli at the back of his mind as he wrote.

Later in the century, another French writer, Jacques Hurault, used the Gabeonite story specifically to oppose Machiavelli on the question of broken promises. In Trois Livres des offices d'estat, avec un sommaire des stratagèmes, published in 1596, Hurault criticises Machiavelli as follows,

Un authieur Italien en son Prince dict que de son temps les Princes se sont faicts grands qui n'ont tenu compte de leur foy, et ont passé ceux qui se sont fondez en loyauté ...
Partant (dit-il) un sage seigneur ne peut garder sa foy, si ceste observance luy tourne à rebours: Et d'autant qu'il y a des hommes meschans qui ne gardent leur foy, il ne la leur faut aussi tenir. 48

Just to make quite sure that we know the identity of the person he is attacking, Hurault adds in the margin that these are 'Maximes tyranniques et bestiales de Machiavel.'

Hurault illustrates his argument against Machiavelli with many examples, one of which is God's punishment of Saul for breaking his
promise to the Gabeonites (pp.115-116). Hurault adds,

Ces exemples nous monstrent combien nostre Dieu a la
pariure en grand horreur, afin qu'on ne s'excuse soubs
ombre de dire qu'il ne faut tenir la foi à celui qui la
rompt, .... Car le iurement doit estre tant saint et
redouté, que pour chose du monde on ne le doit faulser.
(ed.cit., p.116).

It is likely that the anti-Machiavellian aspects of the Gabeonite story
had occurred to La Taille as well. 49

In La Famine, Joab is the figure chiefly connected with Machiavellianism.
Joab, who was David's cousin, does not appear in the Biblical account of
the Gabeonite episode in II Samuel 21: 1-14, but he is mentioned frequently
elsewhere in II Samuel as commanding David's army. In La Famine, one of
his strongest characteristics is his lack of piety. When we first see him
in Act I, he is urging David to flee the country, saying that it is futile
to wait for God's help any longer. When David refuses to leave, Joab
suggests they have recourse to magic (often a sign of atheism in the
sixteenth century). David however prefers to rely on God and his prophets.

In Act III Joab urges to David the political advantages of killing
off Saul's sons. He blames Saul for all the disasters which have befallen
Israel and sees in the request of the Gabeonites an excellent excuse to
eliminate Saul's descendants,

Sire, aurez-vous tousjours ceste pitié niaise,
Ceste douceur cruelle, et bonté si mauvaise,
Que mesmes vous vouliez, au dam de vos amis,
Sauver contre raison vos mortels ennemis? ...
N'esprargnez or' ses fils, et vangez aujourd'hui
Sus son sang tout à coup le tort qu'il vous a fait ...
(p.131).

Machiavelli frequently says that it is necessary to eliminate one's
political rivals in order to establish a strong rule. 50 He refers again
and again to the importance of killing 'i figliuoli di Bruto' (see Discorsi
I, 9, 16, 17, 18; III, 3). Discorsi III, 4 entitled 'Non vive sicuro
uno principe in uno principato mentre vivono coloro che ne sono stati
spogliati,' is particularly relevant to the case of Saul's descendants in
relation to David. As we have seen, Joab's words to David are partly modelled on Pyrrhus's speech to Agamemnon at the beginning of the *Troades*, but the specific emphasis on Joab's wish to eliminate political rivals may owe something to La Taille's knowledge of Machiavelli.

Joab's lack of piety is developed in Act III (pp.137-9) where he shows no hesitation in opening up the tombs of Saul and his ancestors despite Rezefe's accusations of sacrilege. This scene owes much to Seneca's *Troades*, as has been mentioned, but of course disregard for religious sensibilities is one aspect of the Machiavel. In Act IV, Joab admits to feeling compassion for Saul's sons but gives as an excuse for the sacrifices the duty of obedience to God's will (p.143). We feel, however, that his acknowledgement of God's will is politically motivated—through obedience to God's command, Israel will be relieved of famine and of possible political rivals to David. He tells Rezefe,

```
Certainement j'ay de l'affliction
De tes enfans quelque compassion:
Mais Israël d'avantage m'emeut,
Qui sans leur mort avoir salut ne peut.
```

(p.143).

One feels that Joab is working above all for the interests of his country—he was prepared to ignore God when he did not seem to be protecting Israel or its ruler (Act I). A little later on in the same Act, Rezefe charges Joab with faithlessness and specious use of religion.

Joab is not the only person accused of Machiavellianism in the play: in Act IV, Saul's sons actually attribute the Machiavellian policy of wishing to eliminate one's rivals to David,

```
Parquoy David fait bien de nous esteindre,
A celle fin qu'il n'aye plus que craindre:
Car il sçait bien qu'en vivant d'avantage,
Nous reussions eu nostre droit heritage:
Et que le regne enjayy par le traître
Fut revue dessus son juste maistre.
```

(p.147).

For a moment, David is placed in the position of the Machiavellian usurper
rather than as he is finally seen in the play, a king lawfully chosen by God. The fact that La Taille stresses the possible Machiavellian interpretations of David's behaviour reveals an awareness of the subtle web of motives lying behind any political action. Rezefe and her sons certainly think that David's motives are merely political and believe that God must be on their side against the political machinations of David.

The Machiavellian traits given to Joab in the play are an invention by La Taille but fit in well nonetheless with what we are told about the Biblical character in II Samuel and I Kings. There, Joab is portrayed as David's henchman, leading his troops into battle, doing his 'dirty' work. In II Samuel II: 14-26, he succeeds in eliminating another of David's rivals, this time a rival in love, Uriah. He is described as seeking revenge on Abner for the death of his brother and he ends by murdering Abner treacherously and being forced by David to do penance (II Samuel 3: 22-34). Interestingly enough, a contemporary of La Taille, Innocent Gentillet, condemns Joab's treachery here and likens it to Machiavellian perfidy. In his Discours contre N. Machiavel, speaking of II Principe chapter 18, Gentillet argues that David's advice to Solomon in I Kings 2: 5-6 to kill Joab reflects God's condemnation of Machiavellian perfidy. 51

Joab is not wholly condemned in La Taille's play, however. Just as La Taille has an ambivalent attitude to Machiavelli's philosophy in Le Prince Nécessaire, so his attitude towards Joab as presented in La Famine is ambiguous: Joab is portrayed as less noble than David who desires only to follow God's will, but on the other hand, his behaviour is not condemned by the Choruses (the traditional arbiters of moral standards in Renaissance tragedy). Rather, he is portrayed as carrying out a distasteful but necessary action. One feels that La Taille has not yet made up his mind about Machiavelli - he does not want the sacred character of kingship to be tainted with any trace of Machiavellianism, yet he can see the
convenience of such acts as the elimination of one's rivals (especially if this can be presented as God's will). His doubts and questionings of motives make for a more complex and stimulating play than if he was simply following a straightforward Biblical narrative. Far from being a mere 'plagiarism' of Seneca's Troades, La Famine is also concerned with an analysis of political behaviour provoked by La Taille's reading of Machiavelli, an analysis which is intended to contain lessons for contemporary French leaders.

Les Corrivaux

It is now recognised that Les Corrivaux has a precise source in Boccaccio's Decameron (see above, note 34), but an earlier writer, Sainte Beuve, describing the origins of knowledge of Italian drama in France says,

Les Supposés et le Néromant de l'Arioste étaient mis en notre langue par Jean-Pierre de Mesmes et Jean de La Taille. Ce dernier auteur ne s'en tint pas là, et dans ses Corrivaux, la première de nos comédies régulières en prose, il essaya, non sans quelque succès, de suivre à son tour les traces de l'Arioste, de Machiavel et de Bibbiena.

There are some similarities between Les Corrivaux and Machiavelli's two comedies - Clizia and Mandragola - but they are similarities of style rather than plot and arise out of the conventions of Renaissance comedy. Both Machiavelli and La Taille present timid heroines who put in only brief appearances on stage; both have stock characters such as the nurse, the young rivals in love. Both deal with a complicated love intrigue. These are the stand-bys of Renaissance comedy.

Nevertheless, one cannot entirely rule out the possibility that La Taille may have read Machiavelli's comedies (though they were not translated into French during the sixteenth century and I know of no reference to them in any other sixteenth century French writer). But La Taille was influenced by other Italian authors (see above p.166). Italian comedy developed earlier than the French and in view of La Taille's interest in the theory and development of drama, it would have been natural
for him to have read Machiavelli's comedies as an example, along with those of Ariosto, of the work of his Italian predecessors.\footnote{55}

\textbf{B. JACQUES DE LA TAILLE}

Examination of Jacques de La Taille's collection of poetry, \textit{Recueil des Inscriptions, Anagrammatismes, et autres oeuvres poetiques} (published in 1572) and of his play \textit{Alexandre} reveals no trace of Machiavelli's influence.

\textbf{Daire}

\textit{Alexandre} was published in 1573 and dedicated by Jean de La Taille to Henry of Navarre.\footnote{56} Published along with \textit{Alexandre} in 1573 was the only other extant play by Jacques - \textit{Daire} which has as its subject the defeat of Darius III, king of Persia (336-330) by Alexander.\footnote{57} This play is prefaced by a dedication from Jean de La Taille to François de Dangenes, a Protestant nobleman. In his preface, Jean tells us that Jacques wrote \textit{Daire} at the age of nineteen years (that is, in 1561) and he points out the moral lessons that can be drawn from the tragedy: the importance of learning to endure the troubles in France as other nations have borne similar suffering.

Jean believes that \textit{Daire} has some relevance to the French situation. Indeed the reason for his choice of \textit{Daire} and \textit{Alexandre} was probably due to their political subject matter (the analysis of rule, the ephemeral nature of power, the qualities needed in a king) which he felt would interest and even instruct his contemporaries. Jean's continuing preoccupation with giving moral and political advice to the rulers of his country is revealed even in the choice of his brother's tragedies: he did not publish those of Jacques's tragedies which most likely took love as their central theme - \textit{Didon, Athamant, Progne} and \textit{Niobe}. \textit{Daire} in particular parallels Jean's own opus in the questions it raises about political behaviour and especially in relation to its treatment of Machiavellian ideas.
Curiously enough, the echoes of Machiavelli in Daire begin with Jean's dedicatory epistle where he says,

J'ay pensé que je ne pourrois choisir un meilleur Curateur à ce pauvre Orflin (dont le Pere fut né Gentilhomme:) qu'à un si sçavant, et courtois Chevalier que vous, encore que ne soyez Prince, Duc, ny Comte: aymant mieux l'addresser à un qui n'estant né Prince merite de l'estre, qu'à tel qui l'estant ne merite de l'estre.

In the prefatory epistle of the Discorsi addressed to his friends and republicans, Zanobi Buondelmonti and Cosimo Rucellai, Machiavelli says that he has departed from the usual practice of dedicating such works to a prince because then one is obliged to praise the ruler for all his good qualities,

quando da ogni vituperevole parte doverrebbono biasimarlo.

So he says,

Onde io, per non incorrere in questo errore, ho eletti non quelli che sono principi, ma quelli che per le infinite buone parti loro meriterebbono di essere.

(pp.121-2).

The clear verbal echo in La Taille shows the extent to which he allowed himself to identify with Machiavelli's position. Like Machiavelli, La Taille is writing in exile (although his is self-imposed), away from the court and political nerve-centre of his country. His use of Machiavelli here reveals something of La Taille's feelings during his retirement at Bondaroy, for just as Machiavelli feels unable to praise the Medici rulers of Florence, so La Taille does not dedicate the play to the French king but to a Huguenot nobleman. Le Courtisan Retiré revealed his bitterness against the court; this echo of Machiavelli may reveal his bitterness against Charles IX who the previous year had allowed thousands of Reformers to be massacred.

It is impossible to ascertain how much La Taille knew of the details of Machiavelli's biography. In general, knowledge of his life in the sixteenth century was vague and frequently erroneous. However, his
identification with Machiavelli's position as a political writer in exile and in opposition to the government of his day, reveals the extent of La Taille's sympathetic understanding with the Italian writer.

The source used by Jacques de La Taille for Daire is Quintus Curtius Rufus's *Historia Alexandri Magni*. He follows quite faithfully Quintus Curtius's account of the defeat of Darius and the conspiracy against him but, as I hope to show, the way in which he portrays certain episodes and characters found in Quintus Curtius owes something to his reading of Machiavelli. Like his brother in La Famine, Jacques uses a classical source but focusses particularly on those themes which raise questions about the Machiavellian attitude to rule.

i) **The conspirators**

Machiavellian themes in Daire centre around Bessus, governor of the Bactriani, and Nabarzane his adviser, two conspirators to the throne of Darius who are prepared to use any means to gain power. Machiavelli, it is true, is describing in *Il Principe* someone who seizes power temporarily in order to liberate his country, but in the *Discorsi* he disapproves of such usurpers of power as Caesar, Marius and Sulla. He wants to preserve a free State and blames Caesar for ending the Roman Republic. It is therefore only *Il Principe* which lends itself to an interpretation of Machiavelli as a supporter of usurpation. Nevertheless, in the sixteenth century, Machiavelli was often connected with the theme of the usurper. 62

In Daire, the theme of the Machiavellian usurper is complicated by the fact that Darius, now the rightful ruler of Persia, was also in the beginning a usurper of someone else's throne. This is mentioned by Nabarzane in Act IV, scene 2 when he is attempting to urge Darius's followers to support him,
It is historically true that Darius gained the throne from Ochus through the help of a eunuch called Bagoas who destroyed Ochus and his heirs before handing the power over to Darius. But Jacques de La Taille has developed the Machiavellian implications of this action by exaggerating the extent of the usurpation. Darius was not a foreigner but of royal blood (his father was Ochus's cousin) and he was regarded by his subjects as an acceptable candidate for the throne. La Taille also emphasises the fact that Darius later killed Bagoas who had helped him to power. In II Principe chapter 3, Machiavelli says,

Di che si cava una regola generale, la quale mai o raro falla; che chi è cagione che uno diventi potente, ruina; perché quella potenzia è causata da colui o con industria o con forza, e l'una e l'altra di queste due è sospetta a chi è divenuto potente.

(p.25).

La Taille has elaborated on the facts in such a way as to bring out the specifically Machiavellian nature of Darius's rise to power.

In the opening scene of Daire, Darius the former usurper, has become disillusioned with power. His laments on the ephemeral nature of rule and his earlier folly in lusting after power serve as a comment on the plotting of the conspirators in Act II,

O hypocrite Sceptre! ô Diademe faux,
Que sous un front bening tu recelles de maux!

(ed.cit., 4 v).

Bessus and Nabarzane however, desire power at any price: Nabarzane says that he would even prefer earthly power to the heavenly kingdom if it were not for the fact that kings are mortal,
The conspirators' pride and ambition are briefly mentioned by Quintus Curtius,

At Bessus et Nabarzanes olim agitatum scelus exsequi statuunt, regni cupiditate accensi; ... Inflabat impios animos regio cui praerant, armis virisque et spatio locorum nulli earum gentium secunda; ...63

But in La Taille's play, their overweening, almost blasphemous pride recalls the popular view of the Machiavellian usurper and in particular the overreachers in English drama such as Marlowe's Tamburlaine.64

The expansionist policies of Bessus and Nabarzane are described in Daire (11 r-11 v) in a way which recalls the scene with Picrochole and his advisers in Rabelais's Gargantua chapter 31.65 The policies of Picrochole's advisers in Gargantua are similar to Alexander's ambition, and indeed Alexander is the model chosen by the advisers in Rabelais's work. Bessus expresses a desire to be king of the world and Nabarzane, the flattering courtier, paints a fantasy picture of how this can be achieved, listing the nations which have to be conquered and building up to a frenzied crescendo with Bessus as the universal monarch.

Bessus's imagination has been stimulated and in a speech not found in Curtius, he declares himself prepared to commit any kind of crime in order to rule over the world,

Que je meure sans sceptre? ha plustost je turoy Pere, mere et enfans, que je ne fusse Roy. A tout pris que ce soit je veux le Diademe...

(ed.cit., 12 r).

The popular view of the Machiavellian prince as prepared to go to any lengths to seize power is perhaps reflected in these lines. But if Bessus represents one trait of the Machiavellian prince (force), Nabarzane possesses the other characteristic, a fox-like cunning,
Discorsi II, 13 entitled 'Che si viene di bassa a gran fortuna più con la fraude che con la forza,' is particularly relevant here (there is no source for Nabarzane's lines in Curtius). The whole of this conversation between the two conspirators has been invented by La Taille who underlines their ambition and use of fraud in a way which leads one to believe that he is intending the reader to draw a comparison with the Machiavellian usurper.

Bessus is easily persuaded to adopt Nabarzane's plan of forcing Darius to relinquish his power to Bessus until Alexander has been defeated. This plan and Nabarzane's words to Darius are found in Curtius. There, he tells Darius,

Scio me ... sententiam esse dicturum prima specie haudquaquam auribus tuis gratam; sed medici quoque graviores morbos asperis remediis curant ...

(ed.cit., V, ix, p.396).

In Daire, he says,

Et le remede à une playe extreme,
Plus il est aspre, et plus est salutaire,
Deust on souffrir le fer ou le cautère.

(ed.cit., 15 r).

In fact, Machiavelli also frequently favours extreme solutions and abhors the middle way in politics.66

Moreover, in a passage from this speech not found in Curtius, Nabarzane reveals himself as a specifically Machiavellian type of opportunist. He rejects the idea that human affairs are controlled by God or the stars and submits them merely to blind Fortune. Because of this, he says, men must occasionally take affairs into their own hands and change their fortune. His positive approach to fortune is rather in the spirit of II Principe chapter 25 where Machiavelli says men should
adapt themselves to their situation and endeavour to control, rather than be controlled by, fortune.

The Chorus at the end of Act II is totally opposed to the concept of power politics and condemns human ambitions,

Ains les vertus seules sont,
Qui nous font
Regner, et non pas la guerre.
(éd.cit., 17 r).

Nevertheless, there remains something attractive about Nabarzane's energy and dynamism as opposed to the weakness of the rightful king, Darius, who is constantly falling prey to his emotions - of self-pity (Act I), anger (Act II), and defeatism (Act III, 5 and 6). He needs to be continually encouraged and advised by the faithful Artabazes. 67 In Nabarzane, Jacques de La Taille thus portrays the ambiguous nature of ambition, an attractive but at the same time dangerous and amoral quality.

Having failed in their first attempt to seize power, the conspirators decide in Act III, as in Curtius's history, to capture the person of Darius. In order to do this, they must win back the favour of the king by feigning repentance. La Taille has followed the description of their behaviour found in Curtius, but of course the use of dissimulation is also a Machiavellian tactic. As in Curtius, Darius follows the un-Machiavellian policy of pardoning his rivals, an action which will cause his downfall. La Taille elaborates on the Machiavellian theme of dissimulation as Darius expresses his fear that Patron, captain of the Greeks, is merely feigning friendship towards him. In fact, Darius is a bad judge of character - Patron genuinely desires to help him; it is Bessus and Nabarzane who have been dissimulating out of ambition (éd.cit., 21 v). Their actions are finally condemned in Act V by Alexander.
The description of Bessus and Nabarzane as ambitious usurpers is contained in Curtius but the development of this theme in a way which specifically recalls Machiavelli is La Taille's own. From a few hints in Curtius's account, he creates a picture of their craftiness, opportunism and their dissimulation.

ii) Alexander

We have seen (above p.470) that the theme of the Machiavellian usurper is complicated by the fact that Darius himself originally usurped the throne of Persia and first appears as a Machiavellian usurper brought to self-knowledge by his troubles (Bessus and Nabarzane remain unrepentant Machiavels in the play). But La Taille's theme of Machiavellianism in politics is further complicated by the figure of Alexander. Alexander is first described, by Darius, as a pretender to universal monarchy (ed.cit., 4 v). Like Bessus and Nabarzane, and like Darius formerly, Alexander is motivated by an insatiable ambition which will not rest till he has conquered the world. The conversation between Artabazes and Darius (Act I, scene 2) reveals Alexander's greatness but also his audacity and overweening pride. The two-edged quality of ambition is again emphasised and Artabazes predicts Alexander's ruin, through overreaching ambition, in the familiar Icarus image (ed.cit., 8 v).

In the speech to his soldiers (Act II, scene 2) which is partly modelled on the speech in Curtius (Book V, viii), Darius stresses that he is fighting to retain his rightful throne against the usurper, Alexander, an addition by La Taille not found in Curtius. When Alexander appears in Act V the characteristic which is most stressed is his 'vertu,' an ambiguous quality here, closer to the Machiavellian 'virtù' than to the concept of moral virtue. In scene I, Alexander calls on his soldiers to show their 'vertu' in fighting the Persians. The opposite of 'vertu' is
'lascheté' and its end is 'gloire.' In scene 2, Alexander laments the fact that Bessus's treachery has robbed him of 'l'object de ma vertu.' The desire for a glorious reputation and the use of the word 'vertu' in this context have something in common with the Machiavellian prince who, like Alexander here, is a man of great energy. The Machiavellian prince possesses 'virtù,' primarily a political rather than a moral quality (though it does not exclude moral acts of goodness). It is a quality which thrives in times of war or political struggles and tends to be corrupted by peace. The opposite of the Machiavellian 'virtù' is not wickedness but 'ozio' - indolence, idleness.  

La Taille could be consciously adding some Machiavellian traits to his portrayal of Alexander, characteristics which are continued in the account of Alexander's speech in Act V, scene 1. Alexander says that it is not sufficient to have conquered the Persians, the Greeks must secure their conquest by lingering in Asia in order to accustom the Persians to Greek rule,  

Mais pensez vous, soldats, que l'Asie farouche,  
Qui par contrainte admet le frein dedans sa bouche,  
Tousjours accoustumée à l'Empire d'un autre,  
Si nous tournions le dos, puisse demourer nostre?  
Il faut que peu à peu devant on l'apprivoise,  
Tant qu'elle souffre en paix la maistrise Grejoise.  
Penseriez vous. Seigneurs, que tant de gents sauvages,  
Qui en façons de faire, en loix, et en langages  
Avec leur nouveau Roy nullement conviennent,  
Avec leur nouveau Roy longuement se contiennent?  
Croyez qu'ils se feroient ennemis en absence,  
De celuy que par force ils craignent en presence,  
Il les faut adoucir, comme les feres rousses,  
Qu'on enferme, se font avec le temps plus douces.  

(ed.cit., 32 r-32 v).  

In Il Principe chapter 3, Machiavelli distinguishes between a situation where the conquered State shares the language and customs of its conqueror and the case where the customs are, as here, divergent. The latter States, he says, are more difficult to hold,
Ma quando si acquista stati in una provincia disforme di lingua, di costumi e di ordini, qui sono le difficoltà, e qui bisogna avere gran fortuna e grande industria a tenerli; et uno de' maggiori remedii e più vivi sarebbe che la persona di chi acquista vi andassi ad abitare. Questo farebbe più secura e più durabile quella possessione ... Perché, standovi, si veggono nascere e' disordini, e presto vi puoi rimediare; non vi stando, s'intendono quando e' sono grandi e che non vie è più remedio ... satisfannosi e' sudditi del ricorso propinquo al principe; donde hanno più cagione di amarlo volendo essere buoni e, volendo essere altrimenti, di temerlo. (pp.18-19).

He approves of establishing colonies to watch over the inhabitants.

The principle is the same as that expressed by Alexander: conquered peoples must have time to grow accustomed to rule by a foreign nation. 'Il les faut adoucir,' says Alexander. Machiavelli says, 'li uomini si debbono o vezzeggiare o spegnere.'

Alexander is thinking of the future: if the Greeks return home now, they will leave Persia a prey to Bessus and his soldiers, and may have to return to Asia to reconquer it. He argues that it is better to make sure of their conquest before leaving,

Avant que de partir il nous faut arracher
Tout cela qui pourroit nostre Empire empescher.

(ed.cit., 32 v).

In Il Principe chapter 3, Machiavelli says,

Debbe ancora chi è in una provincia disforme come è detto ... guardarsi che, per accidente alcuno, non vi entri uno forestiere potente quanto lui.

(p.20).

He wants the ruler to behave like Alexander here and think ahead,

... e Romani feciono in questi casi quello che tutti e principi savii debbono fare: li quali non solamente hanno ad avere riguardo alli scandoli presenti, ma a' futuri, et a quelli con ogni industria obviare; perché, prevedendosi discosto, facilmente vi si può rimediare ... e' Romani, vedendo discosto e' inconvenienti, vi rimediono sempre, e non li lasciono mai seguire per fuggire una guerra, perché sapevano che la guerra non si lieva, ma si differisce a vantaggio di altri ...

(p.21).

Just so, Alexander refuses to delay fighting Bessus. He wishes to vanquish his enemy thoroughly.
Alexander is frequently mentioned with approval in *Il Principe* and the *Discorsi*, and in particular, the whole of *Il Principe* chapter 4 discusses how he was able to secure the kingdom of Darius so that it did not rebel against Alexander's successors. Machiavelli says that the reason for this was that the Persians, like the Turks, were used to absolute rule by one man so that when the ruler's family was wiped out, there was no one to oppose the new conqueror,

Ora, se voi considerrete di qual natura di governi era quello di Dario, lo troverrete simile al regno del Turco; e però ad Alessandro fu necessario prima urtarlo tutto e torli la campagna; dopo la quale vittoria, sendo Dario morto, rimase ad Alessandro quello stato sicuro ...

(p.27).

La Taille may have dwelt on Alexander's method of securing his conquest in Asia because of Machiavelli's treatment of this question. Daire could, after all, have ended, as Book V of Curtius's history ends, with the death of Darius and his appeal to Alexander to avenge his death. Instead, La Taille has chosen to have recourse to the following book by Curtius in order to develop, in his portrayal of Alexander, a third analysis of the desire for power.

Another episode in *Daire* connected with Alexander may also owe something to La Taille's reading of Machiavelli. For Darius is mentioned in the *Discorsi* II, 10 where Machiavelli says that if money was the sinews of war, as Quintus Curtius maintained, then Darius would have conquered Alexander. It is historically true that Darius possessed much more money and more soldiers than Alexander, but La Taille's emphasis on Darius's reliance on money in Act I, sc.2, may be due to his knowledge of the *Discorsi* II, 10. In the play, Darius laments the plundering of his cities by Alexander. He has lost much of his wealth, but Artabazes, his adviser, reminds him that,
... ce n'est par l'or,
Aïnois le fer, ce sont aussi les hommes,
Non les citez, par qui vainqueurs nous sommes.  
(ed. cit., 7 r).

In Discorsi II, 10, Machiavelli explicitly opposing Quintus Curtius, says,

Dico pertanto non l'oro, come grida la comune opinione,
essere il nervo della guerra, ma i buoni soldati ...
(p. 304).

La Taille may be echoing Machiavelli through the words of Artabazes and
in doing so, echoes his opposition to the very author on whose history
Daire is based.

Alexander's ambition is finally justified in the last Chorus of the
play where he is given the title of 'Grand.' His 'vertu,' previously an
ambiguous quality, now takes on moral overtones as the Chorus says,

Toy sans consort seras d'orenvant
Roy du Levant, aussi merites tu
Par ta vertu de regir l'Univers.  
(ed. cit., 35 v).

Alexander is finally justified, but the question of the moral implications
of usurpation has not been resolved, merely sidestepped by the fact
that Alexander the usurper will also be a good ruler for Persia. This
extremely full and complex (especially when one remembers that the
author of the play was only nineteen years old) analysis of the drive
for power and universal dominion reveals La Taille's ambivalent attitude
towards the Machiavellian theory of rule. Reading the play, one feels
that La Taille has not yet sorted out his ideas about Machiavelli.
Certain Machiavellian policies such as the use of ruse, the use of
dissimulation and treachery are clearly condemned. But Alexander and
Darius both have, or had in the past, Machiavellian aspirations to power
which led them to usurp thrones, and yet the tragic emotion is weighted
in their favour. The theme of both Daire and Alexandre is the downfall
of a great ruler: but the fall (of Darius in Daire and Alexander in
Alexandre) is not portrayed as arising out of the ruler's faults, but from the malice of Fortune. They are not being punished for their previous Machiavellian behaviour in usurping power. Rather, ambition and Machiavellianism are seen as inevitable by-products in the character of a great ruler - and, as in the case of Alexander, are perhaps justified by the splendour of his glory.

Bessus, Nabarzane, Darius and Alexander are all usurpers or potential usurpers and they share an insatiable Machiavellian desire for power. Bessus and Nabarzane have the same values as Alexander and Darius, that is, an un-Christian desire for success and glory. Their presence in the play reminds us to some extent of Marlowe's Tamburlaine. Like La Taille, Marlowe surrounds Tamburlaine, the 'overreacher' whose grasp at power is portrayed as specifically anti-Christian, with lesser characters who have the same values but are simply less attractive and less successful. Likewise, the construction of Daire and the Choruses invite us to condemn Bessus and Nabarzane while sympathizing with Darius and admiring Alexander.

What is the distinction in La Taille's view? The play does not supply us with a direct answer but it is feasible that the distinction lies not in the way power is obtained but in the way it is exercised. Despite their ambition, or former ambition, neither Darius nor Alexander are 'tyrans d'exercice.' Darius shows clemency in pardoning the conspirators (Act III, scenes 3 and 4), courage in rousing his soldiers to fight (Act II, scene 2) and loyalty in refusing to abandon his subjects (Act III, scene 5). Alexander's courage, justice and loyalty are recognised by Darius himself (ed.cit., 20 r-20 v) and he relies on Alexander's hatred of treachery to avenge his death (23 v). Alexander halts the massacre of the Persians (29 v) and Darius's followers voluntarily decide to accept Alexander as their lawful ruler since they trust his reputation for justice and clemency (30 r-31 r). Their faith is justified as Alexander swears to have revenge on Bessus and Nabarzane (Act V, scene 2).
In Daire, the actions of one character serve as a comment on another: Darius's repentance of his former desire for power influences the light in which we view not only the actions of the two conspirators, but also of the great Alexander himself. The behaviour of Bessus and Nabarzane provides, in an almost Shakespearean way, a sub-plot which contains its own criticism of the ambition of Darius and Alexander by showing the meaner aspects of this ambiguous quality. By his portrayal of Bessus and Nabarzane as petty Machiavels, La Taille highlights the Machiavellian aspects of Alexander's rule and so provides a counter-balance to the theme of glorious imperialism so important in the Renaissance period, by revealing its baser, seamier aspects. The implications are that ambition can lead to great and glorious actions, but that it contains within it seeds of baser, more Machiavellian behaviour such as dissimulation, fraud and treachery. For La Taille these two faces of ambition are inseparable.

On the basis of the depth and subtlety of the treatment of the themes of ambition and usurpation in Daire and La Taille's addition of Machiavellian material to his classical source, Quintus Curtius, I would be inclined to put the composition of this play at a later date than Alexandre. The latter is a much more static play, being largely a lament for a hero defeated by Fortune; whereas Daire contains a complex analysis of political behaviour in which La Taille's own questionings and doubts may be discerned.

Both Jean and Jacques de La Taille seem to have possessed a keen fascination with the ideas found in Machiavelli's work. They both wrote plays modelled on classical sources (Seneca and Quintus Curtius) but which could easily be adapted to the treatment of Machiavellian themes. Jean has described how he encouraged and fostered his brother's interest in literature,
One wonders whether it was in fact Jean who initiated his brother's interest in Machiavelli ...
FOOTNOTES


Remonstrance pour le Roy, A Tous ses Subjects qui ont pris les armes contre sa Majesté. Par I. de La Taille, Lyons, Michel Jove, 1567, BN Rés Ye 4274.


Remonstrance pour le Roy, à Tous ses Subjects afin de les encliner à la paix. Revué par l'Auteur et accommodée pour les premiers et derniers troubles, Paris, F. Morel, 1571.


6. This is the edition used by De Maulde in Oeuvres, ed.cit., tome II, pp.v-xxii. All references are to this edition of La Remonstrance.


8. His high regard for the French monarchy is revealed in Hymne à Madame Soeur du Roy where he says,

.... après Dieu il n'est chose si grande
Qu'un Roy de France ...

(Oeuvres ed.cit., tome II, p.xxix and see p.lviii).

This is an echo of Du Bellay's sonnet 191 (1.8) in Les Regrets et autres Oeuvres Poétiques ed.Jolliffe and Screech, Geneva, 1966. In
the same poem, La Taille's patriotism is shown in the passage praising France as 'un si bel heritage.' (p.xxxi). Again this is an echo: of Ronsard's Discours à la royn in Discours des misères de ce temps ed.Malcolm Smith, Geneva, 1979, 1.68.


11. See, for example, Discorsi I, 21, 43; II, 20. It is also found in classical writers such as Polybius and Isocrates, see L.P. Walker's introduction to his translation of the Discorsi, tome II, p.125, note. The echo of Machiavelli has also been pointed out by R. Thomas in her thesis (see note 4 above).


13. See my chapter on Pierre Matthieu, pp.73-5 for Louis XI portrayed as a Machiavellian figure in contemporary political pamphlets.

14. It would be interesting to know whether Henry of Navarre was familiar with Machiavelli's works. There is no mention of Machiavelli in D. Seward's recent biography, The First Bourbon. Henry IV, King of France and Navarre, London, 1977. But his first wife, Margaret of Valois, had a copy of Il Principe in her library, see Keating (L.C.), Studies
on the Literary Salon in France 1550-1615, Cambridge, 1941, p.126.


16. In Discorsi I, 10, a chapter used by La Taille in Le Prince Nécessaire, Machiavelli shows his opposition to kingdoms founded on hereditary rule. Examining Rome under the Empire, he says,

Vedrà ancora per la lezione di questa istoria come si può ordinare un regno buono: perché tutti gl’ imperadori che succederono all’ imperio per eredità, eccetto Tito, furono cattivi; quelli che per adozione, furono tutti buoni ... (p.158).

See also Discorsi I, 2 and III, 5 where he argues that a line of hereditary rulers easily degenerates.

17. The Education of a Christian Prince by Desiderius Erasmus transl. L.K. Born, New York, 1936, pp.139-140.

18. Daley, op.cit., p.93, like Pintard, has criticised La Taille for his utopian ideas in Le Prince Nécessaire. I believe it can be argued that La Taille had a greater awareness of the realities of the political situation in France than has hitherto been allowed.

19. Compare Ronsard’s use of this passage from Machiavelli (discussed in chapter 9 of this thesis) and Bodin’s rejection of Plato in Les Six Livres de la Republique, Lyons, 1579, BL 1476 dd 19, Book I, chapter 1, p.3.

20. Alberico Gentili discusses Machiavelli’s use of this idea, borrowed from Livy, in De Legationibus Libri Tres (first published 1594),
Another French writer, Jacques Ribier, later echoed the same passage from Machiavelli but kept its original application to legal reform, see Discours sur le Gouvernement des Monarchies et Principautez Souveraines, Paris, 1630, BL 1128 h 1, p.53. Many of the themes with which Ribier deals, seem to have been prompted by his reading of Machiavelli.

In fact, La Taille says that a ruler should be a fox rather than a lion, that is, he adapts Machiavelli's metaphor to the humanist preference for ruse in war rather than force.

See the chapters on Ronsard and La Jessee for their borrowing of imagery from Machiavelli.

See Ronsard, Discours des misères de ce temps, ed.cit., p.58. It is frequently found in the sixteenth century, for example, in Francis Hotman's Francogallia, libellus statum veteris Reipublicae Gallicae, tum deinde a Francis occupatae, describens, Cologne, 1574 (second edition), George Buchanan's Rerum Scoticarum Historia, ... Accessit De iure regni apud Scotos dialogus, Edinburgh, 1583 and Innocent Gentillet's Discours contre N.Machiavel, ed.A. D'Andrea and P.D. Stewart, Florence, 1974, p.318.

Pintard omits to mention that the context is slightly different in the two authors. La Taille is describing the French situation where there was a young king on the throne, an easy prey to the ambitions of any powerful men who wished to rule (La Taille is thinking...
specifically of the Guises, see p.civ). Machiavelli, on the other hand, is describing a prince who has established his power through his own efforts and in *Il Principe* chapter 23, he is dealing particularly with the question of free speech on the king's council.

26. Again, there is a difference between the two authors which is not pointed out by Pintard. In Machiavelli, the three grades of capacity for good judgement are used to apply to the prince's ministers - it is not questioned that the prince himself will possess good judgement. In *La Taille*, the grading is applied to the prince who, if he has taken over a hereditary position, may not naturally have the gift of being able to judge for himself. The difference between a new prince and a hereditary prince leads *La Taille* to deal with topics which Machiavelli never touches, for example, the necessity of marrying someone of one's own nationality (p.cvi and p.cxix). Pierre Matthieu also borrows the passage from *Il Principe* chapter 22 in the *Histoire de France*, Paris, 1608, Book VI, pp.504-505.

27. The reason why *Le Prince Nécessaire* was never published may lie in this passage. F. Charbonnier in *La Poésie Française et les guerres de religion* (1560-1574), Paris, 1919, p.333 and De Maulde in his edition of *La Taille*'s *Oeuvres*, tome III, pp.lx-1xi, both claim that it was due to lack of money. But *La Taille* published two editions of his collected works in 1572 and 1574 (by which time the poem was already written). Lack of money did not prevent him from publishing later works. The most likely explanation is that after the Saint Bartholomew's Day Massacres of 1572, certain advice given by *La Taille* in the poem would seem in retrospect to be approval of the Massacres, an interpretation *La Taille*, with his ideas on tolerance, would not have wished (moreover, he was to write a political allegory
criticising the Massacres - Le Festin du lion). Passages such as

Je ne dy pas, s'il peut les chefs seditieux
Exterminer du tout, qu'il ne fist pour le mieux ...
(p.cxii),

and

Je dispense mon Prince, en ces troubles nouveaux,
D'user, si juste il est, de cruautéz utiles,
De punir les plus grands, de raser quelques villes
Qui refuseroient paix; et mesmes que les os
Des morts, auteurs de guerre, aussi n'ayent repos!
Que leur nom soit infâme et soient exterminées
Leurs armes, leurs maisons et mesmes leurs lignées!
(p.cxv).

These passages were originally written against the Guises - indeed the whole poem contains veiled criticisms of their power over the king (see above, note 25), their power in council (p.cx) and their warlike policies. After the 1572 Massacres these passages could be interpreted as a sign of approval of the events of Saint Bartholomew's Day and the description of the leaders urging the king to war (p.cxii) could be taken not as a reference to the Guises, but to the Protestant leaders, particularly Coligny who had been persuading Charles IX to fight against the Spanish in the Netherlands. La Taille may have withheld publication of Le Prince Necessaire in order not to appear as if he was endorsing the Massacres.


30. Machiavelli's approval of a mixed form of government was influenced by his reading of Aristotle's Politics, especially Book II. The idea of a mixed government as a moderate government which avoids extreme
constitutions had been expounded also by Polybius and Aquinas.

31. Compare Ronsard's Institution pour l'adolescence du Roy Tres-Chrestien Charles IX in Discours des miseres de ce temps ed.cit., p.60, 1, 175-8 and see the note to these lines.

32. Henry of Navarre was often accused of being surrounded by courtiers who instructed him in Machiavellianism, see Advertissement des catholiques anglois aux francoys catholiques (Archives curieuses de l'histoire de France ed. Cimber and D'Anjou, tomes 10-12, p.147 and p.157); Advertissement catholique, sur l'heretique ettraistre declaration de Henry d'Albret, se disant Roy de France, et de Navarre, Paris, 1589, BN Lb35 93, pp.15-16; Responce à l'Anti-Espagnol, Lyons, 1590, BN Lb35 315, pp.37-39 (attributed to Claude de Rubys by Père Lelong); François de Verone (a pseudonym for Jean Boucher), Apologie pour Jehan Chastel, Paris, 1595, BL 4092 aaa 18, p.86; and see Mastellone (S.), Venalità e Machiavellismo in Francia (1572-1610), Florence, 1972, chapter 9. For Henry as the opposite of a Machiavellian ruler, see Advertissement au Roy, ou sont deduictes les raisons d'Estat, pour lesquelles il ne luy est pas bien seant de changer de religion, s.l., 1589, BN Lb35 89 and Le Vray Catholique Romain contre le ligueur couvert, s.l., 1591, BN Lb35 391, A ii v.


34. See Zeppa de Nolva (C.), 'Tragédie italienne et française au seizième siècle,' Revue des Etudes Italiennes, Paris, (1937), II,
35. It was believed that the marriage had been deliberately arranged in order to assemble all the leaders of the Reformed party in one place simultaneously so as to assassinate them, see Yates (F.A.), *Valois Tapestries*, London, 1959, p.118; Gabriel Naudé, *op.cit.*, pp.177-180; *Le Tocsain contre les massacres et auteurs des confusions en France* (Archives curieuses de l'histoire de France *ed.cit.*, p.6).


38. See the chapter on Pierre Matthieu, *note 43*, Machiavelli's symbols were adopted by another contemporary of La Taille's in connection with the Massacres, see, *Memoires de l'Estat de France sous Charles IX.*, Middelburg, 1573, BL 283 b 9, attributed to Simon Goulart, 254r, and 386v-387r for the medals commemorating the Massacres. Since the Massacres were so often attributed to Machiavelli's influence, the fox and lion symbols must have seemed to La Taille to be the obvious choice for an allegorical poem about that event.

40. In his edition of La Taille's tragedies, Forsyth follows tradition in giving the date of Saül's composition as pre-April 1562, that is, before the outbreak of the first civil war. G. Spillebout in his review of Forsyth's edition (BHR, XXXII, (1970), pp.180-192) argues that Saül could have been written while La Taille was actually in the army, that is, between April and October 1562. This allows Spillebout to put forward in an attractive, though conjectural, interpretation a case for topical meaning in Saül: Saul as Henry II who is governing badly in the opinion of the Levites (the Reformers). Catherine consulting the prophecies of Nostradamus would have a parallel in Saul conjuring up the spirit of Samuel. Spillebout sees a similarity between David fighting in Achis's army, but remaining loyal to the God of the Jews, and La Taille as a Reformer fighting in the royal army.

41. See Lebègue (R.), Tragédie française ed.cit., p.41 and Thomas (R.), op.cit., pp.187-192, for an analysis of the ambiguity (admiration and condemnation) of La Taille's attitude towards Saul.

42. Tragédies: Saül le Furieux, La Famine ou les Gabeonites ed.E. Forsyth, Paris, 1968, p.76. This is the edition of La Taille's tragedies referred to throughout this chapter.

43. Forsyth, op.cit., p.5 and note to 11.61-63.

44. Forsyth gives 1572-3. Smith and Hall rather unconvincingly argue for 1562 (ed.cit., p.2) - but La Taille in his dedication to Margaret of Navarre explicitly says that he has not delayed in presenting his tragedy to her (ed.cit., p.95, 11.66-71). R. Thomas, op.cit.,
pp.73-76, pin-points 1573 specifically as the date of composition for the reason that there was actually a heavy famine in France during the winter of 1572-3.


49. The author of the Protestant pamphlet De la puissance légitime du prince sur le peuple, et du peuple sur le prince, s.l., 1581, BL 521 b 11 (21), variously attributed to Du Plessis-Mornay, Hubert Languet and Beza, also gives the story of Saul's treatment of the Gabeonites as an example of a ruler breaking his promise to God ('Seconde Question,' pp.57-58). Junius Brutus sees the famine as God's punishment of the Israelites for not rebelling against their king when he broke his promise. Machiavelli is not mentioned here, but opposition to his ideas exists in so far as the whole of this pamphlet is made to reflect opposition to the Italian's teachings by C. Superantius in the preface (C. Superantius has been seen variously as Languet or Gentillet).

50. R. Thomas, op.cit., pp.206-210, also points out the similarity here between Joab's words and Machiavelli's advice.


54. For this convention in Renaissance comedy, see Jefferey (B.), *op. cit.*, pp.151-152.

55. For the influence of Italian comedy in France, see Jefferey (B.), *op. cit.*, pp.24-41.

56. There is a modern edition of *Alexandre* by C.N. Smith, University of Exeter, 1975.

57. There is no modern edition of this play. I have used the 1598 edition in the British Library 164 a 61.


59. And see the beginning of *Le Prince Necessaire* where he adopts Machiavelli's stance of the ordinary citizen instructing his prince in the art of rule, see above, p.455.
60. It is significant that La Taille never openly attacks the French king in any of his works: his respect for the office of monarch was too deeply-rooted. Instead, he puts all his hopes in Henry of Navarre as a future leader of France.

61. See the introduction to this thesis p.20.

62. Pierre Constant, for example, draws a contrast between the Biblical view of kingship and the Machiavellian type of usurper,

Ce n'est pas de telle puissance que je parle, qui vient des enfers plutôt que du Ciel, laquelle un brave et généreux Prince n'affecte jamais, encore bien que les Atheistes et fideles sectateurs du Machiavelisme, tiennent pour une maxime certaine, que l'usurpation entre les grands n'est qu'un trait de magnanimité, et s'il faut forcer le droit, ce doit estre principalement pour regner. Mais j'entends discours d'une vraie et sincère puissance, qui regne sur nous, par la grace de Dieu, et par une voye legitime, authentique, et bien receuë par les loix et constitutions d'un Royaume.

(De l'Excellence et Dignité des Rois, Paris, 1598, BN Rés *E 619, pp.30-31).


64. In her thesis (pp.369-370), R. Thomas points out that Bessus and Nabarzane are pretenders to the throne with Machiavellian characteristics.

65. Ed. Calder, Screech, Saulnier, Geneva and Paris, 1970; the editors point out that this scene has a classical source in Lucian (note 155, p.201). It is possible that La Taille borrowed the idea directly from Lucian.

66. See Discorsi I, 26, 18; III, 2, 21, 40. Guicciardini criticised Machiavelli for his extreme proposals, as did René de Lucinge in

Voyez je vous prie la mauvaise grace qu'il a marchant ainsi par les extremitez, sans tenir le milieu, qui seroit necessaire en ses proportions.

(p.413).

67. Darius's weakness is found in Quintus Curtius, but the play may be intended as a reflection of the French situation in 1561 when there was a young king, Charles IX, on the throne. He too, needed to be supported by his mother and the regent, Antoine de Bourbon, against the ambitions of the Guises.


69. And see Discorsi II, 6.

70. Machiavelli's views on this subject were known to other sixteenth century writers. They are echoed by Jacques Ribier, op.cit., p.51. They are opposed by Rabelais in Pantagruel (see Cooper (R.), 'Rabelais et l'occupation française du Piemont,' Culture et Politique en France à l'Epoque de l'Humanisme et de la Renaissance ed.F. Simone, Turin,

71. Others stressed that Machiavelli's prince was not a great ruler, 

... le Prince de Machiavel est, non un grand et puissant Monarque, dominant en une Monarchie establie de long temps, et fondée sur des loix certaines et equitables, mais un petit Prince, un petit Potentat, la domination duquel s'est formée par artifice, et se maintient par violence, (Fragment de l'Examen du Prince de Machiavel, Paris, 1622, BL 521 c 11, Book V, p.2).

72. C.N. Smith gives *Alexandre* as the later play without, however, giving any reasons for this choice (*ed.cit.*, p.xi).

73. Dedicatory epistle to *Saül* *ed.cit.*, 71 r-71 v. I have assumed that the text of *Daire* as we know it is as it was originally written by Jacques; it is possible, though, that the play was reworked by his brother before publication, in which case the Machiavellian themes could have been added by Jean de La Taille.
There are three main reasons why one would expect Ronsard to be familiar with Machiavelli's works.

i) Ronsard's interest in practical politics.

Like Machiavelli, Ronsard was very much involved in the troubles of his own country. As one of the foremost literary figures of his age, the 'Prince of poets' was expected to comment on major events and crises. He largely concentrated on the religious upheavals of the century, but the latter were so inextricably linked with political actions that he often found himself, especially in the Discours des Misères, giving advice on how to govern. This is particularly so in the Discours à la Royne and the Institution pour l'adolescence du Roy Treschretien Charles neufvieme de ce nom.

Although Ronsard depended heavily on royal patronage and although he has sometimes been described as simply defending and explaining royal policy, nevertheless he had sufficient independence to allow him on occasion to express his own ideas on politics and to warn or rebuke the political leaders of his time. Ronsard often advised a ruler how not to behave as in the Institution (written for Charles IX), the Hymne du Roy Henri II, the Prière à la Fortune and the Épistre de Pierre de Ronsard, à Tresillustre Prince Charles, Cardinal de Lorraine (a subtle criticism of Lorraine's behaviour). There also exist some previously unpublished satirical poems attacking Charles IX and Henry III which have been attributed to Ronsard. He was not afraid to reproach his rulers for extravagance, as in the Institution, and, in common with many French anti-Machiavellians, he frequently charged French leaders with favouring foreigners, particularly Italians, to the detriment of their own subjects — see for example, his criticisms of Catherine de' Medici in the
Compleinte à la Royne Mere du Roy. One would expect Ronsard, concerned as he was with finding practical solutions to the problems of his country, to take an interest in one of the most controversial political thinkers of the age.

ii) Ronsard's admiration for the ancients.

Both Ronsard and Machiavelli admired the ancient world and were well versed in classical literature. In a letter to Francesco Vettori, Machiavelli has left us a delightful description of how he spent the evenings on his farm reading the works of classical Antiquity,

Venuta la sera, mi ritorno in casa ed entro nel mio scrittorio: e in su l'uscio mi spoglio quella vesta cotidiana,
piena di fango e di loto, e mi metto panni reali e curiali: e rivestito condecentemente, entro nelle antique corte delli
antiqui uomini, dove, da loro ricevuto amorevolmente, mi
pasco di quel cibo che solum è mio e che io nacqui per lui;
dove io non mi vergogno parlare con loro e domandarli della
ragione delle loro azioni: e quelli per loro umanita mi
rispondono.

(Written 10 December, 1513).

Ronsard's poetry reveals the same intimate knowledge and love of classical writings. Ronsard believed that it was permissible to hold up pagan leaders as examples for a Christian King to follow and both writers point to Roman politics as a model for modern rule. In the Institution pour l'adolescence du Roy, he set before Charles IX the examples of Achilles, Theseus, Hercules and Jason (Discours des Misères, ed. cit., pp. 52-54). Yet Machiavelli's love of the ancient world was more literal than that of Ronsard. In the Discorsi, he advocates a return to a political system identical in nearly every aspect to the Roman one. He even expresses a wish to return to the religion of pagan Rome. In contrast, Ronsard used classical ideas on religion in a syncretic way, exploiting the treasures of classical antiquity to expound truths which were compatible with the Christian revelation (see especially his poem Hercule Chrestien, Oeuvres complètes, ed. cit., vol. VIII, p. 207).
iii) Ronsard's relations with writers familiar with Machiavelli's works

Ronsard's friendship with several of the French translators of Machiavelli's books provides another reason for expecting Ronsard to have read the Italian author. Guillaume Cappel whose French translation of *Il Principe* appeared in 1553 was a member of the early 'Brigade'.

In *Les Bacchanales*, Ronsard describes Cappel taking part in the festival of Arcueil of 1549,

Voyci Ligneri qui pousse
De son poulce,
Les nerfs du luth immortel:
Et Capel qui ne peut plaire
Au vulgaire,
Ny le vulgaire à Capel.


This poem was published only one year before the appearance of Cappel's translation with its enthusiastic defence of Machiavelli. It is not impossible that Cappel discussed his project with other members of the 'Brigade' and indeed, Estienne Jodelle was to write a sonnet and three Latin couplets in praise of the translation. Two other friends of Ronsard, Marc-Antoina Muret and Rémy Belleau, also wrote verses for Cappel's translation. It is unlikely that a work celebrated by so many of Ronsard's friends could have failed to attract the attention of the French poet.

Also in 1553 appeared Gaspard D'Auvergne's translation of *Il Principe* for which Muret and Jean Dorat, Ronsard's tutor, wrote prefatory verses. In the introduction to his translation, D'Auvergne excuses and approves of Machiavelli's pragmatic attitude to politics and it would be interesting to establish how far his views were shared by those who wrote verses extolling his translation. Ronsard dedicated several poems to D'Auvergne for example, *Le Bocage* (1549) nos. V, VI and VIII (Oeuvres complètes, ed. cit., vol. II) and an Ode in the *Second Livre des Meslanges* (Oeuvres complètes, ed. cit., vol. X, p. 135).
Although D'Auvergne's translation was not published till 1553, the 'privilège' is dated March 1547, implying that D'Auvergne has been rather tardy about completing his work. Is this what Ronsard is referring to in 1549 in Le Bocage no. VI where he urges D'Auvergne to hurry up with his writing?

Que tardes-tu, veu que les Muses
T'ont élargi tant de sçavoir,
Que plus souvent tu ne t'amuses
A les chanter, et que tu n'uses
De l'art qu'ell' t'ont fait recevoir:
Tu as le tens qui faut avoir,
Repos d'esprit, et patience,
Dous instruments de la science;
Et toutefois l'heure s'enfuit
D'un pié leger et diligent,
Sans que ton esprit negligent,
Face appaoriste de son fruit.


In view of Ronsard's friendship with at least two of the translators of Machiavelli's works, it is possible that it was in this way his interest in Machiavelli was first aroused. He never visited Italy although he tells us that he very much wished to see that country at one time - see the Second Livre des Meslanges (Oeuvres complètes, ed. cit., vol. X, p. 32) and Odes Book IV (Oeuvres complètes, vol. II, p. 91).

There are two other people linked with Machiavelli in the sixteenth century who figure in Ronsard's poems, Guillaume Du Bellay and Bartolomeo Delbene. The Instructions sur le faict de la guerre, extraictes des livres de Polybe, Frontin, Vegece, Cornazan, Machiarelle, et plusieurs autres bons auteurs (Paris, 1549) was attributed to Du Bellay and his name was often linked with that of Machiavelli in connection with writings on military affairs. Ronsard praises Guillaume Du Bellay as the wise governor of Piedmont in Ode à Joachim Du Bellai Angevin (Oeuvres complètes, ed. cit., vol. I, p. 115). Bartolomeo Delbene was a Florentine poet in exile at the French court and, probably because of his nationality, he was accused, along with Jacopo Corbinelli, of instructing Henry III in Machiavellianism. Bartolomeo Delbene wrote an Italian ode in honour
of Ronsard (Oeuvres complètes, ed. cit., vol. XVIII, pp. 228-230) to which Ronsard replied with an elegy praising Delbene's poetry (Oeuvres complètes, vol. XVIII, p. 253) and calling him 'Poète Italien excellent.' Ronsard dedicated his Abbregé de l'Art Poétique François to Bartolomeo's son, Alphonse Delbene, who had some pretensions to culture. In this dedication, Ronsard included praise of Bartolomeo's own poetry (Oeuvres complètes, ed. cit., vol. XIV, p. 7).

Therefore, in view of Ronsard's interest in the practical problems of ruling, and his admiration of the ancients as well as his friendship with various people who knew Machiavelli's works intimately, one would expect to find some reaction to the Italian author in Ronsard's poetry.

Ronsard's reaction to Machiavelli

As one would expect in an independent thinker, Ronsard's reaction to Machiavelli is a balanced one: he cannot agree with Machiavellianism in politics, but on the other hand several echoes of the Italian author in his work seem to indicate that neither is his attitude one of outright condemnation.

1) Approval of Machiavelli

Ronsard never actually names Machiavelli in any of his poems but a certain tacit approval of the Italian author is implicit in the way he occasionally borrows from his works. P. Laumonier has pointed to one possible echo of Machiavelli at the beginning of the Discours à la Royne where Ronsard argues that there has always been the same amount of vice and virtue in the world,

Si, depuis que le monde a pris commencement,
Le vice d'age en age eust pris accroissement,
Il y a jà long temps que l'extreme malice
Eust surmonté le monde et tout ne fut que vice.
Mais puis que nous voyons les hommes en tous lieux
Vivre, l'un vertueux et l'autre vicieux,
Il nous faul confesser que le vice diforme
N'est pas victorieux, mais suit la même forme
Qu'il avait dès le jour que l'homme fut vestu
(Ainsi que d'un habit) de vice et de vertu.
Ny même la vertu ne s'est point augmentée:
Si elle s'augmentoit, sa force fut montée
Jusqu'au plus haut degré, et tout seroit icy
Vertueux et parfait, ce qui n'est pas ainsi.
Or comme il plaist aux meurs, aux princes et à l'âge,
Quelque fois la vertu abonde davantage,
Et quelque fois le vice, et l'un en se haulsant
Va de son compagnon le crédit rabaissant,
Puis il est rabaissé, afin que leur puissance
Ne preigne dans ce monde une entière accroissance.

(Discours des Misères, ed. cit.,
pp. 61-62).

It may be that Ronsard is echoing here the preface to Book II of the Discorsi where Machiavelli, following Polybius, says,

E pensando io come queste cose procedino, giudico il mondo sempre essere stato ad uno medesimo modo, ed in quello essere stato tanto di buono quanto di cattivo; ma variare questo cattivo e questo buono di provincia in provincia, come si vede per quello si ha notizia di quegli regni antichi, che variavano dall' uno all' altro per la variazione de costumi, ma il mondo restava quel medesimo.

(p. 272).

He describes how virtue was transferred from empire to empire in ancient times until it finally arrived in Rome. Since then, he says, virtue has not been centred in any one place though nations can be found where men lead virtuous lives, as in modern day Germany. Machiavelli argues that it is a mistake to praise the past continually to the detriment of the present since vice and virtue have always been present in the world in equal quantities. Both Ronsard and Machiavelli display an optimistic attitude, and indeed Ronsard's optimism has been seen as a deliberate attack on the pessimism of certain Reformers (see Discours des Misères, ed. cit., note to Discours à la Royne, 1.1-24).

Another possible echo of Machiavelli in Ronsard's poetry concerns his use of imagery. In Priere à Dieu pour la Victoire, Ronsard says,

On dit bien vray, Fortune est une femme,
Qui aime mieulx les jeunes que les vieulx.
Les jeunes sont toujours victorieux,
Et la Fortune aime mieulx la jeunesse,
Qui' une grisonne et peu forte vieillesse.

(Discours des Misères, ed. cit., 1.118-122).
This image is a reworking of some lines in an earlier poem, Harangue du Duc de Guise (Oeuvres complètes, ed. cit., vol. V, p. 216 var.). As M.C. Smith points out in his edition of the Discours des Misères (p. 249) the image of Fortune as a woman who prefers young men to old is found in Il Principe chapter 25, where Machiavelli says of Fortune,

\[ E \ përo \ sempre, \ come \ donna, \ è \ amica \ de' \ giovani, \ perché \ sono \ meno \ respettivi, \ piu \ feroci, \ e \ con \ piu \ audacia \ la \ comandano. \ (p. \ 101). \]

The description of Fortune as a fickle woman was traditional but Machiavelli developed this comparison by making Fortune into a woman who prefers young men to old, an original twist which is appropriated by Ronsard.\(^{18}\)

Lastly, there is a verbal echo of Machiavelli's opinion of Plato in Ronsard's elegy A Monsieur de Mont-Morency Marechal de France (which first appeared in the 1567 collected edition of Ronsard's Oeuvres). Ronsard criticises Plato's writings for being too theoretical,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Je m'esbahis des parolles subtiles} \\
\text{Du grand Platon, qui veut regir les villes} \\
\text{Par un papier et non par action.} \\
\text{C'est une belle et docte invention,} \\
\text{Qui toutesfois ne scauroit satisfaire} \\
\text{Pour estre oysive: il faut venir au faire,} \\
\text{Ainsi que vous qui scavez contenter} \\
\text{Par l'effect seul, et non par l'inventer.}
\end{align*}
\]

(Oeuvres complètes, ed. cit., vol. XIV, pp. 186-187).\(^{19}\)

Compare Machiavelli's criticism of the Platonic style of writing on politics in Il Principe chapter 15 where, however, he draws very different conclusions from those of Ronsard,

\[
\begin{align*}
\ldots \text{sendo l'intento mio scrivere cosa utile a chi la intende,} \\
\text{mi è parso più conveniente andare dritto alla verità effettuale} \\
\text{della cosa, che alla immaginazione di essa. E molti si sono} \\
\text{immaginati repubbliche e principati che non si sono mai visti} \\
\text{né conosciuti essere in vero; perché elli à tanto discosto} \\
\text{da come si vive a come si dovrebbe vivere, che colui che lascia} \\
\text{quello che si fa per quello che si dovrebbe fare, inpara più} \\
\text{tosto la ruina che la preservazione sua.} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(p. 65).

Ronsard seems to be intentionally echoing this very important passage in Machiavelli here - note the closeness of the wording 'il faut venir au
Machiavelli and Plato were frequently linked in the Renaissance. That political pragmatist, Thomas Cromwell, criticised Plato for writing about politics in too idealistic a way and in doing so, he praised Machiavelli's realism. His admiration for Machiavelli is described in Reginald Pole's *Apologia ad Carolum V* where Cromwell is reported to have said that the Italian author did not run after dreams as Plato had in his *Republic* (*Epistolarum Reginaldi Poli et aliorum ad ipsum collectio*, Brixiae, 1744, vol. I). In his *Traité de la Réformation de la Justice*, Michel de L'Hospital attacked the utopian writings of Plato, Xenophon and Thomas More and in doing so, he may have been consciously echoing Machiavelli. Other writers, however, preferred Plato to Machiavelli.

Ronsard thus rejects Platonic idealism in politics as outmoded and unhelpful for the daily business of policy-making. On the other hand, as we shall see in the following section, neither is he content to subordinate moral principles to utilitarian ends. In common with most writers of his age, Ronsard is torn between the old humanist theories of political behaviour which now seemed hopelessly idealistic, and an unwillingness to sacrifice every moral principle for the good of the State. It is perhaps worth noting that none of these three echoes of Machiavelli in Ronsard concerns the Italian author's political theories as such. Rather, Ronsard borrows his ideas on philosophy (on the nature of good and evil in the world), his imagery and his assessment of a classical author. The latter borrowing, it is true, does involve Ronsard in a rejection of the idealistic approach to politics, but this is as far as the French author is prepared to go. He is not willing to endorse Machiavellianism in politics and especially not to encourage his King in this sort of behaviour.
ii) **Opposition to Machiavelli**

Opposition to Machiavelli's political theories appears most clearly in Ronsard's *Institution pour l'adolescence du Roy Treschretien Charles neufvieme de ce Nom*. M.C. Smith (Discours des Misères, ed. cit., note to the *Institution* 1.5-11), has stressed that the ideas in the *Institution* are fundamentally opposed to those of Machiavelli and indeed, the whole of this poem giving detailed and practical advice on ruling seems tinged with anti-Machiavellian sentiment. The first twenty-six lines in particular appear to be a direct reply to *Il Principe*. Ronsard warns Charles IX that it is not enough for a ruler to be skilled in the art of war,

> Il ne doit seulement sçavoir l'art de la guerre,  
> De garder les cités, ou les ruer par terre...  
> Les roys les plus brutaulx telles choses n'ignorent,  
> Et par le sang versé leurs couronnes honorent:  
> Tout ainsi que lyons, qui s'estiment alors,  
> De tous les animaux estre veuz les plus fors,  
> Quand ils se sont repeuz d'un cerf au grand corsage,  
> Et ont remply les champs de meurtre et de carnage.  
> Mais les princes Chrestiens n'estiment leur vertu  
> Procéder ny de sang ny de glaive pointu...  
> (Discours des Misères, ed. cit., pp. 52-53).

In *Il Principe* chapter 14, Machiavelli had argued that a Prince should know the art of war above everything else,

> Debbé adunque uno principe non avere altro obietto né altro pensiero, né prendere cosa alcuna per sua arte, fuora della guerra et ordini e disciplina di essa; perché quella è sola arte che si espetta a chi comanda.  
> (p. 62).

Ronsard replies,

> Il ne doit seulement sçavoir l'art de la guerre.  
> (p. 52).

In *Il Principe* chapter 18, Machiavelli says that a Prince must know how to imitate the behaviour of a lion or a fox if necessary,

> Dovete adunque sapere come sono dua generazione di combattere: l'uno con le laggi, l'altro, con la forza: quel primo è proprio dello uomo, quel secondo delle bestie: ma perché el primo molte volte non basta, conviene ricorrere al secondo.  
> Per tanto a uno principe è necessario sapere bene usare la bestia e lo uomo... Sendo adunque uno principe necessitato sapere bene usare la bestia, debbe di quelle pigliare la golpe et il lione.  
> (p. 72).
This idea of a King, the image of God and chosen by him, behaving like an animal, would have been repugnant to a sixteenth century humanist. The whole point about Christian humanism, after all, was its stress on the dignity of man made in God's image. Without the grace of God, it was felt that man reverted (horrifyingly) to an animal state. Thus when Erasmus depicts a tyrant, he compares him to an animal. Estienne Pasquier used animal imagery to demonstrate the degradation of a Pope,

Boniface huitiesme, qui estant entre en la papauté comme un regnard, y regna comme un lion, et mourut comme un chien.

D'Aubigné employed animal imagery to ridicule his Catholic opponents in the Tragiques, and indeed Machiavelli himself used animal imagery to satirize his political opponents in Asino d'Oro.

In the passage quoted above (p.516), Ronsard turns Machiavelli's symbol of the lion in Il Principe chapter 18 into something brutal and bloodthirsty and shows that such warlike behaviour is unworthy of 'les princes Chrestiens' (1.27). Note the stress on 'chrestiens': the fact that Machiavelli's book was entitled simply Il Principe may well have shocked sixteenth century readers since it was customary for authors of 'specula principum' to emphasise that they were writing for the Christian ruler.

In La Franciade, Ronsard argues that rulers must act in accordance with their Creator's image and show themselves superior to the animal world: Francus is told,

Seigneur Troyen, le prince ne s'honore
De felonnie, il faut que la fierté
Soit aux lyons, aux rois soit la bonté
Comme mieux nez, et qui ont la nature
Plus prés de Dieu que toute creature.

(Book IV, 1.1618-22).

Ronsard may or may not here be attacking Machiavelli's image of the ruler as a lion, but he is certainly opposing any attempt to make rulers imitate animal qualities. Above all, Ronsard stresses the spiritual qualities and responsibilities of a ruler.
The attacks on Machiavelli at the outset of the *Institution* encourage us to discern criticism of Machiavelli's interpretation of the Chiron legend in the opening lines of the poem. It had been traditional in classical literature to depict Chiron as a wise Centaur who instructed Achilles and other Greek heroes in medicine, law and music. Because of the stress on the divine part of his nature (he was born of the god Saturn) and on his learning, Chiron became the prototype of the humanist tutor of princes in the Renaissance.

Machiavelli's treatment of Chiron in *Il Principe* chapter 18 constitutes therefore, as does so much of Machiavelli's work, almost a complete break with this classical, humanist interpretation of the Chiron legend. He believed that the story of Chiron as teacher of princes illustrates that a ruler needs to learn how to imitate the behaviour of a beast in order to be successful. He says,

Per tanto a uno principe è necessario sapere bene usare la bestia e lo uomo. Questa parte è suta insegnata a' principi copertamente dalli antichi scrittori: li quali scrivono come Achille, e molti altri di quelli principi antichi, furono dati a nutrire a Chirone centauro, che sotto la sua disciplina li costudissi. Il che non vuol dire altro, avere per precettore uno mezzo bestia et mezzo uomo, se non che bisogna a uno principe sapere usare l'una e l'altra natura; e l'una sanza l'altra non è durabile.

(p. 72).

Machiavelli's emphasis on the bestial side of Chiron's nature, where previous authors had stressed his divine qualities, caused perplexity and aroused the hostility of his French readers. In view of the other examples of opposition to Machiavelli at the outset of the *Institution*, it is possible that Ronsard may be adopting the traditional, humanist interpretation of the Chiron legend in deliberate opposition to the Italian author, for he says,

...on dit que Thetis la femme de Pelée,
Apres avoir la peau de son enfant brulée
Pour le rendre immortel, le prist en son giron
Et de nuit l'emporta dans l'antre de Chiron,
Chiron noble centaure, à fin de luy apprendre
Les plus rares vertus dés sa jeunesse tendre,
Et de science et d'art son Achille honorer:
Car l'esprit d'un grand roy ne doit rien ignorer.

(1.5-12).

As in Machiavelli, Chiron is the tutor of Achilles, but rather than teaching him how to use violence, fraud and dissimulation, Ronsard's Chiron instructs Achilles in the peaceful disciplines of history, rhetoric, music and mathematics (p. 53). There are many other references to Chiron as the moral instructor of Achilles in Ronsard's poetry for example, in L'Orphée (Oeuvres complètes, ed. cit., vol. XII, p. 126). Although Ronsard probably knew of the legend of Chiron through his own studies, his interest in the allegory may have been stimulated by what he would regard as Machiavelli's incorrect interpretation. We know how seriously Ronsard took these fables and how important he believed it was to see the divine truths behind them. In his Abbregé de l'Art poétique francois he says,

...la Poésie n'estoit au premier aage qu'une Theologie allegoricque, pour faire entrer au cereveau des hommes grossiers par fables plaisantes et colorées les secretz qu'ilz ne pouvoyent comprendre, quand trop ouvertement on leur descouvroit la vérité.

(Oeuvres complètes, ed. cit., vol. XIV, p.4).

Ronsard's interpretation of the Chiron legend is fundamentally opposed to that of Machiavelli: Ronsard believes that a King is created in God's image and should prove his superiority over the animal world by cultivating spiritual qualities. Chiron was a good tutor not because he taught Achilles to be warlike, but because he taught him moral virtues and encouraged him in a love of learning. Anti-Machiavellian sentiment continues in the Institution as Ronsard warns Charles IX that he should be loved not feared (p. 58) and the whole poem ends on an un-Machiavellian note:

...sans l'ayde de Dieu la force est inutile.

(p. 60).
Incidentally, if Machiavelli was such a favourite author of French rulers as their enemies claimed, it seems quite courageous of Ronsard to address a poem to Charles IX in which he warns him, however discreetly and subtly, not to follow any of the Italian author's theories. One could compare the courage of Estienne Pasquier who sent a letter to Chandon, the King's secretary, criticising Machiavelli (see my chapter on D'Aubigné, note 36).

There are a number of passages in Ronsard's poetry where he attacks the theory of power politics. Whether or not these passages contain specific criticism of Machiavelli, it is important to examine them since they reveal Ronsard's fundamental antipathy towards any sort of Machiavellian attitude in politics.

Ronsard constantly emphasises that rulers hold their power from God alone and that it can be taken away from them at any moment. In La Franciade Book IV, Francus is told,

...par tel exemple aprens
Que tout royaume augmente en accroissance
Par la vertu, et non par la puissance,
Et que Dieu seul qui toute chose peut
Perd et maintient les sceptres comme il veut,
Pour les garder l'homme en vain se travaille
Car c'est luy seul qui les ooste et les baille,


This is very different advice from that in II Principe where Machiavelli gave four methods of acquiring power by purely human means (chapters 6, 7, 8, 9). The absence of the Christian concept of Providence guiding rulers was one of the things that shocked contemporary readers of II Principe. Machiavelli believed that if a ruler followed his advice on governing he would have a stable and secure government which would only be overturned by the inevitable cyclical process occurring in every State even, eventually, in one with a mixed constitution, (Discorsi Book I, 2). In II Principe chapter 24 he says,
He seems to have no recognition of God's possible intervention and relies on purely human methods for acquiring and maintaining power.

In contrast with this reliance on human resources, Ronsard stresses the fragility of human power in comparison with God's strength. At the end of the Institution, a poem in which, as we have seen, he is opposing Machiavelli, Ronsard emphasises the futility of human force against the might of God,

Je dy ce puissant Dieu dont l'Empire est sans bout,
Qui de son trosne assis en la terre voit tout,
Et fait à un chascun ses justices égales,
Autant aux laboureurs qu'aux personnes royales;
Lequel je suppliroy vous tenir en sa loy,
Et vous aymer autant qu'il fit David son roi,
Et rendre comme à luy vostre sceptre tranquile,
Car sans l'ayde de Dieu la force est inutile.
(ed. cit., p. 60).

Machiavelli had believed that only by playing the rules of power politics more cleverly than anyone else, could a Prince survive and give any sort of permanence to his rule. Ronsard rejects such worldly advice, for in the face of time which alters everything, the only quality which carries within itself the promise of eternity is virtue. La Franciade Book IV ends with this advice to Francus,

N'espere rien au monde de certain:
Ainsi que vent tout coule de la main:
Enfant d'Hector, tout se change et rechange:
Le temps nous fait, le temps mesme nous mange:
Princes et rois et leurs races s'en vont,
De leurs trespas les autres se refont.
Chose ne vit d'eternelle durée.
La vertu seule au monde est asseurée!

Ronsard believes that purely human criteria for government are useless without God's help (see Hymne au Roi Henri II, Oeuvres complètes, ed. cit., vol. VIII, p. 26). He often reminds Kings that they should not use their power arrogantly for they are only men and face death like
everyone else. In the *Institution* he tells Charles IX,

```plaintext
Aussi, pour estre Roy, vous ne devés penser
Vouloir comme un Tyran vos subjects offencer,
Car comme nostre corps, vostre corps est de boëe,
Des petis et des grands la fortune se jouë:
Tous les regnes mondains se font et se défont,
Et au gré de fortune ils viennent et s'en vont,
Et ne durent non plus qu'une flamme allumée
Qui soudain est esprise et soudain consumée:
Or, Sire, imités Dieu, lequel vous a donné
Le sceptre, et vous a fait un grand Roy couronné.
(ed. cit., p. 57).
```

All advice based on purely worldly factors, like that of Machiavelli, is doomed to failure Ronsard implies, in the light of man's short stay on this earth.

Ronsard thus looks at politics and the King's role in the light of eternity and his belief in God, whereas Machiavelli examines politics from the point of view of worldly success (both for the ruler and for his country), even at the expense of manipulating truth. Ménager's emphasis (op. cit., p. 147 note 16, p. 157, p. 361) on the idea that Ronsard (and other sixteenth century French authors) saw politics as a scenario played out beneath the watching eyes of the populace is surely misleading. Ménager's stress on the importance of appearances in the writings of French humanists leads to such dubious comparisons with Machiavelli as the following,

```plaintext
Machiavel découvre que la politique est une pratique de l'apparence, et un maniement des opinions. Les poètes de la Pléiade, et Ronsard avec eux, pensent également qu'il ne suffit pas au roi d'être le Savoir Absolu, mais qu'il doit le paraître.
(op. cit., p. 361).
```

There is surely a distinction between manipulating appearances so that one feigns to possess qualities one does not (Il Principe chapter 15), and impressing one's subjects with one's real qualities of character and intellect acquired through study 'dans l'Antre de Chiron' and obedience to God's laws, as Ronsard recommends in the *Institution*. 
It is misleading to say that, 

Pour l'un comme pour l'autre, le prince règne autant par ce qu'il paraît que par ce qu'il est...

(Ménager, op. cit., p. 157),

since while Machiavelli's Prince is always conscious of his public role and is concerned above all with appearances, Ronsard's ruler aims firstly for qualities which could only be acquired through long hours of study and contemplation in private. The fact that with these qualities a ruler may then impress his subjects in order to gain their loyalty, is surely of secondary importance for Ronsard. The theme, for example, of the necessity of a ruler preserving a virtuous reputation for posterity, a theme which would seem to emphasise appearances in a Machiavellian way, is really often a method for Ronsard to advertise his services as a poet - services he will only give if the King really is virtuous.

These high personal standards of intellect and character set by Ronsard for his King have been described by Henri Weber as 'une illusion d'humanisme'. But Ronsard continually insists on the practical effects of the King giving the lead in morality and virtue to his subjects. In Discours à la Royne he remarks that history reveals that the character of the French nation has varied according to the quality of its leadership,

Un tel roy fut cruel, l'autre ne le fut pas,  
L'ambition d'un tel causa mille debats.  
Un tel fut ignorant, l'autre prudent et sage.  
L'autre n'eut point de cœur, l'autre trop de courage.  
Tels que furent les Roys, tels furent leurs subjects,  
Car les Roys sont toujours des peuples les objects.  
(p. 63).

Compare the Panégyrique de la Renomée dedicated to Henry III where Ronsard says that force is not necessary: it is sufficient for a leader to set his subjects a good example for them to do as he wishes. For instance, if a King is not extravagant, neither will his subjects be (Oeuvres complètes, vol. XVIII, pp. 7-8).
The opposite idea is found in *Il Principe* where Machiavelli insists that his Prince, rather than setting moral standards, must act according to the prevailing standards of morality in order to be successful. In chapter 15 of *Il Principe*, he says,

...elli è tanto discosto da come si vive a come si doverrebbe vivere, che colui che lascia quello che si fa per quello che si doverrebbe fare, inpara piu tosto la ruina che la preservazione sua: perché uno uomo, che voglia fare in tutte le parte professione di buono, conviene rovini infra tanti che non sono buoni. Onde è necessario a uno principe, volendosi mantenere, imparare a potere essere non buono, et usarlo e non usare secondo la necessità.

(p. 65).

He enumerates what he classes as conventional good and bad qualities in a Prince and alleges their frequent drawback in politics,

Et io so che ciascuno confesserà che sarebbe laudabilissima cosa uno principe trovarsi di tutte le sopracritte qualità, quelle che sono tenute buone: ma, ... non si possono avere, né interamente osservare, per le condizioni umane che non lo consentono...

(p. 65). 36

Far from being a moral exemplar, Machiavelli's Prince will not be afraid to lower his standards of morality to the level of (or even below) that of his subjects and this, Machiavelli maintains, is the only way to preserve power. 37 The sixteenth century translator of *Il Principe* and friend of Ronsard, Gaspard D'Auvergne, was obliged to adopt similar arguments when defending Machiavelli,

...telle est la loy du monde, qui est naturellement vicieux de n'y pouvoir longuement prosperer, mesmes en ces souveraines dignitez, sans se scavoir aider au besoing du vice. 38

Like Machiavelli, D'Auvergne allows the ruler to compromise,

Car il est bien difficile...que le Prince puisse se maintenir, et eviter les inconveniens, ou il est subject entre tant de puissans et ambitieux voisins...s'il ne veut jamais lascher la bride à la severite des reigles de conscience.

It is an interesting question and one still relevant today (in politics and in other domains), whether a leader or group of employers will be more successful if they maintain high moral standards refusing to cheat
even when their employees or subjects are using doubtful methods to gain their own ends, or if they disregard moral principles and try to outdo their employees at their own game. The exponents of both kinds of argument are seeking success: Ronsard had no doubt that his method of ruling would lead to long-term prosperity for both the King and his country; he was not arguing for acceptance of failure but for a government which, by keeping certain principles and laws, would in turn be blessed by God. There is in fact no compromise between the two arguments for either one is arguing in the light of eternity or some absolute standard of morality (like Ronsard) or one is arguing (as Machiavelli does) in the face of prevailing standards of morality without any higher aspirations.

Machiavelli believes that upholding certain moral values is a good ideal and one which the ruler should feign to endorse, but that it is not effective as a technique for gaining and preserving power. Whereas Ronsard would argue that observation of moral norms is intrinsically conducive to social harmony (and hence political success), as well as being pious. That is, like Montaigne, he would refute Machiavelli on pragmatic as well as theological grounds. It is the eternal conflict highlighted by Hoederer's question to Hugo in Jean-Paul Sartre's play Les Main Sales, 'Est-ce que tu t'imagines qu'on peut gouverner innocemment?'

Although Ronsard certainly seems to have been familiar with Machiavelli's works, it is not always clear in the passages quoted, with the exception of the Institution, whether he is specifically attacking Machiavelli. However, his elevated conception of the duties of a King must have rendered him hostile to Machiavelli's works. In Panégyrique de la Renomée dedicated to Henry III, he describes what will happen to someone who besmirches Henry's reputation,

Nature qui peut tout, dont le ventre desserre
Toutes perfections, ne donne à nostre terre
Rien si parfait qu'un Roy modeste et moderé,
Et au poids de vertu justement mesuré.
Seul entre les humains il a peint au visage
De Dieu le venerable et redoutable image:
Il en est le miroir: si par un vilain trait,
De l'image qu'il porte il souille le pourtrait,
Si quelqu'un le diffame empoisonne ou massacre,
Dieu jaloux de l'honneur de son saint simulacre
Punira le forfait, sans laisser invangé
Quiconque aura meschant son pourtrait outragé,
Et ne souffrant en terre un seul pas de sa trace,
Perdra luy, ses enfants, sa maison et sa race.

(Oeuvres complètes, ed. cit., vol. XVIII, pp. 16-17).

Ronsard may have felt that this is what Machiavelli had done to the image of a King in *Il Principe* - degraded and desanctified it.

It may seem from this analysis of Ronsard's reaction to Machiavelli, that the French author has fallen into the usual contradiction of criticising Machiavelli whilst at the same time borrowing from his works. However, a closer examination of Ronsard's reaction to Machiavelli reveals that it is only in the 'neutral' areas of imagery, literature and philosophy that he is content to accept the Italian author's ideas. Nowhere in Ronsard's works do we find approval of Machiavelli's political theories. Thus where reaction to Machiavelli in other French writers such as Pierre Matthieu, is contradictory and conflicting, in Ronsard the tension becomes resolved. No longer do we have the 'curioso fenomeno' of explicit anti-Machiavellianism and implicit approval of the Italian author. Ronsard gives us a clue to a way of reconciling the sixteenth century reader's admiration for Machiavelli's erudition and talent with their horror of his 'atheism' and political methods. For the French poet adopts what he can approve of in Machiavelli's style, literary judgements and philosophy but rejects him as an author who laid down universally applicable rules for political science. Interestingly, a similar reaction to Machiavelli is found in two disciples of Ronsard, one acknowledged (Amadis Jamyn), the other unacknowledged (Jean de La Jessee). Jamyn attacks Machiavelli's interpretation of certain episodes in history, while La Jessee criticises Machiavelli's political theories but adopts his use
of imagery and his judgement of several historical figures. Both Ronsard and La Jessee select only what they can approve of in the Italian author and an analysis of their work reveals that reaction to Machiavelli in sixteenth century France was perhaps not as muddle-headed and confused as has sometimes been thought. Nor was it always a reaction of downright (and unsubtle) hostility as in Innocent Gentillet.

It remains true, however, that reaction to Machiavelli takes up a relatively small proportion of Ronsard's work. One reason for this may be that he did not wish to give Machiavelli's political theories currency by airing them in order to refute them: poetry, and in particular Ronsard's poetry, had a wider audience then than now. Ronsard's comparative neglect of Machiavelli may also have been caused by his overriding concern to write great poetry which involved him in a certain amount of stylisation when dealing with political problems. Even when he deals with such a Machiavellian topic as whether money is the sinews of war, he quickly retreats from a practical discussion of France's economic situation into a mythological description of the origins of money (Au Trésorier de l'Espargne, Oeuvres complètes, vol. XVIII, p. 299). Similarly, in La Promesse (vol. XIII), he writes to Catherine de' Medici on another Machiavellian topic - the breaking of promises. But instead of treating this potentially anti-Machiavellian theme in a political way, he concentrates on the personal theme of Catherine's as yet unfulfilled promise to reward him and he brings in an allegorical figure, Promise.

Ronsard may have felt that by attacking certain passages in Machiavelli in detail in the Institution, he was destroying Machiavelli's arguments more effectively than the broad and vague attacks on his 'atheism' and 'wickedness' carried out by his contemporaries. Detailed criticism of specific points, such as the importance of a ruler being skilled in the art of war, is always more convincing than vague allegations
of wickedness which could be dismissed as mere prejudice on the part of the critic. Moreover, in the area of political science, Ronsard aimed not merely to indict Machiavelli on moral grounds (arguments centred around morality could lead to interminable disputes) but to show that his ideas (such as his interpretation of the Chiron legend) were erroneous and therefore unhelpful as guidelines for political behaviour. As we would have expected, the 'Prince of poets' has turned out to be one of the more penetrating and subtle of Machiavelli's sixteenth century French readers.
FOOTNOTES

1. Since there are several good biographies of Ronsard in existence, it would be superfluous to give an account of his life here. For biographical details, the reader is particularly referred to Claude Binet, La Vie de P. de Ronsard (1586), ed. P. Laumonier, Paris, 1910 and R. Lebegue, Ronsard. L'homme et l'oeuvre, Paris, 1950.


3. The Institution is published in the edition of the Discours des Misères referred to above, note 2. The other poems can all be found in vol. VIII of Ronsard's Oeuvres complètes...Edition critique avec introduction et commentaire par Paul Laumonier (Révisée et complétée par J. Silver et R. Lebègue), Paris, 1914-75, (20 volumes). This is the edition of Ronsard's collected works referred to throughout this chapter.


6. It is interesting to compare Montaigne's similar feeling of friendship with classical authors which transcends the centuries,

Me trouvant inutile à ce siecle, je me rejette à cet autre, et en suis si embabouyné que l'estat de cette vieille Romme, libre, juste et florissante...m'interesse et me passionne...Il me plaist de considerer leur visage, leur port et leurs vestements: je remache ces grands noms entre les dents et les faicts retentir à mes oreilles...Je les visse volontiers deviser, promener, et soupper!

Like Machiavelli, he holds imaginary conversations with the ancients,

Or j'ay attaqué cent querelles pour la deffence de Pompeius et pour la cause de Brutus. Cette accointance dure encore entre nous... (Essais, Paris, Garnier-Flammarion, 1969, Book III, ch. 9, p. 210).

7. Is it this kind of literalness that Ronsard is attacking in his Hymne au Roy Henri II (Oeuvres complètes, ed. cit., vol. VIII, p. 26) where he insists that times have changed since the Roman Republic and that therefore it is impossible to govern exactly according to their laws? Guicciardini also criticised Machiavelli for basing his Discorsi too closely on Roman usage.
8. Nevertheless Ronsard, like Machiavelli, was sometimes accused of paganism, especially by Reformers who picked on such actions as taking part in a festival centred around Greek ritual (described in Les Bacchanales 1552, Oeuvres complètes, ed. cit., vol. III). For a discussion of these accusations, see M.C. Smith, Political and Religious Controversy in the work of Ronsard, with special reference to the Discours des Misères, University of London Ph.D. thesis, 1967, chapter 1.


10. See my chapter on Jodelle, pp.115-117.

11. Ronsard also dedicated several poems to a certain Jean Brinon, sieur de Villennes et de Médan, who was a wealthy patron of the arts (see P. Laumonier, Ronsard Poète Lyrique, Paris, 1909, pp. 133-134). Les Meslanges of 1555 are dedicated to Brinon (Oeuvres complètes, ed. cit., vol. VI) and Brinon is mentioned in the Continuation des Amours of 1555 (Oeuvres complètes, ed. cit., vol. VII, p. 190). An Yves de Brinon ('gentilhomme ordinaire de la chambre du Roy') published his translation of the Istorie Fiorentine in 1577 and it would be interesting to know whether he was any relation of Jean Brinon with whom Ronsard was on such good terms. This Yves de Brinon was apparently at one time a spy for Catherine de' Medici and gave evidence at the trial of La Molle and Coconat in April 1574, see F. De Crue, Le Parti des Politiques au lendemain de la Saint-Barthélemy, Paris, 1892, p. 175.

12. Claude Binet says that Ronsard went to Piedmont, but P. Laumonier has listed the reasons for doubting this (La Vie de Pierre de Ronsard, ed. cit.).

13. See for example, René de Lucinge in De la Naissance, Duree et Cheute des Estats, Paris, 1588, (BL 8007 aaa 25),

C'est un doute longuement debatu, et non encor bien resolu, à sçavoir s'il est meilleur d'aler attaquer l'enemy en sa maison, que de l'attendre chez soy: le Sieur de Langey, Machiavel et autres de nostre aage en ont fort suffisament traitté.

(Book I, p. 9).


17. This echo has also been pointed out by D. Ménager in Ronsard. Le Roi, le Poète et les Hommes, Geneva, 1979, p. 201, note 64. In his book, Ménager draws several comparisons between Ronsard and Machiavelli some of which although interesting, seem however rather tenuous. For example, he compares Machiavelli's criticism of the Italian church causing divisions within Italy, with Ronsard's attacks on the Reformers for disrupting and dividing the French nation (p. 137 and note 38). Ménager's stress on Ronsard's desire for social cohesion through religious unity leads him into
the unbalanced statement: that Ronsard, like Machiavelli, sees Christianity in general as harmful to the State. Ronsard's views seem to me to be closer to those of Montaigne who also blames the Reformers for disrupting the social order, than to Machiavelli. Ménager's insistence that Ronsard's desire for social order and the continuance of the traditions of the French nation determined his adherence to the Catholic church, is misleading in that it ignores the important part played by the poet's belief that his Catholic commitment was a divine gift. It also ignores Ronsard's belief in the essential truth of the Catholic doctrines which led him to oppose the Reformers' trust in the power of human reason ('Opinion') to judge religious matters. The overstatement of Ronsard's desire for social order leads Ménager into these rather dangerous comparisons with Machiavelli's view of religion as socially useful (see also, op. cit., pp. 168, 171, 174).

18. See my chapter on La Jessee, pp. 16-7 for another borrowing of this passage on Fortune in Machiavelli by a French poet.


21. See the Epistolae Platonis Graece et Latine: eruditissimis notis, logicis, ethicis, et politicis distincte et illustrate: ac Machiavellismo oppositae Ioannis Iacobi Beureri, Basle, 1586, (BL 1455 g 5) where Plato's writings on politics are contrasted with those of Machiavelli to the detriment of the latter. In Fragment de l'Examen du Prince de Machiavel, Paris, 1622, (BL 521 c 11), the anonymous author accuses Machiavelli of inventing a type of government as fictitious as that of Plato,

Et partant nous pouvons remarquer en passant l'inadvertence de Machiavel, lequel faisant profession de destruire les maximes les plus approuvées, non seulement les escoles des Philosophes, mais dans le sentiment commun des hommes, nous propose icy neantmoins une idée des plus abstraites de toutes les imaginations de l'Académie de Platon, ou du partie des Stoïques.
(Book V, p. 31).


25. In other poems, Ronsard stresses the incompatibility of an offensive, expansionist war policy with the duties of a Christian ruler. In his sonnet Au Roy Dauphin for example, he tells the future Francis II,

Souvienne toy pourtant, quand tu seras grand Roy,
Beaucoup de sang Christien ne respendre sous toy.


See also the poem to Henry II, La Paix (vol. IX, p. 113) and Complainte contre Fortune (vol. X, p. 67).

26. See my chapter on the La Taille brothers, pp. 55-6.


29. In the Hymne de l'Automne (Oeuvres complètes, ed. cit., vol. XII, p. 50), Ronsard says that he has tried to use such allegory in his own poetry, a technique he learned from Dorat. For an examination of Ronsard's use of allegory, see M.C. Smith's article, 'The hidden meaning of Ronsard's Hymne de l'Hyver', Renaissance Studies in honor of Isidore Silver ed. P.S. Brown, Kentucky Romance Quarterly, XXI, (1974), pp. 85-97.

30. See also the Discours à Treshault et Trespuissant Prince, le Duc de Savoie (Oeuvres complètes, vol. IX, p. 158) for this idea of God making and unmaking Kings.

31. See my chapter on D'Aubigné, pp. 28-2.

32. Ronsard often twisted this theme of a ruler preserving a good reputation for posterity to his own uses. He says that Kings will only have this glory if they are celebrated by poets in their own lifetime—see for example, the Continuation des Amours (Oeuvres complètes, ed. cit., vol. VII, p. 301). Corneille was another author who discredited Machiavelli's belief in the value of temporal success by using the theme of the verdict of history, see A. Stegman, L'héroïsme cornélien, Paris, 1968, Tome II, chapter 2.

33. There are other traces of anti-Machiavellian feeling in this poem, but they are probably coincidental, arising from Ronsard's examination of the French situation. For example, he approves of the use of mercenaries as a way of sparing the lives of Frenchmen (p. 19), he advises the King to be generous (p. 18) and he stresses that political and military affairs have changed since Roman times, making it impossible to judge by their standards.
34. Discussing sixteenth century poetry written for Kings, Weber says,

Ces divers poèmes sont la manifestation d'un espoir et d'une illusion de l'humanisme, qui aboutira au dix-huitième siècle à l'idée du despotisme éclairé. L'humaniste, ayant foi dans l'éducation et la culture, est naturellement amené à penser que celles-ci suffisent à former le bon roi qui rendra heureux ses sujets.


35. The idea that subjects model their lifestyle on that of their ruler, is found in Du Bartas’s poem Le Second Jour where he remarks that

...le peuple agité de diverses humeurs,
Reçoit, cameleon, de ses princes les moeurs.


36 See Discorsi III, 20 where he describes outstandingly virtuous actions performed by leaders such as Camillus, Fabricius, Scipio and Cyrus,

Vedesi ancora questaparte quanto la sia desiderata da' popoli negli uomini grandi, e quanto sia laudata dagli scrittori, e da quegli che descrivano la vita de' principi, e da quegli che ordinano come ei debbono vivere.

(p. 445).

But he adds that it is possible to be just as successful in politics by displaying great vices,

Pure nondimeno, veggendo Annibale con modi contrari a questi avere conseguito gran fama e gran vittorie, mi pare da discorrere nel seguente capitolo donde questo nasca.

(p. 445).

37. Gentillet opposed this style of argument in the Discours contre N. Machiavel (ed. cit.), Part III, XXVII where he says that Princes should endeavour to set a high moral example so that his subjects will imitate him, rather than the Prince imitating the vices of the people around him.

38. Le Prince de Nicolas Machiavelli secretaire et citoyen de Florence, traduit d'Italien en Français, Poitiers, 1553, (BN^E 914)), unpaginated.


40. See respectively chapters 10 and 3 of this thesis.
Poets and Dramatists whose works reveal little or no influence of Machiavelli

This thesis has concentrated so far on authors who have been quite deeply influenced by Machiavelli with the result that the reader may come away with the impression that Machiavelli influenced very many French writers in the sixteenth century. In order to redress the balance and complete the account of my research, it is necessary to discuss briefly the authors I have studied in connection with Machiavelli and who reveal little or no interest in Machiavelli's ideas. Only those poets and dramatists who touch on subjects of a political nature have been included and this study thus omits fairly major poets such as Philip Desportes and Maurice Sceve who wrote predominantly on subjects other than politics. Also excluded are authors of neo-Latin works.

i) Poets

Jean-Antoine de Baïf

Baïf enjoyed extensive patronage under Charles IX; indeed at the height of his popularity at court during the years 1567-73, he was patronised not only by Charles IX, but also by Catherine, Anjou and Alençon. Thus we find in his works several poems dealing with political events and the concept of kingship. His views on government are similar to those of his friend Ronsard: he holds the Christian humanist ideal of a ruler guided by God and superior to his subjects by reason of his greater virtue and learning. Baïf regards it as the duty of a King to keep peace rather than wage war. Examples of these Christian humanist ideas can be found in his poems Au Roy, Remonstrance sur la Prinse de Calais et de Guine, L'Hymne de la Paix and A Monseigneur, le Duc d'Anjou.

Baïf frequently emphasises that God can make and unmake Kings and that Kings are mortal just like other men, see Epistre au Roy sous le nom de la Royne sa Mere: pour l'instruction d'un bon roy (Oeuvres en Rime,
Indeed, in this poem Baïf admits that he is following traditional ideas of 'speculi principum' because, he says, these are the wisest. In a preliminary poem to Catherine, he describes his work as

\[
\text{Ce recueil des mots des plus sages,}
\]
\[
\text{Où se reglans, par beaux ouvrages}
\]
\[
\text{Vos Fils aimaient se font louer.}
\]

(p. 236).

He continues

\[
\text{...ne faut que t'étonnes,}
\]
\[
\text{Si me voys remarquer maintes sentences bonnes}
\]
\[
\text{Des choses que tu sçais. Car bien je le sçavoy:}
\]
\[
\text{Mais en les amassant, je sçay que je n'avoy}
\]
\[
\text{Entrepris te chanter quelque chose nouvelle.}
\]

(pp. 244-245).

Nevertheless, the extent of his reliance on patronage, obliging him to praise royal policy at all times, eventually led Baïf into contradiction with these Erasmian ideals. In his poem Sur le Trespas du Feu Charles IX (Œuvres en Rime, ed. cit., vol. V), Baïf is concerned with exonerating Charles IX for his part in the Saint Bartholomew's Day Massacres and in order to justify the massacres, he is obliged to adopt more utilitarian arguments on politics than in his previous poems. He congratulates Charles IX on his action, saying,

\[
\text{Toutefois en un grand affaire}
\]
\[
\text{Tu sçavois bien dissimuler.}
\]
\[
\text{Aussi ton regne enceint de troubles,}
\]
\[
\text{Par les cueurs de tes hommes doubles,}
\]
\[
\text{Sans foy, du vray bien égarez,}
\]
\[
\text{Ne te permit d'une ame ouverte}
\]
\[
\text{User de ta façon aperte,}
\]
\[
\text{Vers des esprits tant bigarrez.}
\]

(p. 249).

Here Baïf is following Machiavelli's method of excusing the conduct of his Prince by the vices of his subjects, as in chapter 15 of Il Principe. The traditional idea is that the King should be superior to his subjects and set them an example. There is, however, no evidence that Baïf
was consciously adopting Machiavelli's method of reasoning here, and
indeed the similarity between the two authors seems coincidental, arising
out of a passing need of Baïf's to argue from a utilitarian standpoint.
I have found no other echo of Machiavelli in Baïf's poetry.

Rémé Belleau
Like Estienne Jodelle, Belleau wrote a Latin sonnet for Cappel's
French translation of Il Principe published in 1553. In 1556, he was
appointed tutor to Charles d'Elbeuf and became official poet for the House
of Lorraine, obliging him to celebrate every event connected with that
family. He has thus written several political poems, but in none that
I have examined does he show any influence of Machiavelli: he holds to
the traditional view of Kings as appointed and guided by God. 3

Pierre de Belloy
Belloy, a Catholic and defender of Navarre's claim to the throne,
was frequently attacked by his contemporaries for displaying Machiavellian
behaviour. In Le Faux Visage descouvert du fin Renard de la France, a
pamphlet criticising Henry III, Belloy is accused of changing his religion
according to political circumstances. 4 In L'Atheisme de Henry de Valois:
où est monstré le vray but de ses dissimulations et cruautez, Belloy is
placed with Catherine, Espermon and Machiavelli in a list of the evil
influences on Henry III. 5 Henry III, says the author, was able to benefit
from reading about Louis XI's use of dissimulation,
puis les bons traits de cest divina Itallienne /Catherine/, la
gentille façon de laquelle elle l'a nourry, Machiavel, Belloy,
les diables de Nogaret, pensez que tous ces gens de bienn ont
employé toute leur industrie et moiens pour le faire maistre
passé: Loys unziesme n'estoit qu'un lourdaut au pris de luy.
(p. 28).

In another political pamphlet, Belloy is specifically described as
Henry III's 'Machiavel'. 6
Despite this propaganda, I have found no evidence of Machiavelli's influence in Belloy's only extant poem, Panégyrique ou Remonstrance... contre les notaires, et secrétaires du Roy. The pamphlets which attack Belloy as a Machiavellian, seem to do so mainly on account of the fact that though a Catholic, Belloy argued in defence of the Edict of Nantes and of religious tolerance, and supported the idea of a Protestant King. His insistence on the absolute powers of the French king is also held against him.

François de Beroalde

In 1584, Beroalde published a poem titled L'Idée de la Republique. As the title indicates, most of the political ideas in this poem are treated in a philosophical way, but there is a passage in Book IV which may be deliberately anti-Machiavellian. Beroalde, describing the character of an ideal ruler, says that the prince

... ne doit se montrer seulement
Comme hypocrite faux, embrasser par feintise
Les bien heureuses lois de l'ordre de l'église:
Il doit dedans son sang tout pur d'opinion
Nourrir la vérité de la religion ...
(41v-42r).

This is the opposite of Machiavelli who in Il Principe encourages his prince to feign religious zeal. Moreover, in the introduction to Book I, Beroalde laments the dissimulation favoured by his contemporaries and their scorn of virtue and piety. In this way, Beroalde makes clear, however briefly, his opposition to any kind of Machiavellian dissimulation.

Pierre Boton

Pierre Boton was a minor Catholic poet writing towards the end of the sixteenth century. He published a collection of love poetry in 1573 titled La Camille, but later turned to political poetry. In 1595 he published Les Trois Visions de Childeric which contains anti-League propaganda and supports Henry IV as saviour of the French monarchy.
This volume also contains *Le Triomphe de la Liberté Royalle* and *Le Premier* and *Le Second Livre de la France divisee* where he pleads for religious tolerance. In *Le Second Livre* he gives a sympathetic account of Henry III's flight from Paris and supports the assassination of the Guises at Blois for political reasons,

... tous grands Princes,  
Pour conserver l'Estât, leurs grandeurs, leurs Provinces,  
Se permettent souvent de faire mourir ceux  
Qu'ils soupçonnent vouloir attenter dessur eux:  
Car le salut du peuple, et la nécessité  
Dispensent de ce droit, le droit de Royauté,  
Qui n'est point obligé pour sauver sa Couronne,  
D'obeir à la Loy, qu'à ses sujets il donne.  

(p. 77).

Such utilitarian reasoning and the freeing of the King from all restrictions on his power, has something in common with Machiavelli.

In Boton's poem in the same volume, *Discours de la Vertu et Fortune de la France*, the mythological figure Fortune says that it is necessary for nations to be continually in conflict since this keeps them courageous,

Une trop longue Paix estouffe en la Cité,  
Des esprits courageux la generosité ...  
La Mer et la Cité sans trouble et faction,  
N'engendre un Tephis, ny un bon Scipion,  
Par la diversité, dont nature est contente,  
Le monde s'entretient, se nourrit, s'alimente.  

(p. 39).

This is very similar to Machiavelli's approval of the conflict at Rome between the plebeians and the Senate in *Discorsi* I, 4. Machiavelli's writings are permeated with the idea of the necessity of a State maintaining warlike virtues amongst its citizens. Rome, he says, declined when she no longer had foreign wars to stimulate the ambitions of her subjects, see *Discorsi* III, 16.

In the same poem, Fortune says,

L'opulence aux Estats fait naistre des symptômes,  
Des crises, des exces, des maux, des accidens,  
Qui les troublent dehors, et les broûillent dedans.  

(p. 38).

Machiavelli stresses many times the virtue of poverty in a State and the
dangers of corruption arising from wealth and luxury, see for example, Discorsi III, 25. These echoes of Machiavellian ideas are, however, too infrequent in Boton's works for any direct link with Machiavelli to be established.

Pierre Constant

One of Constant's prose works, De l'Excellence et Dignité des Rois, contains several attacks on Machiavelli for example, Constant says that Kings are chosen by God and that anyone who tries to usurp power is therefore a rebel against God,

... encore bien que les Atheistes et fideles sectateurs du Machiavelisme, tiennent pour une maxime certaine, que l'usurpation entre les grands n'est qu'un traict de magnanimité, et s'il faut forcer le droict, ce doit estre principalement pour regner. Mais j'entends discouvrir d'une vraye et sincere puissance, qui regne sur nous, par la grace de Dieu, et par une voye legitime, authentique, et bien receuë par les loix et constitutions d'un Royaume.

Constant also opposes Machiavelli's idea that it is necessary to be feared by one's subjects,

Il n'y a ... Royaume si grand et puissant, qui puisse long temps subsister, oë est la crainte qui gehenne et ronge le coeur des subjects ... Je sçay que ce tiercelet d'Athee, Machiavel, homme autrement sans Dieu, et sans religion, tient le contraire, soutenant que l'Estat est plus asseuré par la crainte, que par l'amour ... En quo y son impieté se trompe grandement, estant ... la crainte une chose forcée, et contre nature, et laquelle, par consequent, ne peut estre perdurable, toute violence n'estant de longue durée.

Constant concludes,

Je pourrois icy ruiner et destruire sa damnable opinion, et ses faules maximes, par bonnes raisons, et d'une infinité de beaux exemples: mais quoy? l'impieté est la soeur germaine de l'heresie, laquelle ne se peut vaincre ny debeller, sinon que par une saincte creance ...

Discours X, pp. 89-92.


Guillaume Des Autels

In 1559, Des Autels wrote a long political poem giving advice
about the problems in France, Remonstrance au peuple François, de son
devoir en ce temps, envers la majesté du Roy. The same volume
contains other poems prompted by political events, Eloge de la Paix,
Eloge de la Trefve and Eloge de la Guerre. He also wrote La Paix
Venue du Ciel. But neither these political poems nor his prose work,
Harengue au peuple François contre la Rebellion, reveal any
acquaintance with Machiavelli's ideas, possibly because Des Autels was
writing in the early part of the second half of the sixteenth century,
before Machiavelli had become a subject of controversy in France.

Jean Dorat

It might have been expected that Dorat, tutor to Ronsard and Baïf,
would show some reaction to Machiavelli in his poetry since he wrote a
prefatory poem congratulating Gaspard D'Auvergne on his French translation
of Il Principe in 1553 and a Greek poem for Cappel's translation of
Il Principe which also appeared in 1553. Dorat defended the Saint
Bartholomew's Day Massacres, attributed by many to the influence of
Machiavelli's theories. Despite this, however, I have found no trace of
Machiavelli's influence in the political poetry published in his
Oeuvres poétiques.

Guillaume de Salluste, sieur Du Bartas

Claims for the influence of Machiavelli on Du Bartas have been made
at various times by literary historians. The editors of the critical
edition of Du Bartas's works published in 1935 draw several comparisons
between passages in La Premiere et Seconde Sepmaine and the writings of
Machiavelli. John Parkin in his thesis The Impact of the works and
theories of Machiavelli on political and military writing in sixteenth
century France, describes Du Bartas's Holofernes as a tyrant possessing
several Machiavellian traits. Our account of the influence of
Machiavelli on sixteenth century French poetry would thus be incomplete
without some examination of these claims for Machiavelli's influence on Du Bartas.

Du Bartas conceived his epic *La Premiere et Seconde Sepmaine* as a poem of praise to God. In it, he celebrates the creation of the world and the first 'week' in the lives of God's people. Yet the poem is also concerned with contemporary events for Du Bartas was a Reformer who wished to help the Reformers' cause without, however, supporting any particular faction: he had above all a horror of civil war. James VI of Scotland recognised the contemporary nature of Du Bartas's work when he described *Les Furies* as 'a vive mirror of this last and most decrepied age.'

Du Bartas's poem *L'Uranie* (part of *La Muse Chrestienne*) testifies to the seriousness with which he regarded his art: criticising those who use their divine gift of poetry to describe earthly loves, he says that poets should only write about sacred and elevating subjects since poetry has a great moral influence on its readers,

> Ne vous suffit-il pas d'estre entachés de vices,  
> Sans que vous corrompés par vos nombres charmeurs  
> Du lecteur indiscret les peu constantes moeurs,  
> Lui faisant embrasser pour vertu les delices?  

He borrows the Horatian aesthetic much used by the Pleiade,

> ... celui-là doit seul le laurier meriter,  
> Qui, sage, le profit avec le plaisir mesle.  
> (op. cit., p. 183).

Thus, while not forgetting that God is the central focus of Du Bartas's work, we can nevertheless expect to find some useful advice on contemporary events and problems and more specifically, details of Du Bartas's reaction to Machiavelli; he is, after all, aiming at an encyclopaedic description of all subjects in God's world, including the art of politics.

In his thesis, John Parkin asserted that the portrayal of Holofernes in *La Judit* amounts to 'a satire on the Machiavellian Prince.' Parkin cites as examples of Machiavellian traits Holofernes's kind treatment of conquered nations and the importance of policy rather than religion or
ethics in determining the tyrant's behaviour. Yet these traits can all be found in Du Bartas's source for this poem, the Book of Judith.

Holofernes is described in the Book of Judith as a purely political animal seeking to replace all the gods and idols of the people he conquers with one god, his ruler, Nebuchadnezzar. Judith 3: 8 relates that

he demolished all their shrines and cut down their sacred groves; for it had been given to him to destroy all the gods of the land, so that all nations should worship Nebuchadnezzar only, and all their tongues and tribes should call upon him as god.

In Discorsi I, 25, Machiavelli is against such radical changes at the beginning of a reign,

Colui che desidera o che vuole riformare uno stato d'una città, a volere che sia accetto e poterlo con satisfazione di ciascuno mantenere, è necessitato a ritenere l'ombra almanco de' modi antichi, accio che a' popoli non paia avere mutato ordine ... (p. 192).

Moreover, the Machiavellian Prince is supposed to preserve religion as a useful expedient for keeping his subjects obedient. Machiavelli never proposes that religion should take the form of worship of one man; if there is going to be a change in religion, he advises the ruler to select one which resembles that of pagan Rome. It is unlikely that Du Bartas used Machiavelli for his portrayal of Holofernes as a tyrant who ignores all ethical and religious principles.

Holofernes's kind treatment of conquered nations is also mentioned in the Biblical source. Judith 3: 5-7 describes how Holofernes ceased his plundering and killing when the opposition sued for peace. He built garrisons in the conquered lands and chose men from among the vanquished to be his allies with the result that he and his army were welcomed. In Book V of Du Bartas's poem, Holofernes recalls how the inhabitants of the coastal towns came in peace to give themselves up to him. The description follows the Biblical narrative very closely,
Aussi sans abuser du droit de ma conquête,
Avec toute douceur, comme amis, je les traiète.
Puis, ayant dans leurs forts des mortes-payses mis,
Et leurs meilleurs soldats en mes troupes admis,
Je par avec mon ost ...

(p. 114).

This is Machiavellian behaviour perhaps: in Discorsi II, 6 Machiavelli describes a similar policy used by the Romans, and in Discorsi II, 19 and Il Principe chapter 3, he praises the establishment of colonies in conquered lands. But Du Bartas had no need to look for it in Machiavelli's works since these traits were already in his Biblical source.

Du Bartas developed the character of Holofernes by making him fall violently in love with Judith (the Biblical character is rather more cynical, see Judith 12: 12). 'Aveuglé d'amour', Holofernes is led astray by his passion to neglect military affairs. This addition to the character of Holofernes indicates that Du Bartas was probably not intending to portray Holofernes as a Machiavellian prince, for the latter would never have allowed his personal feelings to distract him from political and military affairs. Elsewhere in Du Bartas's works, the theme of the tyrant is dealt with in a conventional manner. There is a traditional comparison between the tyrant and the good ruler at the beginning of Babylone (in La Seconde Sepmaine, ed. cit., p. 119). In the Second Jour (La Premiere Sepmaine, ed. cit., p. 225) there is a description of an archetypal Senecan tyrant. In La Loy (La Seconde Sepmaine, p. 269) God's punishment of tyrants is described (and see La Decadence in La Seconde Sepmaine, p. 442 and 473).

Further supposed allusions to Machiavelli are pointed out by the editors of the modern edition of Du Bartas's works. However, many of their references are vague and not a reliable indicator of Du Bartas's true knowledge of Machiavelli which was, as I hope to show, first-hand. It is pointed out for example, by the modern editors that Du Bartas criticises rulers who keep their subjects in poverty. In La Loy, the tyrannical Pharaoh exclaims,
... O rois, que fols nous sommes.
De penser contenir en leur devoir les hommes
Par amour et douceur! ...
Pour bien jouir d'un peuple, il faut que sur son dos,
De verges escorché, paroissent tous ses os;
Le faut tenir de court, luy faut rongner les ailes,
L'assommer de tributs, l'espuiser par gabelles,
L'esrener de travaux, le tondre, l'escorcher,
Luy succer sang et graisse, et puis, manger sa chair.

(The Works, ed. cit., iii, p. 264).

There is a footnote to these lines in the modern edition, 'there is nothing so strong as this in Machiavelli's Il Principe'. This footnote is rather misleading since although the Italian author was often accused of encouraging rulers to keep their subjects poor, this interpretation arose out of a misreading of Machiavelli.26

In the Discorsi, Machiavelli praises poverty in a republic as encouraging civic 'virtù' but implies that such frugality should be adopted voluntarily by the citizens rather than imposed upon them from above. In Discorsi III, 25, 'Della povertà di Cincinnato e di molti cittadini romani', Roman leaders are depicted as leading a frugal life during peacetime of their own free will, in order to increase public wealth,

Notasi, come è detto, l'onore che si faceva in Roma alla povertà ... come e' bastava a quelli cittadini trarre della guerra onore, e l'utile tutto lasciavano al publico...Durò questa povertà ancora infino a' tempi di Paulo Emilio, che furono quasi gli ultimi felici tempi di quella Republica, dove uno cittadino, che col trionfo suo arricchi Roma, nondimeno mantenne povero sé.

(pp. 458-459).

When Machiavelli praises poverty, he means this willingness to accept personal poverty in order that the wealth of the State should increase.

When in chapter 16 of Il Principe, he advises his prince to be avaricious rather than extravagant, it is not in the interest of the prince solely, but in order to increase public funds and to avoid the danger of the ruler robbing his subjects to pay for his 'generosity'. Machiavelli never recommends poverty gratuitously or even in order to keep subjects
obedient to their ruler as is Pharoah's policy here. Pharoah's speech thus owes little to any teaching in Machiavelli and could just as easily have been inspired by the heavy taxation in France especially under Henry III who frequently raised large sums of money to pay for his extravagances at court and the upkeep of his 'mignons'.

In Le Schisme, the general assembly of Israel addresses a speech to Rehoboam the new King,

Commande (disent-ils) dans le parc abramide,
En pasteur, non en loup; relasche un peu la bride
De nostre servitude; allege des impos
(Par ton pere inventez) nostre descharné dos;
De tes fins gabelleurs reprime l'avarice,
Si tu fais autrement nous quittons ton service.


As the editors point out, this was probably written just after the assassination of Henry III and may have been intended as advice to the future Henry IV. The Biblical passage (I Kings 12: 4) mentions only the 'yoke' laid upon the Israelites by Rehoboam's father, Solomon - there is no mention of taxes or poverty. Du Bartas's belief that it is the policy of tyrants to keep their subjects in poverty may have been dictated more by the actual situation in France than by any advice Machiavelli gives to his prince. Indeed, the idea that only tyrants keep their subjects in poverty is found in other sixteenth century poets also concerned about the troubles in France, such as Du Bellay and Ronsard, without it being necessary to say that this was a reaction on their part against Machiavelli. Only in special circumstances, where Machiavelli is specifically named, can we presume that the Italian author is being blamed (erroneously) for this policy of keeping one's subjects poor.

Another supposed allusion to Machiavelli occurs in Les Furies where Du Bartas says

Le roy, qui veut ravir d'un roy voisin la terre,
Avant que battre aux champs, et faire ouverte guerre,
Corrompt par riches dons de son conseil la foy,
Sachant qu'un bon conseil est la force d'un roy.

(The Works, ed. cit., iii, p. 57).
The modern editors have a note to the effect that this is 'a Machiavellian statement, but not in Il Principe'. Machiavelli admits that fraud can be a glorious thing in war (Discorsi III, 40) but many other sixteenth century writers recognised the importance of ruse in waging war for example, Thomas More in Utopia, Rabelais in Gargantua, Ronsard (vol. viii of the Laumonier 'critical' edition of his Oeuvres, p. 75) and Du Bellay (vol. iv of H. Chamard's edition of his Oeuvres, p. 140). The footnote is misleading because this passage does not indicate that Du Bartas was using Machiavelli, and by stressing a rather vague 'machiavellian' attitude, it ignores the deeper knowledge Du Bartas had of Machiavelli's works and the more profound opposition to the Italian's ideas which exists in Du Bartas's poems.

In La Magnificence, in David's speech to Solomon on his deathbed, there is a passage describing Solomon's position as younger son of David by a concubine. The passage has been attributed by the modern editors of Du Bartas to chapter 6 of Il Principe. David says,

Mon fils, celuy que l'heur, la nature et la loy,
Sans corrival, sans force, et sans trouble ont fait roy,
Doit estre sage et bon, si long temps il desire
De tenir dans le poing les resnes de l'emperie.
Mais cil qui seulement du bon-heur assisté,
Par un degré nouveau monte à la royauté,
Se doit montrer plus qu'homme, et par sa vertu rare
Asseurer sur son chef la bruslante tiare.

It is true that in chapter 2 of Il Principe, Machiavelli remarks that hereditary princes have a fairly easy task in comparison with those who rule kingdoms acquired through their own efforts,

Dico, adunque, che nell' stati ereditari e assuefatti al sangue del loro principe sono assai minori difficoltà a mantenerli che ne' nuovi, perché basta solo non preterire l'ordine de' sua antinati, e di poi temporeggiare con li accidenti: in modo che, se tale principe è di ordinaria industria, sempre si manterrà nel suo stato.
(p. 16).

On the other hand, the idea that Solomon would encounter more difficulties in ruling than someone with more hereditary rights, has a Biblical source;
though David's speech has been much developed by Du Bartas on the basis of the Biblical passage. In the story of Solomon in 1 Kings 1 and 2, we see some of the difficulties he had in establishing himself as rightful heir in the face of opposition from Adonijah, David's eldest son after Absalom. In the end, Solomon is forced into the 'Machiavellian' policy (not mentioned by Du Bartas) of killing off his rival (1 Kings 2: 23-25). 'Machiavellian' behaviour existed well before Machiavelli's time and this demonstrates how difficult it is to rely on vaguely Machiavellian traits for proof of knowledge of Machiavelli, rather than on textual echoes.

Du Bartas, then, had no need to look in Machiavelli for David's warning and in fact it is very unlikely that he would be comparing the wise and glorious Solomon to the Machiavellian prince who usurps others' power. Du Bartas's vision in Le Septième Jour of a well-ordered society with each keeping to his appointed position, accords ill with approval of usurpers,

De moy, je ne voy point en quel endroit le sage
Puisse trouver ça bas un plus parfait image
D'un estât franc de bruits, de ligues, de discords,
Que l'ordre harmonieux qui fait vivre nos corps ...
Ains sans troubler l'estat de leur chose publique
Par combats intestins, un chacun d'eux s'applique
Sans contrainte à l'estat qu'il a receu d'en haut,
Soit honneste, soit vil, soit infirme, soit haut.

There is in Du Bartas a passage which throws more light on his attitude to usurpers and which is, I think, intended as a specific attack on Machiavelli. In Les Capitaines there is a description of Joshua's right to the throne,

Josué par faveur ny par l'achapt des voix,
N'obtient un plus hault rang que cil des plus grands rois ...
Il ne l'acquiert par sort (le sort n'a point des yeux),
Il n'y vient en tyran (quiconque entre, odieux,
Par force en une charge, il en sort avec honte),
Aux affaires, nouveau, tout d'un coup, il ne monte:
(Quiconque aux hauts degrez ne monte pas-à-pas,
N'en descend, ains, brisé, se precipite en bas).
(The Works, ed. cit., iii, pp. 298-299).
These methods of gaining power which are rejected by Du Bartas, are precisely those recommended by Machiavelli in *Il Principe* chapters 6, 7 and 9. Chapter 6 is titled 'De principatibus novis qui armis propriis et virtute acquiruntur' and Du Bartas says of Joshua,

\[
\text{Il n'y vient en tyran (quiconque entre, odieux, Par force en une charge, il en sort avec honte).}
\]

Chapter 7 has as its title, 'De principatibus novis qui alienis armis et fortuna acquiruntur'. Du Bartas says of Joshua, 'il ne l'acquiert par sort'. In chapter 9, Machiavelli deals with the case of someone 'che si ascende a questo principato o con il favore del populo o con il favore de' grandi', (p. 45). Similarly, Du Bartas says that Joshua did not acquire power through 'faveur'. Chapter 8 of *Il Principe* deals with 'De his qui per scelera ad principatum pervenere' and there is perhaps a hint of this latter category in the last three lines of the passage in Du Bartas.

It is thus possible to establish that Du Bartas is specifically opposing Machiavelli here, and the proof (verbal echoes, use of material unique to Machiavelli) is more satisfactory than vague allegations of anti-Machiavellian feeling which might in reality be the result of Du Bartas's source material or of reaction to the French situation at the time.

In David's advice to Solomon in *La Magnificence*, there is further opposition to Machiavellian methods of ruling (possibly another proof that Solomon was not intended to be compared with the Machiavellian usurper). David says,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Desmentir sa parole est indigne d'un roy;} \\
\text{Quiconque rompt sa foy, ne trouve point de foy;} \\
\text{Trompeur, il est trompé, contre son inconstance} \\
\text{Le peuple soupçonneux s'arme de defiance;} \\
\text{Et les princes voisins ayment mieux d'autre part} \\
\text{Avoir pour allié un lion, qu'un renard.}
\end{align*}
\]

(The Works, ed. cit., iii, p. 373).

The echo of Machiavelli's fox and lion imagery and the opposition to a policy specifically associated in the sixteenth century with Machiavelli,
clearly proves that this is a real case of opposition to Machiavelli, and one not previously pointed out. A few lines earlier in this speech, David has said,

Ne fay ce que tu peux, mais bien ce que tu dois.

Thomas More said a King's counsellor should tell him not what he can do but what he should do, but Machiavelli, like Thomas Cromwell, was often accused of precisely the opposite.

In _Les Capitaines_, in a speech warning against the evils of monarchy, an unnamed 'homme pauvre' says,

O divine entreprise, ô louable soucy
De reformer l'estat et par edicts severes
Guarir la republique affoible d'ulceres!
Mais ô sage Jacob, c'est bien ores qu'il faut
Te garder de tomber de la fievre en mal-chaut,
Et qu'en pensant fuir la confuse anarchie
Tu n'embrasses, pipé, l'injuste monarchie ...
Et qui pourra souffrir qu'un million d'humains
Attire et pousse l'air, occupe pieds et mains
Seulement pour un homme, et qu'une ample province
Tremble à la voix, au nom, au clin d'oeil d'un vain prince?

Machiavelli's _Il Principe_ is based on the idea that when a State has fallen into great corruption ('la confuse anarchie'), the only way to reform it is through the 'virtù' of one man. The whole of the advice to the prince in _Il Principe_ arises out of this need to reform a corrupt State. In _Discorsi_ I, 18, Machiavelli says that in such a corrupt State

non basta usare termini ordinari ... ma è necessario venire allo straordinario, come è alla violenza ed all'armi, e diventare innanzi a ogni cosa principe di quella città e poterne disporre a suo modo.

(p. 182).

Machiavelli's prince thus falls into the category of the 'injuste monarchie' described by Du Bartas's 'homme pauvre'. The latter figure is an invention by the poet in order to enlarge and develop Samuel's speech on the evils of monarchy in _I Kings_ 8: 11-18. Possibly Du Bartas felt the need to add extra interest for the sixteenth century reader by incorporating into the Biblical treatment of political themes, the new ideas and problems being discussed by his contemporaries. Du Bartas
attacks the basic principles behind *Il Principe*, that a ruler can instil 'virtù' and a sense of citizenship into his subjects by creating a strong leadership. On the contrary, says Du Bartas, any man of valour would resent being in such subjection to one man ('joug insupportable aux genereuses armes'). Again, Du Bartas is dealing with material unique to Machiavelli and which lies at the heart of *Il Principe*.

Du Bartas thus clearly opposes Machiavelli on three points, the description of the four methods a usurper may use to gain power, the idea that a prince can restore a State by subjecting it to very stringent laws, and the policy of using broken promises in ruling. The other possible allusions to Machiavelli mentioned by previous historians seem vague and appear to arise rather out of Du Bartas's preoccupation with the situation in France and his use of Biblical sources.

Du Bartas's thought has not in any way been modified by Machiavelli's ideas and opposition to the Italian remains peripheral to his main aim which is to glorify God. The attacks on Machiavelli may be the result of Du Bartas's wish to embrace every subject in writing his epic. They are also useful in supplying Du Bartas with additional material for the passages dealing with political topics. He may have felt the need, for example, to develop the speech of the 'homme pauvre' in *Les Capitaines* by incorporating an attack on Machiavelli's political ideas. In this way in this speech, in that of David and in the description of how Joshua came to power, Du Bartas adds to the Biblical source political material which would be of interest to modern readers grappling with new ideas on politics. Nevertheless, for one who had close links with such political leaders as Henry of Navarre and James VI, Du Bartas seems to have been only marginally interested in Machiavelli's theories: politics is not central enough to his main theme, particularly in *La Premiere et Seconde Sepmaine*, for Machiavelli to be the subject of a prolonged attack.
Joachim Du Bellay

There are several reasons for expecting Joachim Du Bellay to have been familiar with Machiavelli's works: Du Bellay was acquainted with some of the translators of Machiavelli's works, he had visited Italy, his treatment of satire sometimes coincides with that of Machiavelli, both Machiavelli and Du Bellay wrote works on language, their writings are inspired to a great extent by patriotism, the theme of Rome is dominant in some of the works of both authors, and they both gave their views on military affairs.

i) Like Ronsard, Du Bellay knew several people who were familiar with Machiavelli's works. He dedicated some poems to Jacques Gohory, translator of the Discorsi (Book I was published in 1544 and the complete translation in 1548), and of Il Principe (published in 1571). Du Bellay must also have been acquainted with Guillaume Cappel as both Du Bellay and Cappel are mentioned by Ronsard as having been present at the outing to Arcueil.

Moreover, a relation of Du Bellay's, Guillaume Du Bellay, sieur de Langey, was believed to be the author of a book about military affairs which relies heavily on Machiavelli's Arte della Guerra - the Instructions sur le faict de la guerre, extraictes des livres de Polybe, Frontin, Vegece, Cornazan, Machiavelle, et plusieurs autres bons auteurs. The attribution of the Instructions to Guillaume Du Bellay has been questioned several times, not only by modern historians but even in the sixteenth century. Charles Fontaine in a letter to Jean Morel argues against the attribution to Du Bellay on the grounds that the latter is spoken of in the third person in the Instructions and highly praised. More recent readers have adopted this line of argument.

Whether or not Joachim Du Bellay believed that the Instructions were written by his relation is largely irrelevant for our purposes, since the mere fact that it had been attributed to Guillaume Du Bellay would be enough to arouse Du Bellay's interest in the book. Joachim Du Bellay had
a great admiration for Cardinal Jean Du Bellay and Guillaume Langey and indeed he had thought of serving as a soldier under Langey until the latter's death, on 9 January 1543, put an end to that. He frequently mentions Langey in his poems, calling him 'ce grand Lange inimitable'.

It is probable that Joachim Du Bellay read the Instructions and through this intermediary, if not by first hand acquaintance, he may have gained knowledge of Machiavelli's ideas on military affairs. Langey and Machiavelli were often associated in the minds of sixteenth century writers such as, for example, Jacques Hurault in his Trois Livres des Offices d'Estat avec un sommaire des Stratagemes.

ii) Joachim Du Bellay spent four years at Rome in the entourage of Cardinal Jean Du Bellay and his work there for the Cardinal obliged him to become involved in the political events of the day. It is these events which form the background to Du Bellay's collection of sonnets, Les Regrets, published in 1558 after his return to France.

In Les Regrets, Du Bellay, although a sincere Roman Catholic, frequently satirizes the Popes. He does not question the authority of their position, but points out the harmful effect of their worldly ambitions on the status and credibility of the Roman Catholic Church (see for example, Les Regrets, 78, 81, 101-106, and many others in this collection).

Interestingly, Machiavelli also criticised the ambitions of the Popes, but from a different, more secular point of view - he blames them for keeping Italy divided. In Discorsi I, 12, he says,

... la Chiesa ha tenuto e tiene questa provincia divisa ... Non essendo adunque stata la Chiesa potente da potere occupare la Italia, né avendo permesso che un altro la occupi, è stata cagione che la non è potuta venire sotto uno capo, ma è stata sotto più principi e signori, da' quali è nata tanta disunione e tanta debolezza che la si è condotta a essere stata preda, non solamente de' barbari potenti, ma di qualunque l'assalta. (pp. 165-166).

In this chapter of the Discorsi, Machiavelli also criticises the lack of
religion at the Papal court,

... per gli esempli rei di quella corte questa provincia ha perduto ogni divozione e ogni religione ... Abbiamo adunque con la Chiesa e con i preti noi Italiani questo primo obbligo: di essere diventati senza religione e cattivi.

(p. 165).

It is interesting that both Du Bellay and Machiavelli agree on the lack of religion at the Roman court, but indeed these abuses were often pointed out by sixteenth-century writers. Moreover, Machiavelli is mainly concerned with the effect on the political situation in Italy, whilst Du Bellay is concerned about the prestige of the Roman Catholic religion.

Du Bellay's poems often contain anti-Italian satire prompted by personal observations during his stay in Italy, for example, in the *Regrets* (80), Rome is seen as a centre of financial intrigue. In *La Courtisanne Repentie, La Contre-Repentie* and *La Vieille Courtisanne*, Du Bellay describes the prostitution rife at Rome. Much of Du Bellay's anti-Italian satire arises out of a wish to debunk Italy's cultural image and to establish France's cultural supremacy (see *Regrets* 32). Du Bellay's desire to demonstrate France's supremacy over Italy is also seen in the *Hymne de la Surdité* where he says that there is no comparison between an Italian prince and the French King (*Divers Jeux Rustiques*, ed. cit., 1.1-6).

Du Bellay sometimes criticises Italians for their dissimulation, for example, in the *Regrets* 86 where he attacks the dissimulation of Roman courtiers. This is however traditional anti-courtier satire, not inspired by anti-Machiavellian sentiment. In his *Elegie d'Amour*, he says,

\[
\text{Je ne suis point si subtil artizan,} \\
\text{Que de pouvoir d'un parler courtizan,} \\
\text{D'un faulx souspir et d'une larme feincte} \\
\text{Monstre dehors une amitie contraincte,} \\
\text{Dissimulant mon visage par art,} \\
\text{Car je ne suis ny Tuscan, ny Lombard.} \\
\](Oeuvres Poétiques, ed. cit., v, p. 79).

He links dissimulation with Tuscans again in his poem *A une Dame* where he says,
Mais aussi tost qu'Amour s'est fait scavant,
Lui qui estoit François auparavant,
Est devenu menteur et decevant,
Et de Thysque nature.
(Oeuvres Poétiques, ed. cit., iv, pp. 211-212).

However, in both poems Du Bellay is talking of love, not politics, and satirizing the Petrarchan idealisation of love. When Du Bellay speaks of Tuscan dissimulation, it is Petrarch he has in mind rather than Machiavelli's writings. For Du Bellay, 'le Florentin' is still Petrarch (Songe xiii) whereas later in the century it would be hard to talk of 'the Florentine' without one's readers immediately thinking of Machiavelli and taking the reference in a pejorative way.

iii) Du Bellay's treatment of satirical subjects sometimes coincides with that of Machiavelli. For instance, both authors deny possessing the traditional divine inspiration of poets in their satirical works. In Capitolo Primo of the unfinished poem Dell' Asino D'Oro, Machiavelli says,

Non cerco ch' Helonica altr' acqua versi,
O Phebo posi l'arco e la pharetra,
E con la Lira accompagni i miei versi:
Si perché questa grazia non s'impetra
In questi tempi ...41

Similarly in sonnet 2 of the Regrets, Du Bellay denies being divinely inspired. Boldly parodying Persius's parody of noble language in poetry, Du Bellay says,

Un plus sçavant que moy (Paschal) ira songer
Aveques l'Ascrean dessus la double cyme:
Et pour estre de ceulx dont on fait plus d'estime,
Dedans l'onde au cheval tout nud s'ira plonger.
Quant à moy, je ne veulx pour un vers alonger,
M'accourser le cerveau ...42

The demands of the literary genre in which they were writing appear to have dictated this curious resemblance here between Machiavelli and Du Bellay.

As we have seen, both writers disapproved of the irreligious atmosphere at the Papal court. Machiavelli's works often contained anti-clerical satire, for example, his play La Mandragola of 1518 where
Fra Timoteo is depicted as a greedy, idle monk who abuses confession.

Du Bellay included some of this type of traditional anti-clerical satire in his *Divers Jeux Rustiques*, for example, in the Epitaphe de l'Abbé Bonnet (*Oeuvres Poétiques*, ed. cit., v, p. 111). In the Hymne de la Surdité he speaks of 'l'oysiveté' which is

Aussi peu familière aux soldats de Pallas,  
Comme elle est domestique aux prestres et prelats.  

This satire of idle, greedy clerics had a long literary tradition of course, but it is an interesting point of contact between Machiavelli and Du Bellay. Both also point out the financial transactions surrounding the elections of Popes.

iv) A more important link between Machiavelli and Du Bellay is the fact that they both wrote works on the growth and development of language. The inconoclastic pamphlet *La Deffence et Illustration de la Langue Françoyse* was published in 1549 under Du Bellay's name, though in reality it was a joint effort with other members of the Pliade, especially Ronsard. Machiavelli's *Discorso o Dialogo Intorno alla nostro Lingua* was written probably around October 1525, but it was not published till 1730 and therefore it is extremely unlikely that Du Bellay was familiar with it. There are, however, several coincidental likenesses between the two works despite the fact that Du Bellay is dealing with the French language as a whole, whereas Machiavelli is writing in defence of the Florentine dialect.

Both writers at the outset link their defence of their native language with defence of their country and claim that their motive for writing on language is patriotic feeling for their country. In his dedication to Cardinal Jean Du Bellay, Du Bellay puts forth patriotism as the inspiration behind the whole book,

C'est en effet la Deffence et Illustration de nostre langue françoyse. A l'entreprise de laquelle rien ne m'a induyt, que l'affection naturelle envers ma patrie ...
At the beginning of his Dialogo, Machiavelli also invokes patriotism, saying,

Sempre che io ho potuto onorare la patria mia, eziandio con mio carico e pericolo, l'ho fatto volentieri; perché l'uomo non ha maggiore obbligo nella vita sua che con quella, dependendo prima da essa l'essere e, di poi, tutto quello che di buono la fortuna e la natura ci hanno concessuto ... 45

For Machiavelli, despite Dante's criticisms, Florentine is the best dialect in Italy and he maintains that court usage is based on it.

Both writers agree on the importance of producing literary works for the development of a language. Many times during the Dialogo, Machiavelli praises Boccaccio, Petrarch and Dante for having helped the Florentine vernacular to develop by producing literary masterpieces in their native tongue. In the Deffence et Illustration Book II, chapter 2, Du Bellay imputes the poverty of the French language to the fact that few writers deign to use the vernacular,

je ne le [nostre vulgaire] puis mieux defendre, qu' attribuant la pauvreté d'iceluy, non à son propre et naturel, mais à la negligence de ceux qui en ont pris le gouvernement, et ne te puis mieux persuader d'y ecrire, qu'en te montrant le moyen de l'enrichir et illustrer, qui est l'imitation des Grecz et Romains.

(p. 70).

In Book II, chapter 12, "Exhortation aux Françoys d'écrire en leur Langue: avecques les louanges de la France", Du Bellay gives examples of those writers who have gained glory by writing in the vernacular,

Petrarque semblablement et Boccace, combien qu'ilz aient beaucoup écrit en Latin, si est-ce que cela n'eust été suffisant pour leur donner ce grand honneur qu'ilz ont acquis, s'ilz n'eussent écrit en leur Langue.

(p. 109).

In his Ode à Madame Marguerite d'escrire en sa Langue, Du Bellay praises Boccaccio and Petrarch for writing in the vernacular and this time, he adds praise of Dante (vol. iii, p. 99). That is, he mentions precisely the same three writers as Machiavelli.

Both writers see a link between the customs of a country or a city and its language. In his criticism of language at the Roman court, Machiavelli says,
Dove sono i costumi perversi, conviene che il parlare sia perverso e abbia in sé quello effeminato lascivo che hanno coloro che lo parlano.

(ed. cit., p. 724).

Du Bellay links the present high standard of civilisation and virtue in France with the intrinsic worth of the French language. In Book II, chapter 12, he says,

... quand à la pieté, religion, intégrité de meurs, magnanimité de couraiges, et toutes ces vertuz rares et antiques ... la France a toujours obtenu sans controverse le premier lieu ... Pourquoy mandions nous les Langues étrangeres, comme si nous avions honte d'user de la nostre?

(p. 108).

Both writers believe that there is a connection between the standard of morality in a country and the development of its language.

Finally, both Machiavelli and Du Bellay approve of borrowing words from other languages in order to enrich one's own. Machiavelli says,

... qualunque volta viene o nuove dottrine in una città o nuove arti, è necessario che vi venghino nuovi vocaboli, e nati in quella lingua donde quelle dottrine o quelle arti son venute; ma riducendosi, nel parlare, con i modi, con i casi, con le differenzi e con gli accenti, fanno una medesima consonanza con i vocaboli di quella lingua che trovano, e cosi diventano suoi ... E di qui dipende che le lingue da principio arricchiscono, e diventano più belle essendo più copiose ...

(ed. cit., p. 718).46

In the Deffence et Illustration Book I, chapter 8, 'D'Amplifier la Langue Françoyse par l'imimitation des anciens Aucteurs Grecz et Romains', Du Bellay says,

... ce n'est point chose vicieuse, mais grandement louable, emprunter d'une Langue estrangere les sentences et les motz, et les approprier à la sienne.

(p. 38).

In this way, he explains, a language which 'n'est encor' bien copieuse et riche' will develop.

v) We have already remarked upon the importance of patriotism in their works on language, but patriotism is a sentiment which pervades nearly all the writings of Machiavelli and Du Bellay. Du Bellay was the first French writer to speak of 'la patrie' in a developed way: before the
Pleïade began to use it in the sense of a whole nation, 'la patrie' had merely meant one's native province.\textsuperscript{47} Bruel has called Du Bellay's patriotism 'une obsession dans toute son oeuvre'.\textsuperscript{48} We see his longing for France in the Regrets and in his Latin poems written at Rome for example, Patriae desiderium. Even his collection of love sonnets, L'Olive, begins with a declaration of Du Bellay's intention to rival Petrarch and make France supreme over Italy, culturally as well as militarily. Addressing 'Olive', Du Bellay says,

\begin{center}
Orne mon chef, donne moy hardiesse  
De te chanter, qui espere te rendre  
Egal un jour au Laurier immortel.\textsuperscript{49}
\end{center}

In his poetry, Du Bellay is constantly concerned to build up the image of the French King by comparing him with Roman rulers, see, for example, the comparison of Henry II with Augustus in the Hymne au Roy sur la Princesse de Calais (Oeuvres Poétiques, ed. cit., vi). By means of such comparisons Du Bellay wished to reinforce France's cultural and military supremacy and her claim to world dominion. At the end of the Regrets he says,

\begin{center}
... rien n'est apres Dieu si grand qu'un Roy de France.  
\textit{(ed. cit., 191, p. 267).}
\end{center}

In the dedication of Les Antiquitez, in Au Roy, Du Bellay expresses the hope that France under Henry II will one day be as great as Rome.

Patriotism is a feeling shared by Machiavelli. In chapter 26 of Il Principe he rises to the heights of lyricism with his vision of a unified and liberated Italy. The nineteenth century saw him as a heralder of Cavour and the modern Italian State. In a letter to Francesco Vittori written on 16 April 1527 as Spanish troops were closing in on Florence, Machiavelli says,

\begin{center}
Io amo, messer Francesco Guicciardini, amo la patria mia piu dell' anima ...\textsuperscript{50}
\end{center}

At the end of his Discorso sopra il riformare lo stato di Firenze ad instanza di Papa Leone X, Machiavelli says,
Io credo che il maggiore onore che possono avere gli uomini sia quello che volontariamente è loro dato dalla loro patria: credo che il maggiore bene che si faccia, e il più grato a Dio, sia quello che si fa alla sua patria.51

Il Principe, the Discorsi and L'Arte della Guerra are all animated by the desire to put the affairs of Italy and of Florence in particular to rights, usually by following the example of the Romans in political and military matters. They stemmed from Machiavelli's frustration at being unable to help in any practical way himself because of the unwillingness of the Medici to employ him. We may say that both Machiavelli's and Du Bellay's patriotism was inspired by a sense of exile: in Machiavelli's case from the political role he so much desired, in Du Bellay's case from his beloved France.

vi) For both Machiavelli and Du Bellay, Rome was a yardstick by which to measure their own age. In Machiavelli's eyes, Italy had declined both militarily and politically since the days of the Roman Republic; for Du Bellay, the glory of ancient Rome was something which France might be capable of rivalling or even eclipsing.52 If it is true of the Pleiade that 'la vision que ces poètes ont de l'histoire antique informe ... et déforme la vision qu'ils ont de leur propre histoire',53 this could equally be said of Machiavelli who read Roman authors for constant comparison with modern times. Petrarch's 'Quid est omnis historia nisi Romana laus?' could as easily apply to Machiavelli's view of history as to that of Du Bellay.

Both Machiavelli and Du Bellay felt a very close kinship with the classical authors they read.54 In his introduction to the Regrets, M.A. Screech says of Du Bellay, that 'il semble vouloir créer, dans les Regrets, quelque chose de l'atmosphère du siècle d'Auguste,' (p. 24). In Les Antiquitez de Rome, in the opening sonnet where Du Bellay invokes the spirits of the classical authors to help him in his work, we see that Du Bellay, like Machiavelli, has a friendship with classical poets which
transcends the centuries (Montaigne, too, claimed he felt this kind of relationship with Plutarch).

But Rome is treated in a very different way in the two authors. Machiavelli looks to Rome for practical details on politics and warfare, whilst in Les Antiquitez Du Bellay's imagination is captured by the splendour of Rome and the swiftness of her downfall. Machiavelli treats Roman history in a utilitarian way, whereas Du Bellay sees Rome in mythical and philosophical terms and in Les Antiquitez draws lessons of moral philosophy from her downfall, lessons not only for States but also for the individual (Rome's hubris led to her ruin, as an individual's overweening ambition may ruin him). Petrarch's definition of history as 'philosophy teaching by example' applies to Du Bellay's treatment of Rome in Les Antiquitez but not to Machiavelli's works.

Du Bellay's use of myth in connection with Rome in Les Antiquitez shows the difference between his view of Rome and that of Machiavelli. For example, Du Bellay sees Romulus's murder of Remus as the first seed of sin which led to Rome's downfall (Les Antiquitez, 24). Machiavelli sees it as the only possible action for Romulus to have taken and one which ensured the future stability of Rome. Machiavelli is the innovator here since the idea of Rome's destiny being determined by the fratricide is traditional in medieval theology and is found in Saint Augustine's De Civitate Dei.

There is one coincidence in Du Bellay's treatment of Rome in Les Antiquitez and Machiavelli's interpretation of Roman history. In Les Antiquitez 23, Du Bellay refers to Scipio's reluctance to destroy Carthage as it would leave Rome without any formidable rival,

Il prevoyoit que le Romain courage
Impatient du languissant plaisir,
Par le repos se laisseroit saisir
A la fureur de la civil rage.

In sonnets 21 and 31, Du Bellay again says that Rome declined because she lacked foreign wars to satisfy her ambition and courage. When peace was made with foreigners, the civil wars began.

Machiavelli also stresses that Rome declined when she no longer had any strong rival. In Discorsi III, 16, he says,

... tenendo fuori quella città sempre eserciti, sempre vi era luogo alla virtù degli uomini ... ma a quella [città] ancora, poiché l'ebbe vinto Cartagine ed Antioco (come altrove si disse), non temendo più le guerre, pareva potere commettere gli eserciti a qualunque la voleva, non riguardando tanto alla virtù quanto alle altre qualità che gli dessono grazia nel popolo.

(p. 437).

Du Bellay blames Rome's downfall on herself (lack of competition led to the sin of hubris); Machiavelli, much more literally, blames it on the introduction of the agrarian laws and prolonged military commands (Discorsi III, 24). There is an essential difference between the two authors' treatment of Rome: Machiavelli's attitude is that of a historian (a recorder of facts), Du Bellay's is that of a poet (dealing in eternal truths and values), a distinction which goes back as far as Aristotle. Machiavelli deals with the surface history of Rome whilst Du Bellay concentrates on underlying meanings and patterns in her history out of a desire to arrive at the essence of Rome.

Moreover, each writer chooses to praise a different period of Roman history. Machiavelli concentrates on the Republic, believing that 'virtù' was better exemplified during that period than under the Emperors. Du Bellay, on the other hand, concentrates on the Empire under Augustus and uses Caesar and Augustus as examples of the glory to which French Kings can aspire. Differences in attitude to religion also lead to differences in treatment of the Roman theme by the two authors. In Les Antiquitez we have a strong sense of Du Bellay's belief in the guiding hand of providence in Rome's fate, whereas in the Discorsi, Machiavelli speaks only of man's mistakes and efforts.
In *Les Regrets* where Du Bellay describes his occupations in Rome, we see the difference between his response to the exacting demands of diplomatic life and the response we would expect from Machiavelli placed in a similar position. Du Bellay frequently comments on the frustrations of his work for Cardinal Du Bellay - he is obliged to keep up appearances all the time and attend to trivia (see, for example, sonnets 14, 15, 26 39, 84, 85). He feels that he is wasting time which would be more valuably spent writing poetry. By contrast, Machiavelli would have rejoiced at finding himself at the centre of intrigue at the Roman court and able to influence events. Machiavelli's frustrations arise from being forced into exile on his farm at San Casciano (the type of rural retreat so often longed for by the PleIade poets). In his boredom, Machiavelli turned to writing as a consolation but for him this literary work, especially *Il Principe*, was chiefly a means to re-gain entry into the political world, rather than an end in itself. The difference in character of the two men is thus clearly revealed.

vii) Du Bellay seems to have been familiar with certain contemporary works on military affairs, for in his *Ample Discours au Roy*, he says,

```
... Quant à l'art militaire,
Et à la discipline aujourd'hui nécessaire,
Ce n'est pas mon sujet: puis tant de bons esprits
Ont si bien cultivé par leurs doctes escrīts
Ce champ, qui est assez de soī mesmes fertiles,
Que mon labeur seroit apprés eux inûtile.
```

(Oeuvres Poétiques, vi, p. 233).

This may refer to the *Instructions* which was the most comprehensive sixteenth-century book on the art of war in France. Despite the fact that Du Bellay says that war is not his subject, he does describe military tactics in some detail in *Discours au Roy sur la Trefve de l'An 1555*, published in 1558. Celebrating the Truce of Vaucelles, Du Bellay picks out for special praise several tactics used by Henry II during the wars against Charles V. He praises the ability of Henry II to keep his plans
secret,

L'Empereur est tesmoing ...  
Combien de voz desseings les secrets sont couvers,  
Mesmes faisant la guerre en tant de lieux divers ...  
(Oeuvres Poétiques, vi, p. 7).

In L'Arte della Guerra Book VII, Machiavelli stresses the necessity for army leaders to keep their plans secret,

Consigliati, delle cose che tu dei fare, con molti; quello che di poi vuoi fare conferisci con pochi.58

However, this advice of Machiavelli was adopted by the author of the Instructions sur le fait de la Guerre in Book II where he says,

... en tout le fait de la guerre, n'y a chose plus utile que tenir secret ce que lon entend faire.  

Joachim Du Bellay could have borrowed this idea of the necessity of keeping one's plans secret from either author or merely from his own commonsense.

In the Discours au Roy sur la Trefve, Du Bellay also praises Henry II for keeping his frontiers well guarded,

L'Empereur est tesmoing ...  
... comment vous tenez voz frontiers garnies  
De villes et chasteaux, tousjours sur l'estranger  
Repossant loing de vous la perte et le danger.  
(ed. cit., pp. 7-8).

In Discorsi II, 6, Machiavelli stresses the necessity of placing colonies of people to guard one's frontiers,

La quale vinta, i nimici, perché non fosse guasto loro il contado affatto, venivano alle condizioni, ed i Romani gli condannavano in terreni: i quali terreni gli convertivano in privati commodi o gli consegnavano ad una colonia, la quale posta in su le frontiere di colore, veniva ad essere guardia de' confini romani con utile di essi coloni che avevano quegli campi, e con utile del publico di Roma che senza spesa teneva quella guardia. Né poteva questo modo essere piu sicuro o piu forte o piu utile.  
(p. 295).

This passage is not one of those borrowed by the author of the Instructions but in view of the lack of textual echoes of Machiavelli, Du Bellay probably derived this military tactic from his own observation of the situation in France.
Later in the Discours au Roy sur la Trefve, Du Bellay describes the factors which determine victory,

La vertu des soldats, et l'opportunité
Ou du temps ou du lieu, les vivres, et les armes ...

(ed. cit., p. 9).

These elements are all mentioned by Machiavelli, for example, in the Arte della Guerra Books I and IV, he stresses the necessity of maintaining the 'virtù' of the soldiers by strict military discipline. The author of the Instructions follows Machiavelli in this in Book III, chapters 3 and 5. In Book IV of the Arte della Guerra, Machiavelli deals with the necessity of choosing a favourable time and place to do battle, themes which are discussed in the Instructions Book II, chapter 1 (place) and chapter 2 (time). Machiavelli deals with the type and quantity of provisions an army should carry in the Arte della Guerra Book V. As usual, he prefers the Roman usage to modern methods. His ideas are borrowed in Book II, chapter 5 of the Instructions. Both Machiavelli and the French author have long sections discussing the type of arms a soldier should carry (Arte della Guerra Book II, Instructions Book I, chapter 4).

The factors determining victory as described by Joachim Du Bellay are thus found in both Machiavelli's work and in the Instructions. However, there is not enough evidence to decide whether Du Bellay read either work and indeed he may have derived his ideas on warfare in this poem from his own observations. He ends his poem on a very un-Machiavellian note, praising the truce and stressing the duty of a Christian ruler to seek peace rather than war. He emphasises Henry II's superiority in this respect over pagan rulers,

... pour le commun bien
Vous estes souvenu d'estre Roy Treschrestien:
Non un Jules Cesar, un Pyrre, un Alexandre,
Qui ne prenoient plaisir qu'à sang humain espadre.

(p. 11).
Du Bellay distinguishes between those rulers who are opportunists and seek their own profit in politics and those who rule as Christians,

Parle donc qui vouldra de la chauve Deesse,
Qui deux fois aux cheveux empoigner ne se laisse:
Discoure sur Milan, qui vouldra discourir,
Sur Naples, et sur ceux qu'on devoit secourir,
Sur le danger de voir paisible l'Angleterre,
L'Empire hereditaire, et tout ce que la guerre
Empeschoit a Cesar: discours passionnez
De gens qui seulement a leur profit sont nez,
Et non pas de Chrestiens ... 

(p. 12).

Thus whilst not opposing war when it enhances a country's prestige, Du Bellay is against Kings recklessly endangering the lives of their subjects: in his Ode de Porter les Miseres et la Calummie, he describes war as

... ce furieux Dieu,
Qui maintenant obtient le premier Lieu
Entre les Roys, les Empereurs et Princes,
Au grand dommage (helas) de leurs Provinces.

(Oeuvres Poétiques, ed. cit., iii, p. 47).

In the Ample Discours au Roy, the poem in which Du Bellay gives his most detailed advice on the political situation in France, he reminds Charles IX how he can help the peasants by maintaining peace. In Regrets 137, he points out the cost of wars. Also in the Ample Discours au Roy, Du Bellay opposes the use of mercenaries who, he says, tend to be disloyal. Machiavelli had also stressed the dangers of relying on mercenaries, but the similarity with Du Bellay's advice is probably coincidental, arising out of the French situation. Machiavelli suggests a citizen army as an alternative to mercenaries; Du Bellay prefers the nobles as an alternative.

Despite the occasional similarity of themes and treatment in Machiavelli and Du Bellay, there is no discernible influence of the Italian author on Du Bellay's works. As we have seen, it would be surprising if Du Bellay had not read Machiavelli or come into contact with some of Machiavelli's ideas either when he was in Italy or through the intermediary of the book attributed to his uncle. However, I have found no precise reference to Machiavelli in Du Bellay's poetry.
Before he went to Rome, Du Bellay's writings were primarily concerned with his literary ambitions and desire to renovate the French language. Later, when he deals with political subjects, we see that his values are those of a Christian humanist; he attacks the utilitarian view of politics and the ambitions of rulers which lead them into war. Du Bellay was writing rather early in the second half of the century, before Machiavelli's ideas had really come under attack in France; even if he were familiar with Machiavelli's works, he may not yet have felt the urgent need to oppose them which writers felt later in the century.

The *Ample Discours au Roy*, published posthumously in 1568, shows Du Bellay on the verge of developing into a writer deeply concerned about the political situation in France. If he had lived he may well have been forced into examining politics and political theories in depth and events may have prompted him to be more militant in defence of his Erasmian view of politics. But he died before the civil wars in France began and his priorities are always cultural rather than political. Perhaps the difference between Machiavelli and Du Bellay is best revealed in the description Machiavelli gives of the principal foundations of a State,

\[
\text{E' principali fondamenti che abbino tutti li stati ... sono le buone legge e le buone arme. (Il Principe chapter 12, p. 53).}
\]

Du Bellay praises France for being 'mère des arts, des armes et des lois', Regrets 9. The fight to establish France's cultural supremacy was the one which Du Bellay fought and largely won, before his death. The political battles were yet to begin in which Machiavelli's name was to be bandied around as an effective weapon with which to crush one's opponents.

**Amadis Jamyn**

As poet at the court of Charles IX, Amadis Jamyn played an important role: he became secretary to the King and then 'lecteur ordinaire'.

He was closely in touch with the events of his time and even under Henry III he remained in the King's entourage although his popularity was eclipsed by that of Desportes. From about 1557 to 1572, Jamyn was in the service of Ronsard who, as we saw in chapter 9, had some knowledge of Machiavelli's works.

Jamyn's first collection of poems, *Oeuvres poétiques*, was published in 1575 and there were further, augmented editions in 1577, 1579 and 1584. He wrote circumstantial poems on various political events such as Anjou's victory at Montcontour, the death of Charles IX and the return of Henry III from Poland. He often dedicated his poems to people closely involved in political events, such as the Secretary of State, Villeroy. Jamyn's view of kingship as revealed in his poems is the traditional one with the King as God's representative on earth,

Un monarque sur tous doit estre l'excellence
Et ne ceder au vice elevé d'impudence:
Car il est ici bas l'image du grand Dieu
Qui le donne aux mortels pour y tenir son lieu.

There is an echo of Machiavelli's advice to his prince in *Poème de la Chasse* dedicated to Charles IX where Jamyn says that hunting is good training for the art of war,

Ainsi les Persiens à la chasse vivoyent
D'Autant que l'art de guerre en elle ils retrouvoyent,
Comme en estant l'image et la plus vraye feinte.

In chapter 14 of *Il Principe*, Machiavelli explains that hunting is a useful training for the art of war. In Discorsi III, 39, he says that hunting gives training in the knowledge of the terrain,

Questo si dice per mostrare come le cacce, secondo che Senofonte appruova, sono una immagine di una guerra: e per questo agli uomini grandi tale esercizio è onorevole e necessario.
(p. 491).

It is probable, however, that this similarity of ideas and expression in Jamyn and Machiavelli arises from the fact that they are both using the
same source, Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*. Indeed, in the passage cited above, Jamyn is discussing the Persians and later in this poem, he specifically mentions the example of Cyrus learning the art of warfare through hunting.

Clearer traces of reaction to Machiavelli, centre round a poem by Jamyn published in the 1575 edition of the *Oeuvres poétiques*. In "Que prier Dieu est oeuvre tres-necessaire et digne d'un vray Chrestien," Jamyn emphasises the fact that Kings cannot rule by themselves but need God's help if their rule is to be successful. He says, for instance, that Kings need to rely on God in war and cites the example of the Romans who never fought without first consulting the auspices,

Mesmes les bons Romains, guerriers devotieux,
Ne combatoyent jamais sans invoquer leurs dieux:
Et bien que tres-vaillant prenoyent garde à l'augure
Pour prevoir le succez de la guerre future.


This is very different from Machiavelli's description of the Romans' manipulation of the auguries for their own (political) purposes. In *Discorsi* I, 14, 'I Romani interpretavano gli auspizi secondo la necessitâ, e con la prudenza mostravano di osservare la religione, quando forzati non la osservavano,' he says,

... quando la ragione mostrava loro una cosa doversi fare, non ostante che gli auspicii fossero avversi, la facevano in ogni modo ...

(p. 170).

Jamyn emphasises that the Romans sincerely believed in the auspices and did not merely use them as a political ploy.

Further on in this poem, Jamyn argues that a sincere religious faith is effective in politics,

Puis la devotion au service de Dieu,
Ou tre que dans les cieux elle nous donne lieu,
Proffite dessus tout aux princes de la terre
Et aux pasteurs de peuple, en paix et à la guerre.
Les pais, les citez aiment et vont suivant
Ceux qu'ils pensent aimez de l'Eternel vivant:
Ils adjoustent creance à tout ce qu'ils desirent,
* Assurez que de Dieu leurs actions s'inspirent.

(p. 182).
Machiavelli had advised his prince to feign religious zeal for political purposes, but Jamyn insists that true religious belief is more effective.

Jamyn continues by arguing that Numa used a false religion for political purposes and that therefore true Christian belief will be even more effective in politics,

Comment ne serviroit la vraye conscience
Et la certaine foy, quand la faulse apparence
Et l'ombre seulement de quelque deïté
A Sertore et Numa jadis ont proffité,
Soit pour planter des loix en diverses murailles,
Soit pour conduire un camp au meurtre des batailles?
(p. 182).

In Discorsi Book I, 11, Machiavelli employs the example of Numa to show how a ruler may use a religion in which he does not himself believe in order to impose new institutions on his subjects. He says of Numa,

Il quale trovando un popolo ferocissimo, e volendolo ridurre nelle obbedienze civilì con le arti della pace, si volse alla religione come cosa al tutto necessaria a volere mantenere una civiltà, e la constitui in modo che per più secoli non fu mai tanto timore di Dio quanto in quella republica ... E si vede che a Romolo, per ordinare il Senato e per fare altri ordini civili e militari, non gli fu necessario dell' autorità di Dio, ma fu bene necessario a Numa, il quale simulò di avere domestichezza con una Ninfa, la quale lo consigliava di quello ch' egli avesse a consigliare al popolo; e tutto nasceva perché voleva mettere ordini nuovi ed inusitati in quella città, e dubitava che la sua autorità non bastasse.
(pp. 160-161).

Jamyn treats the legend of Numa in a very different way to that of Machiavelli: he admits that Numa was successful in founding a political rule based on an invented religion, but believes that this does not mean it is always more useful for a ruler to manipulate the religious beliefs of his subjects than to believe himself. Against Machiavelli's indifference as to whether the religion of a State is based on Christianity or on pagan rituals (indeed he often prefers the latter), Jamyn argues that true religion and a sincerely Christian ruler will be even more effective in politics than feigned beliefs or an invented religion. 60

An interesting footnote to Jamyn's treatment of the Numa legend, is the view on Numa ascribed to Ronsard by De Bruës in his Dialogues of 1557. Here,
Ronsard is made to express approval of those legislators who persuade the populace of rules in which they themselves do not believe (an extremely unlikely view point for the real Ronsard to have held). Numa is not named here but he was well-known for practising this kind of ruse and at least one modern historian has pointed out the possible influence of Discorsi I, 11 on this dialogue.  

In the same poem, Que prier Dieu, Jamyn may also be opposing Machiavelli's interpretation of Moses's success as a leader in chapter 6 of Il Principe. Machiavelli argues that Moses would not have succeeded without arms,

... tutti i profeti armati vinsono, e li disarmati ruinorono. Perché oltra alle cose dette, la natura de' popoli è varia; ed è facile a persuadere loro una cosa, ma è difficile fermarli in quella persuasione. E però conviene essere ordinato in modo, che quando non credono più, si possa fare credere loro per forza. Moisè, Ciro, Teseo e Romulo non arebbono possuto fare osservare loro lungamente le loro costituzioni, se fussino stati disarmati ...

(p. 32).

Jamyn replies that Moses would not have succeeded without God,

Comment le grand Moyse eust-il par les dangers Sauvé tout Israël des soldats estrangers?
Comment eust-il mené selon sa fantaisie Par mers et par deserts une tourbe infinie,
Si les peuples gaignez de son bruit nonpareil N'eussent creu qu'à tous coups Dieu luy donnait conseil?

(p. 182).

In Que prier Dieu, Jamyn has chosen episodes from Roman history and legend and from the Bible which are used by Machiavelli, and he has given them a very different interpretation from that of the Italian author. Whereas Machiavelli draws the conclusion that the veracity of a religion does not determine its political usefulness and allows his ruler to feign religious beliefs, Jamyn argues that only the true, by which he means Christian, religion will be successful in politics and then only if the ruler sincerely believes in it. The presence of so many different interpretations of Machiavellian themes in one poem seems to point to a sustained and conscious attack on Machiavelli by Jamyn.
As in the case of Ronsard, it is Machiavelli's interpretation of legend and history that Jamyn criticises (as Ronsard had attacked Machiavelli's interpretation of the Chiron legend in the Institution pour l'Adolescence). This confirms that there were other sixteenth-century readers besides Jacques Gohory who concentrated on Machiavelli as a historian rather than a politician (see my introduction to this thesis, p. 25). Jamyn's hostility towards Machiavelli may have been influenced by Ronsard's views on the Italian author. Like Ronsard, Jamyn prefers to attack Machiavelli's interpretation of certain episodes in legend and history in detail rather than making vague attacks on his 'atheism', see my conclusion to chapter 9 of this thesis.

Jamyn's attacks on Machiavelli in this poem help to counterbalance the picture of him as a court poet. S.M. Carrington has suggested that Jamyn may have written Que prier Dieu to fit in with the mystical crisis Henry III underwent at Avignon towards the end of 1574 (op. cit., p. 180, note 1 and see the introduction, pp. 57-58). Yet Jamyn's attacks here on Machiavelli, allegedly one of Henry III's favourite authors, however veiled and discreet, reveal an independence of spirit similar to that displayed in the Institution by Ronsard. The attacks are appropriate and indeed, courageous, in a poem dedicated to the sixteenth-century ruler who was most frequently accused of Machiavellianism. Apart from Que prier Dieu, I have found no evidence of interest in Machiavelli in Jamyn's other poems. (I have examined the two volumes of S. Carrington's edition of Jamyn's poems, published in 1973 and 1975 respectively).

Odet de La Noue

Odet de La Noue was a Reformer soldier and poet writing towards the end of the century. Unlike other Reformers writing at this time, with whom he is often classified such as D'Aubigné, Du Bartas and Pont-Aymery, and unlike his father François, La Noue's work shows no acquaintance with Machiavelli. I have examined his Poesies Chrestiennes and the prose
work attributed to him in the BL catalogue, Résolution claire et facile sur la question tant de fois faite de la prise des armes par les inférieurs. 65

René de Lucinge

René de Lucinge is an author whose knowledge of Machiavelli appears in his prose works but not in his collection of poetry, Le premier loysir. 66 His prose writings on political and military affairs reveal a detailed knowledge of Machiavelli's work. In De la Naissance, Durée et Cheute des Estats, he both praises and criticises Machiavelli's ideas on military affairs and has obviously read the Discorsi in the original. 67

In his Dialogue du François et du Savoysien of 1593, 68 he sees the Saint Bartholomew's Day Massacres as primarily political rather than religious and blames them on the pernicious influence of Machiavelli's teachings,

... je m'estime que l'on face certeines leçons à nos princes chrestiens puisées du Machiavel, par lesquelles on leur enseigne de diviser leurs serviteurs et leurs ministres, croyant par là (que), durant leurs querelles et leurs piccoteries en leur charge, d'en estre mieux servis et plus fidèlement ... Cest autheur instruit un tyran usurpateur de la liberté de sa patrie, qui change l'estat populaire en monarchie; un tel usurpateur doibt véritablement tout craindre et se meffier. (p. 64).

Lucinge is an author who was quite familiar with Machiavelli and a study of his treatment of Machiavelli in his prose works would be valuable for knowledge of Machiavelli's influence on French historians of the sixteenth century.

Claude de Trellon

Like Odet de La Noue, Claude de Trellon belongs to that group of soldier-poets writing at the end of the sixteenth century, such as D'Aubigné, Du Bartas and Pont-Aymery. Unlike these latter, however, Trellon was a Catholic who at one time fought on the side of the League. Also unlike these authors, it is difficult to ascertain to what extent, if at all, Trellon was familiar with Machiavelli's works.
In the collection of sonnets written during his imprisonment at Turin, Trellon criticises Italians for their perfidy, concentration on appearances, dissimulation and atheism, without it being possible to say definitely whether he is attacking Machiavelli or merely mingling with traditional criticisms of Italians the watered-down version of Machiavellianism which was in general currency in France. From his Italian prison, Trellon writes,

Sortons de cest enfer, allons revoir la France,
L'Italie n'a rien d'esgal à sa beaté,
Ce n'est rien que larcin, rien que desloyauté,
Et jamais les vertus n'y firent residence.
Les plus grands en honneur sont ceux en apparence
Qui sont les gens de bien ...

In the following sonnet, he continues,

Ha! que je me suis faict sçavant en ce voyage,
J'ay recogneau l'humeur de ce peuple estranger, ...
Il est dissimulé, accort, bon mesnager ...
Tout cela qu'il promet tend et touche à son bien:
Promettre et ne tenir luy sont autant que rien,
Il ne veut rien sinon voir sa bourse garnie:
Craindre Dieu c'est à quoy il va le moins songeant,
Celuy la qui d'entr'eux plus souvent le renie,
C'est celuy bien souvent qui a le plus d'argent.

(Sonnet x, pp. 58-59).

After Trellon had left the League, he composed a series of stanzas titled Le Ligueur Repenty in which he accuses the League of treachery towards their King. One of his methods of criticism lies in depicting the League using religion as a cover for their political ambitions,

Le masque de la Ligue est par tout descouvert,
Ce n'est qu'ambition, ce n'est que tyrannie,
C'est vouloir usurper la couronne à nos Rois ...
Ce n'est plus pour la Messe, helas! qu'on se debat,
C'est pour la Royauté que lon vient au combat,
Bien tard à mon regret j'en ay la cognoissance.

(Le Ligueur Repenty, ed. cit., p. 12).

Later in the same work, he describes the League as perfidious and irreligious,

Veux-tu sçavoir que c'est du serment de Ligueur,
Estre traistre à son Roy, loger dedans le coeur
L'ambition, l'orgueil, l'envie, et l'avarice.
Feindre de servir Dieu, n'avoir ny Dieu, ny loy,
Estre sans amitié, sans respect et sans foy ...

(op. cit., p. 47).
In a sonnet written during his imprisonment at Turin, Trellon says,

Espagnols, Espagnols vous nous promettez fort,
   Et ne nous tenez rien de toutes vos promesses:
Vous estes des mathois, vous avez des fineesses,
   Que pour les descouvrir il faut bien estre accort.

(op. cit., p. 55).

He concludes that,

... un François Ligueur est un homme sans foy,

(op. cit., p. 56).

As in the works of D'Aubigné and Pont-Aymery, Trellon builds up his political opponents as treacherous and dissimulating atheists. Unlike the works of the former authors, those of Trellon show no evidence of first-hand acquaintance with Machiavelli and it is impossible to tell whether he deliberately intended to depict the League as Machiavellian. Neither do any of his other writings reveal a knowledge of the Italian author.
The following is a list of the works of poets which I have examined and which reveal no trace of Machiavelli's influence.

Ambillou, R. B. d' pseud. for René Bouchet

Discours de la guerre civile et mort tres-regrettée de Henry III, Tours, 1590, BL 11474 c 11.

Amboise, François d'

Elegie sur le trépas d'Anne Duc de Montmorancy pair et connestable de France, avec un panegiric latin et une ode française sur le desastre de la France agitée des troubles et revoltes civiles, l'an 1568, Paris, 1568, BN Ye 4962.

Hymne triumval, au Roy sur la victoire nouvellement conquire sur les rebelles et conjurez, Paris, 1568, BN Rés Ye 1783.

Odes lamentables sur le desastre de la France agitée de troubles et revoltes civiles 1568, Paris, 1568, BN Rés Ye 1777.

Au Roy sur son entree, son mariage et sa chasse, Paris, 1571, BL 1073 d 36.

Au Roy. Sur la reduction de la ville de Paris, s.l., 1594, BN Ye 1900.

Bartelon de Ravieres, P.


Belleforest, François


Bereau, Jacques


Bertaud, Jean


Billard, Claude

Vers funèbres français et latins sur le vray discours de la mort de Monseigneur le Duc de Joyeuse, pair et admiral de France, Paris, 1587, BN Rés Ye 530.

Hymne de Victoire, sur les deffaites et la reddition des reytres, Paris, 1588, BN Ye 15520.

Hymne de la Lorraine à Monseigneur le Serenissime Cardinal Legat de Lorraine, Nancy, 1602, BL 11475 d 7.

Larmes sur la tombe de très grand, très victorieux, très chrestien roy de France et de Navarre Henry III. À la Royne, Paris, 1610, BN Rés G 2845.
Tragédies françaises, Paris, 1612, BL C 39 c 61.

Songe de la guerre, s.l.n.d., BN Ye 2057.

La Mort d'Henry IV, Tragédie en 5 actes et en vers, Paris, 1806, BL 11740 s 12 (first performed 1610).

Sonnets spirituels recueillis pour la plus part des anciens théologiens, tant grecs que latins, avec quelques autres petits traitéz poétiques de semblable matière, Paris, 1573, BN Rés Ye 1826.

Ode sur la naissance ... de Madame Marie Isabel de Vallois, Lyons, 1573, BN Ye 5965.


Opuscules du Traverseur des voyes perilleuses, Poitiers, 1526, BL G 18193.

Triomphes, du Treschrestien, Trespuissant, et Invictissime, Roy de France, François premier de ce nom: contenant la difference des Nobles, Poitiers, 1550, BL 640 1 2.

Brève adhortation au peuple de France, de s'amender, pour appaiser l'ire de Dieu, Paris, 1568, BN Rés Ye 1782.

Congratulation au Roy de France tres-chrestien, Paris, 1568, BN Rés Ye 1778.

Larmes sur le trespas de la Roine d'Espagne, Paris, 1568, BN Rés Ye 1779.


Les poèmes de Pierre de Brach, Bordeaux, 1576, BL 11475 f 5.
Brèche de Tours, Jean
Manuel Royal, ou Opuscules de la doctrine et condition du Prince, tant en prose que rhytme francoys, Tours, 1541, BN Rés Yz 345.

Bugnyon, Philibert
Premier Livre de l'Honneste Exercice du Prince, à Madame la princesse de Navarre, Paris, 1544, BL 85 e 12.

Busche, A. van den
Les plaintes et regretz des trois estatz du royaume de France, Lyons, 1571, BN Rés Ye 3636.

Buttet, Marc Claude de
Poèmes et Anagrammes composez des lettres du nom du roy, et des roynes, ensemble de plusieurs Princes et Centilhommes et Dames de France, Paris, 1576, BL 11475 c 5.

C.A.D.I.P.S.C.,
Le Premier livre des Vers de Marc-Claude de Buttet, Paris, 1561, BN Rés Ye 1873.

Cato ou Reproche à Pompee, se reportant aux troubles presentes: avec une imprecation à Dieu vengeur, s.l., 1568, BN Rés Ye 3673.

Chesne-Verd, Louis de

Complainte de la France sur les demerites de Jean Louis de Nogaret, de la Valette Duc D'Espernon presentée au Roy, s.l., 1588, BN Ye 18890.

Complainte de l'Université de Paris, contre aucuns estrangers nouvellement venus, surnommez Jesuites, s.l., 1564, BN Rés Ye 427.

Complainte des fidelles Chrestiens et Catholiques de la France, sur le temps present, Paris, 1588, BN Rés Ye 3744.

La Complainte et Lamentation ou Prophetie de Melusine à la France, Paris, 1575, BN Rés Ye 3741.

Complainte et regretz de Gaspard de Coligny, qui fut Admiral de France, Paris, 1572, BN Ye 55533.

Contenu par lequel Henry de Valois, confesse estre Tyran et ennemy de l'Eglise Catholique Apostolique et Romaine, s.l., 1589, BN Ye p 5962.

Corrozet, Gilles attrib.
Le Chant de la paix de France, chanté par les troys estatz, Paris, 1544, BN Rés Ye 3701.

La Cronique des luthériens et outre-cuidance d'iceux, Paris, /1572/, BN Rés Ye 4105.

Declaration par laquelle Henry de Valois confesse estre Tyran et ennemy de l'Eglise Catholique, Apostolique et Romaine, s.l.n.d., BN Ye 1955.
Déploration de la mort de Henry III, s.l., 1589, BN Ye p 5970.

Discours poétique sur la misère et calamité de nostre siècle, Lyons, 1591, BN Rés Ye 3868.

Discours Royal de ce qui est requis et nécessaire aux Roys et Princes, Lyons, 1594, BN Rés Ye 3869.

Discours sur les plaintes et doléances des misères et calamités de ce temps, Paris, 1589, BL 1192 e 49.

D.L.C.R. Nouvelle Lettre escripte à D'Espernon et à ses aliés sur les misères de la France, par un sien amy estant en son gouvernement de Mets, s.l., 1588, BN Rés Ye 4481.

Dorleans, Louis Cantique de victoire par lequel on peut remarquer de la vengence, que Dieu a prise dessus ceux qui vouloient ruiner son Eglise et la France, Paris, 1569, BN Rés Ye 3903.

Du Buys, Guillaume Les Oeuvres, Paris, 1583, BL 11483 a 37.

Du Peyrat, Guillaume Les Essais poétiques, Tours, 1573, BL 11475 b 16.


- Sonnet contre le parricide exécrable du très chrétien roy de France et de Navarre Henry III, s.l., 1610, BN Ye 1066.

- Discours sur la vie et mort de Henry le Grand, Paris, 1611, BL 695 a 24 (1).

- Stances au Roy pour la paix, Paris, 1616, BN Ye 7562.

Durant, Gilles Les œuvres poétiques du Sieur de la Bergerie, avec les imitations, Paris, 1594, BL 11475 cc 31.

Du Rosier, P. Déploration de la France sur la calamité des dernières guerres civiles, advenues en icelle, l'an 1568, Paris, 1568, BL 1193 h 30 (3).

Du Verdier, Antoine Les Omonimes, satire des moeurs corrompues de ce siècle, Lyons, 1572, BN Rés Ye 449.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ellain, Nicolas</td>
<td>Les Sonnetz de Nicolas Ellain, Paris, 1561,</td>
<td>BN Rés Ye 1760</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.M.S.E.A.</td>
<td>Deux epistres en rithme françoise, s.l., 1561,</td>
<td>BN Rés Ye 3849</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exhortation aux Catholiques, pour attaquer promptement Henry de Valois, avant qu'il puisse avoir secours d'aucuns estrangers heretiques, Paris, 1589, BN Rés Ye 3989.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exhortation de la France aux Françoys desvoyez, Paris, 1562, BL 164 i 38.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expilly, Claude</td>
<td>Les poèmes du sieur d'Expilly à Madame la Marquise de Monceaux, Paris, 1596, BL 640 k 7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forcadel; Estienne</td>
<td>Poésie d'Estienne Forcadel, Lyons, 1551, BN Rés Ye 1824.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oeuvres poétiques, Paris, 1579, BL 11475 bbb 51.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frégeville, Antoine de</td>
<td>Plusieurs belles consolations sur la malice du temps, Angoulême, 1570, BN Ye 55577.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.B.B.</td>
<td>Les pleurs et larmes, s.l.n.d., BN Ye 30206.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gayeté en forme de responce, à la complainte des Liguez Toulouzains, s.l., 1589, BN Ye p 5976.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godard, Jean</td>
<td>La nouvelle muse, ou les loisirs de Jean Godard, Lyons, 1618, BL 11482 aaa 10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meslanges poétiques: tragiques, comiques et autres diverses, Lyons, 1624, BL 11475 dd 3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>La Grande Trahison et volerie du Roy Guillot Prince et Seigneur de tous les larrons bandolliers, sacrilèges, voleurs et brigans du Royaume de France, s.l.n.d., BN Rés Ye 3018.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Le Grand Gueridon Italien et Espagnol venu nouvellement en France, s.l., 1616, BN Ye p 5964.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Work Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guiet, Thomas</td>
<td>La Resjouissance de la paix, présentée aux quatre Estatz de la France, par Thomas Guiet, Paris, 1588, BN Ye pièce 6000.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habert, François</td>
<td>Le Dieugarde de la ville de Paris, à Monsieur de Guise, Paris, 1558, BL 238 m 314.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesteau, Clovis</td>
<td>Les oeuvres poétiques, Paris, 1578, BL 85 f 20 (1).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hymne à Dieu, pour la delivrance des Françoys de la plus que Egyptienne servitude, en laquelle ils ont esté detenus par le passé, s.l.n.d., BN Ye 24330.**

**Hymne de la guerre et de la paix, Tours, 1590, BN Rés Ye 544.**

**L., A.D.R.**

Chanson spirituelle et action de graces, contenant le discours de la vie et tyrannie de Henry de Valois in Les Belles Figures et Drolleries de la Ligue (1589-1600) recueillies par Pierre de l'Estoile, Paris, 1877.

**La Boëtie, Estienne de**


**Lamentations de la France, et sa prière, Orleans, 1577, BN Rés Ye 4155.**

**La Tayssonniere, Guillaume de**

Sourdine Royale, sonnant le bouteselle l'acheval, et à l'estandart, à la noblesse Catholique de France pour le secours de nostre Roy Tres-Chrestien Charles IX, Paris, 1569, BN Ye 55615.

**La T.D., A. de**

Le Caron, Louis

La Poésie de Loys Le Caron Parisien, Paris, 1554, BL 1073 a 5 (1).

--

Panégyrique, ou Oraison de louange, au Roy Charles VIII, Paris, 1565, BL 1193 a 30 (6).

Le Loyer, Pierre


Le Masle, Jean

Chant d'allegresse sur la mort de Gaspar de Colligny, jadis Admiral de France, Paris, 1572, BL 11475 c 18.

--

Bref discours sur les troubles qui, depuis douze ans, ont continuellement agité et tourmenté le royaume de France, Lyons, 1573, BN Ye pièce 5992.

Le Tour, B.

Cantique au nom du Roy, Paris, 1568, BN Rés Ye 1780.

Louange de la France au Roy pour la paix de ce royaume, Paris, 1614, BN Ye p 5963.

Magny, Olivier de


--

Sonnets inédites d'Olivier de Magny ed. P. Tamizey de Larroque, Paris, 1880.

Malherbe, François de


Maynard, François


Morenne, Claude de

Poesies profanes ed. L. Duhamel, Caen, 1864, B. Arsenal Rf 1425. From a manuscript dating 1584.


Muret, Marc-Antoine de

Poesies de Marc-Antoine Muret, mises en vers francais par M. P. Moret, Paris, 1682, BN Yc 8409.

--


Navières, Charles de

Cantique de la paix, Paris, 1570, BN Rés Ye 1810.

Nouvellet, Claude-Estienne

Hymne triomphal sur la Saint-Barthélemy, ed. J. Manecy, Chambéry, 1900.

Ode sacree de l'Eglise Françoise sur les miseres de ces troubles huitiemes depuis vingt cinq ans en ça, s.l., 1586, BN Rés Ye 4489.
Ollenix du Mont-Sacré, pseud. for Nicolas de Montreux

Pasquier, Estienne
- La Main ou œuvres poétiques faits sur la main de E. P., Paris, 1584, BL 640 k 29 (1).
- La Jeunesse d'Estienne Pasquier et sa suite, Paris, 1610, BL 245 h 12.

P., I. S.
- Discours sur la mort de Gaspart de Coligny, Paris, \[1572\], BL 1073 d 36 (8).

Le Paradis contre l'enfer de Blois, s.l., 1589, BN Ye 5986.

Passerat, Jean

Peletier du Mans, Jacques attrib.
- Remonstrance aux Princes du sang, touchant les affaires de nostre temps, s.l., 1561, BN Lb 3322.
- Oeuvres poétiques de Jacques Peletier du Mans, publiées d'après l'édition originale de 1547, par Léon Séché, avec une notice biographique, un commentaire et des notes par P. Laumonier, Paris, 1904.

Pibrac, Guy du Faur
- Cinquante Quatrains, Lyons, 1574, BL 1073 d 30.

Poème sur la blessure du Roy, Lyons, 1595, BN Rés Ye 4578.

Poncet, Simon

Pontoux, Claude de
- Les œuvres, Lyons, 1579, BL 11481 a 37.

Quercu, Legier (Latin form of Du Chesne)
- Exhortation au Roy, pour vertueusement poursuivre ce que sagement il a commencé contre les huguenots, Paris, 1572, BL 11474 h 27.

Quillian, M.
- Discours dédié à Monseigneur le Duc de Guyse, s.l., 1588, BN Rés Ye 4630.

R., G. S. P.
- Les alliances royales et rejouissances publiques, Lyons, 1612, BN Ye 5987.

Régnier, Mathurin
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regrets et Soupirs Lamentables de la France sur le trespas de ... Monseigneur le Duc de Guyse, Paris, 1588, BN Ye 5983.</td>
<td>Regrets et Soupirs Lamentables de la France sur le trespas de ... Monseigneur le Duc de Guyse, Paris, 1588, BN Ye 5983.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regrets sur la mort de Monseigneur le Duc de Mayenne, s.l.n.d., BN Ye 5982.</td>
<td>Regrets sur la mort de Monseigneur le Duc de Mayenne, s.l.n.d., BN Ye 5982.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responce à la complainte qu'un Ligueur a fait sur la mort des Guisans freres, s.l., 1589, BN Ye p 5980.</td>
<td>Responce à la complainte qu'un Ligueur a fait sur la mort des Guisans freres, s.l., 1589, BN Ye p 5980.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Prophonematique au Roy sur son entrée à Paris le 6 Mars, 1571, Paris, 1571, BL 1073 d 36 (3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossant, André</td>
<td>Discours triomphal et chant de lyesse, Paris, 1587, BN Ye p 5988.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonnets sur la corruption et malice de ce temps, s.l., 1591, BN Rés p Ye 381.</td>
<td>Sonnets sur la corruption et malice de ce temps, s.l., 1591, BN Rés p Ye 381.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorbin, Arnaud</td>
<td>Regrets de la France sur les misères des presens troubles de l'an mil cinq cens soixante-sept, Paris, 1568, BN Rés Ye 4855.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spifame, Martin</td>
<td>Les premières oeuvres poétiques, Paris, 1583, BN Rés Ye 1871.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talpin, Jean</td>
<td>Institution du prince chrestien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Les Tenebres de la France, ou lamentations qu'elle faict durant ceste semaine saincte sur la rebellion de ses Ligueurs, Tours, 1590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Le Testament de la Ligue, Lyons, 1594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Le Triple Enfer des Ligueurs, s.l., 1589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnebus, Adrianus</td>
<td>Brief discours de l'occasion des troubles et dissentions du jour d'huy au fait de la Religion, et moyen d'y obvier, /Paris/, 1564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brief discours et veritable des principales conjurations de ceux de la maison de Guyse, contre le Roy et son royaume, /Paris/, 1565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyard, Pontus de</td>
<td>Les oeuvres poetiques, Paris, 1573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vatel, Jean</td>
<td>Le premier livre des meslanges de Jehan Vatel, Paris, 1601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vauquelin de la Fresnaye, Jean</td>
<td>Oraison, de ne croire legerelement a la calomnie, digne d'estre en ce temps toujours devant les yeux des rois, des princes et des grans, Caen, 1587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Les diverses poesies du Sieur de la Fresnaye, Vauquelin, Caen, 1612</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ii) Dramatists

Nicolas Chrétien, Sieur des Croix

In his Tragedie D'Ammon et Thamar, Des Croix adds to the Biblical account of Amnon's incest and Absalom's revenge in II Samuel 13, the theme of Absalom's ambition to be King after David. This addition gives the play a unity of moral theme: Absalom is dominated by his ambition as Amnon is dominated by his passion for Thamar, whilst David is portrayed as a mature ruler who has conquered his youthful passions and learned wisdom. The theme of Absalom's lust for power also introduces a political, and even Machiavellian, note into the story of Amnon and Thamar.

In Act II, Absalom is given two advisers, Cusay who counsels moderation and prudence rather than force, and Architofel who encourages Absalom's ambition. The latter adviser possesses several Machiavellian traits. He suggests killing Amnon in order to obtain political power (p. 41), and says that positions of responsibility should be given according to merit rather than age,

En affaires d'estât on ne regarde aux ans,
Mais à ceux qui de luy sont les plus suffisans,
Qui sçavant gouverner, comme vous plus capable
Que vostre frere Amnon d'un acte si louable.

(p. 41).

Similarly, in Discorsi I, 60, 'Come il Consolato e qualunque altro magistrato in Roma si dava sanza rispetto di età,' Machiavelli says,

E quando uno giovane è di tanta virtù, che si sia fatto in qualche cosa notabile conoscere; sarebbe cosa dannosissima che la città non se ne potessi valere allora, e che l'avesse a aspettare che fosse invecchiato con lui quel vigore dell' animo e quella prontezza, della quale in quella età la patria sua si poteva valere.

There is something Machiavellian about Architofel's argument that political responsibility can be given to young men.

Inspired by Architofel, Absalom uses ruse to gain revenge on Amnon in Act V. He is depicted as a dissimulator and a schemer, whereas the Biblical account merely states that he killed Amnon while the latter was
drinking (II Samuel 13: 28). However, there is something reminiscent of Seneca rather than Machiavelli in Absalom's use of a banquet to trap Amnon. It is difficult to establish categorically whether Des Croix is wishing to depict Absalom as a Machiavel, though it does seem that his adviser, Architofel, is deliberately presented as Machiavellian.

Interestingly, in another play, Albouin ou la Vengeance (originally titled Rosemonde ou la Vengeance), Des Croix cites Book I of the Istorie Fiorentine as one of the works he has used as a source for his tragedy. Des Croix thus exemplifies in a minor way, a tendency we have noted all along in this thesis, that is, to criticise Machiavelli's political ideas by putting them in the mouths of scheming courtiers, whilst at the same time using Machiavelli as a historian. Des Croix could not have approved of Machiavelli as a politician for not only does he put Architofel on stage as a Machiavel, but also in the Cantique présenté à Monseigneur le Dauphin, Des Croix sets out his personal ideas on kingship, ideas which are very different from those of Machiavelli, namely that a King should rule with justice, piety and clemency.

I have found no trace of reaction to Machiavelli, either favourable or unfavourable, in Des Croix's other plays, Le Ravissement de Céfale and the Tragédie des Portugaiz Infortunées. The latter does contain a debate on the relative merits of clemency and severity, but the topic is dealt with in a traditional, Senecan way owing nothing to Machiavelli.

Cléophon

This tragedy was published in Paris in 1600 under the initials I.D.F., possibly Jacques de Fontenay. The names of the characters have been changed but the subject of the play is clearly Henry III's siege of Paris at Saint Cloud and his assassination. Henry III under the name of Cléophon, is presented sympathetically as a clement and good King. Some of the characters make vaguely Machiavellian or anti-Machiavellian
remarks from time to time for example, Apliste, representing the rebel Parisians, tells Diadotime, who represents the loyal Parisians,

Puis qu'il [Cléophon] te traiçte mal tu peux faulser ta foy.  
(Act II, p. 15).

In Act III, Diadotime defends her King in a way that is possibly reminiscent of other attacks on Machiavelli in the sixteenth century,

Un grand Roy, comme luy plain d'ame et de courage  
Pour decevoir autruy ne porte un faux visage.  
Le ciel ne meit jamais avec sa majesté  
Chose qu'on peut nommer feintise ou fausseté.  
Qu'ont que faire les Roys d'estre feints pouvants faire  
Sans crainte, ouvertement tout ce qui leur peut plaire?  
(p. 21).

However, there is nothing specifically anti-Machiavellian in this play: the author is more concerned with literary expression than with political ideas.

Antoine Du Favre

In 1589 Antoine Du Favre published his play, Les Gordians et Maximins ou l'Ambition, on the subject of the revolt by the Romans under the leadership of the Gordians against the rule of the tyrant Maximinus. In this drama, Maximinus who has usurped the Empire from Severus, possesses several characteristics of the Machiavellian ruler, whilst Gordian père reveals his opposition to any kind of Machiavellianism in politics.

In Act I, Gordian père is portrayed as rising above the current level of political behaviour; he is not selfishly ambitious nor is he prepared to perjure his oath of loyalty to Maximinus by leading a rebellion against the Emperor. To Antoine's urgings that he will be supported by the army and the populace, Gordian replies,

Le peuple, et le Senat peut-il faire pour moy,  
Que je ne sois parjure, en parjurant ma foy?  
La Foy, fille des Dieux, doit estre inviolable.  
(9v).

The subject of the legitimacy of resistance to a tyrant is not a Machiavellian one, but in depicting Gordian père as opposed to perjury,
Favre may be intending to build him up as the opposite of a Machiavellian ruler, in contrast with Maximinus. If the elder Gordian is reluctant to indulge in self-interested ambitions, his son is less so. In Act II, father and son discuss whether they have a right to break their oath of loyalty to the Emperor. In reply to his father's hesitation, Gordian fils says,

La parolle ne peut obliger, qui est folle ...
Le peuple n'est tenu de supporter la loy
Du Prince vicieux, qui premier rompt sa foy.
(23r).

It is perhaps significant that in this Act, as well as endorsing perjury, Gordian fils also gives the Machiavellian definition of the just war,

Et bonne, et juste ell' est, quand ell' est necessaire.
(28v).

In Il Principe chapter 26, following Livy, Machiavelli says,

Iustum enim est bellum quibus necessarium, et pia arma ubi nulla nisi in armis spes est.
(p. 103).

Maximinus makes his appearance in Act III. In the first scene, he is depicted as cruel and bloodthirsty, owing more to the Senecan tyrant than to Machiavelli's theories, for instance, he swears to blind his own son as a punishment for disobedience. By scene 3, however, Maximinus has come to resemble the Machiavellian ruler more closely. He is portrayed as an opportunist who prefers to rely on Fortune and his own strength rather than on the gods. He tells Modestin, his adviser,

Des Dieux il ne faut pas, Modestin, que j'attende
De mon heur esbranlé l'assurance plus grande,
La force de mes bras, qui fidelle tousjours
A guidé mes desseins, portera mon secours ...
De Fortune plustost la puissance volage
Recevra le serment de mon loyal hommage.

Modestin warns him,

Gardez d'attribuer à Fortune l'honneur
Que demandent les Dieux, jaloux de leur grandeur.
(45v-46r).

The discussion then moves onto the topic of the new ruler, a
specifically Machiavellian theme; Maximinus believes that cruelty is necessary if a new ruler is to preserve his power,

Ou par force, ou par dol, les Empires se prennent,
Mais par la cruauté plus seurs, ils se maintiennent:
Car le peuple conquis jamais n’aime son Roy,
Si l’horreur de la mort ne le pasme d’effroy.

(51v).

Modestin argues that clemency is necessary,

Sire, pardonnez moy, Par force il n’est possible
Qu’un nouveau conquerant se maintienne invincible,
Si vray maistre des cueurs du peuple subjugué
De leur haine il ne sait se rendre desbrigé.

(51v).

Every Machiavellian statement uttered by Maximinus is countered by Modestin, possibly reflecting Favre’s own opposition to the Italian’s political ideas.

The portrayal of Maximinus as a Machiavellian is continued as he expresses his approval of dissimulation,

... celuy n’est digne de l’Empire
Qui ne sçait en tout temps l’un faire, et l’autre dire.

(54r).

Modestin replies,

Le dissimulateur coulpable se confesse
D’estre pauvre de foy, et manque en hardiesse ...
Malheur à celuy là qui ses humeurs deguise,
Qui Lyon au dedans vest encor la feintise
D’un cauteleux regnard, et ne tasche sinon
Par dols, par cruauté ensanglanter son nom.

(54v).

The use of the fox and lion symbols appear to indicate that it is specifically Machiavelli who is being attacked here. Maximinus wonders how a prince can survive without using guile. Modestin replies that he must win his subjects’ love and trust and that God will eventually punish a perjurer.

In this way, Maximinus is shown as possessing some traits of the Machiavellian ruler; but Machiavellianism is only one element in the portrayal of Maximinus who at other times resembles more closely a violent Senecan tyrant. Even Act III, scene 3, the only scene in the play where Maximinus is depicted as a Machiavel, ends with Maximinus’s degeneration
from a rational and calculating Machiavellian ruler into a bloodthirsty and passionate Senecan tyrant. The theme of Machiavellianism is thus only one strand in a play whose central subject is the question of the legitimacy of rebellion.  

It is unlikely that Favre possessed first hand acquaintance of the Italian author's works; there is nothing, for instance, in the portrayal of Maximinus which he could not have borrowed from popular political pamphlets or from Gentillet's book. It is perhaps significant that Favre's play was published in 1589, a year in which a lot of political pamphlets attacking Machiavelli appeared. Many of these pamphlets criticise Henry III by linking him with Machiavellianism; if, as R. Thomas suggests (op. cit., 92-93), Maximinus is intended to represent Henry III, Favre would be merely adopting a popular line of attack against the French King by depicting him as a Machiavellian ruler. Moreover, Maximinus seems an odd choice of an Emperor to be depicted as a Machiavel since in chapter 19 of *Il Principe* Machiavelli specifically names Maximinus as an illustration of a ruler whose excessive cruelty led to his downfall, and warns his prince not to follow his example.

Jan-Edouard Du Monin

R. Thomas points out (op. cit., pp. 218-219) that perfidy is a major theme in Du Monin's play *L'Orbecc-Oronte.* Sulmon, the King of Persia has discovered his daughter's secret marriage to Oronte. He pretends to Zostre, his adviser, that he will show clemency towards Orbecc and Oronte, but when alone, he reveals his true feelings,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{La foi ne se doit pas à ceux qui n'ont pas point,} \\
\text{Qui, Roi, cherche autre los, il est serf de tout point.} \\
\text{Cette ruse s'appelle un sutil stratagème.} \\
\text{(Act III, 102r).}
\end{align*}
\]

Zostre, ignorant of the King's true intentions, assures Orbecc and Oronte that Sulmon will forgive them,
Car comme l'ame au corp d'une aimantine corde
Se marie en un noeud d'étERNELLE concorde,
Ainsi au Roi la Foi: et comme l'ame aussi
Faisant divorce au corp, son naturel souci,
L'homme est cassé de vie: ainsi quand le Roi manque
A la foi de sa foi, son sceptre ront (sic) sa banque.
(104r).

The theme of perfidy is continued in Act IV as Sulmon has Oronte assassinated. His action is approved of by his two ministers, Perondin and Chandellan, who endorse the policy of breaking promises and describe Zostre as inexperienced in affairs of State. Oronte's dying words accuse Sulmon of perfidy and the Chorus enlarges on this theme, warning that perfidy is always punished by God (116r-118r). But despite the importance of the theme of perfidy, it seems unlikely that Du Monin intended his play to be a criticism of Machiavelli. There are no verbal echoes of the Italian author, and the violence and bloodthirstiness of Sulmon (he presents Orbecc with the heads of her husband and two children) owe more to Seneca than to Machiavelli. Perfidy is just as much the mark of the Senecan tyrant as of a Machiavellian ruler. Though Du Monin knew Italian, there is no evidence in his works of first-hand acquaintance with Machiavelli.

Jacques Grévin

Grévin was a member of the early Pleiade group and a disciple of Ronsard until bitter differences over religion separated them. In 1561 Grévin published an edition of his plays and poems titled *Le Théâtre*. This collection included his tragedy *César*. There are several reasons for the likelihood of Machiavelli's influence on this play. Firstly, Grévin is using Roman history to draw parallels between the Roman civil wars and the French wars of religion. Machiavelli had also looked to Roman times for a solution of his country's problems and we have already seen that Garnier's tragedies use Machiavelli's analysis of Roman history and politics to draw parallels with French affairs. Grévin was a
militant Reformer closely involved in the political situation of his day (he twice had to seek refuge in England). Like Garnier, his involvement in politics could have led to an interest in Machiavelli's political theories. Grévin also knew Italian. Around 1567 he went to Turin where he entered the service of Margaret of France as her doctor and perhaps as tutor to her son. He was sent by her on various missions, especially to Rome.

Grévin wrote several poems on political subjects, for example, *Les Regretz de Charles d'Austriche Empereur, Cinquiesme de ce nom* and *Sonnets d'Angleterre et de Flandre* where he laments the troubles in France. He often gives advice to rulers, for example, in *Hymne à Monseigner le Dauphin, sur le mariage dudit Seigneur, et de Madame Marie D'Esteuert, Royne d'Escosse* where he suggests the names of Roman rulers whom the Dauphin should imitate in politics.

There is anti-Italian propaganda in several of Grévin's poems, for example, in *Les Regretz de Charles d'Austriche* where he contrasts Frenchmen's loyalty to their King with the fickleness of Italians. In his collection of satirical sonnets on court life, *La Gelodacrye*, there is some anti-Italian satire, as when he says of Jupiter,

Il sçait dissimuler comme un Italien.

(Edward, p. 344).

But this type of satire of Italians occurs frequently in sixteenth-century poems which criticise life at court (Grévin was very much influenced by Du Bellay's *Regrets*) and contains nothing specifically anti-Machiavellian.

Moreover, on closer examination, the depiction of the rulers in *César* owes more to the influence of Seneca, through the intermediary of Muret's *Julius Caesar*, Plutarch and Suetonius, than to any of Machiavelli's ideas on politics. Act I, scene 2, for example, where Mark Anthony urges Caesar to be more severe ('la puissance sera par force maintenue') comes straight from the traditional Senecan debate on clemency and severity in
politics. In Act II, scene 1, Marcus Brutus praises the ancient republican heroes like the Decii Mus who took their own lives rather than lose their honour. Such men, says Brutus,

... oserent mourir de propre volonté
Pourveu que par leur mort l'honneur fust racheté.

Machiavelli frequently praises the Decii Mus as outstanding examples of Roman valour in his Discorsi, for example, II, 16, III, 1, 45, but it is more likely that Grévin's praise was inspired by his own reading of Roman history.

In Act V, scene 1, Cassius accuses Caesar of changing the auspices according to where his political interests lie. He describes Caesar as

Celuy qui meprisoit l'aruspice sacré,
Se vantant qu'il pouvoit malgré tous les plus sages
Changer à son vouloir les assurez presages.

(p. 161).

Discorsi I, 14 is titled 'I Romani interpretavano gli auspizi secondo la necessità, e con la prudenza mostravano di osservare la religione, quando forzati non la osservavano ...'. But Machiavelli never accuses Caesar in particular of acting in this way and it is probable, as E.S. Ginsberg points out (ed. cit., p. 161, note 134) that Grévin borrowed this criticism of Caesar from Suetonius. Examination of Grévin's works thus reveals no evidence for Machiavelli's influence.

Jean Heudon

In Heudon's tragedy, Sainct Clouaud, the tyrants Childebert and Clotaire have been described as possessing several Machiavellian traits. It is true that Childebert's dislike of half-measures ('Tout bon ou tout meschant doit estre un Prince sage', Act III, p. 38) does appear to echo the title of Discorsi I, 27, 'Sanno rarissime volte gli uomini essere al tutto cattivi o al tutto buoni'. But the Senecan tyrant is also devoured by excessive ambition and on the whole, the atmosphere of this tragedy seems to be Senecan rather than Machiavellian. As in Seneca, the conflict
depicted is essentially a family one: Childebert and Clotaire are angry at their mother's protection of her grandsons and plot to kill them.

The description of Clotaire by Belleroche (pp. 40-41) depicts the archetypal Senecan tyrant, bloodthirsty, impassioned and bent on killing members of his own family. It is true that Childebert favours ruse (Act IV, p. 52) but then guile is also part of the character of a Senecan tyrant. I can find no definite proof of Heudon's first-hand acquaintance with Machiavelli in this play.

Antoine de Montchrestien

R. Thomas believes that in Montchrestien's play, *David ou l'Adultère*, David degenerates into a Machiavellian ruler as a result of his adulterous love for Bathsheba. While it is true that David dissimulates to Uriah in Act II, this is also found in the Biblical account (II Samuel 11: 7-8, 10). It is also true that Nadab tells David in Act III that he is above the law, but there is nothing particularly Machiavellian in this since Machiavelli never recommends that a ruler break his own laws, especially for a purely personal reason. The Chorus to Act III describes the misery caused by Kings who rule by force and says of this kind of monarch,

Le juste il mesure au possible,
Et ne tient conte de'la foy.
(p. 220).

These lines could be interpreted as anti-Machiavellian but the context is too vague to be sure that Montchrestien did in fact have Machiavelli in mind here.

Although David does misuse his power as a result of his adulterous love and employs dissimulation and ruse for his own ends, these tactics are also found in the Biblical account of this episode and they are not dwelt upon in the play in a way which would suggest that Montchrestien was making David into a specifically Machiavellian ruler. Montchrestien is not primarily concerned with the question of statesmanship in *David* but
with exploiting the moral lessons of David's situation.

R. Thomas sees two other plays of Montchrestien as containing potentially Machiavellian themes: La Cartaginoise ou la Liberté (originally titled Sophonisbe) and La Reine d'Escosse. In the former play, Syphax is described as perfidious since he has broken his promise to Rome, but the theme of Syphax's perfidy is also found in Montchrestien's sources, Plutarch's Life of Scipio and Appian (Roman History, Book XI). In Act V (p. 154) Sophonisba doubts whether Massinissa will keep his promise to her, but again, this is found in Plutarch. There is no need to postulate the influence of Machiavelli for the theme of broken promises in this play and, moreover, the theme of perfidy is not central to the play which is an analysis of the effect of love on brave warriors and the necessity of freedom.

Even Montchrestien's play dealing with a contemporary political subject, La Reine d'Escosse, reveals no real interest in Machiavelli's theories on government. As F.A. Yates has pointed out, Montchrestien approaches his subject primarily as a poet rather than a politician. In his play titled Aman, ou la Vanité, the portrayal of the tyrant Aman is Senecan rather than Machiavellian. Nor have I found any trace of Machiavellianism in his other tragedies, Hector and Les Lacènes. Montchrestien is a good example of a dramatist whom one could reasonably expect to have had some knowledge of Machiavelli but whose plays reveal no first hand acquaintance with the Italian author.

Nicolas de Montreux

In 1601 under the pseudonym of Ollenix du Mont-Sacré, Nicolas de Montreux published a tragedy titled La Sophonisbe. In the 'Argument', Montreux states that his sources are Appian and Plutarch but, unlike Montchrestien's tragedy on the same subject, Montreux concentrates on the downfall of Syphax rather than on the love between Sophonisba and
Massinissa. This results in a greater emphasis on the theme of kingship and in particular, it is stressed throughout the play that perfidy is a trait unworthy of a true King.  

In Act I, p. 46, Scipio accuses Syphax of breaking his promise to Rome and dwells at length on the punishment which follows perfidy. Scipio's accusation is however found in both Appian and Plutarch. The theme of broken promises is continued as Laelius says that God gives us the power to keep our promises (pp. 47-48). The theme is developed during Act I but not in a way that is specifically Machiavellian since it is set in the context of Syphax's love for Sophonisba.

In Act III, the scene between Massinissa and his advisers provides an opportunity for a discussion on politics, but the ideas expressed are traditional, for example, that prudence is necessary for a ruler. Massinissa is concerned about his promise to Sophonisba that she will remain free. His adviser, Misipsa, replies that promises need not be kept if it is not to the advantage of the State,

La foy perd ce beau nom, dont l'effet dommageable  
Fait paroistre un public à jamais miserable,  
Et l'on ne doit garder la promesse qui fait  
Un estât miserable en son cruel effait.  
(p. 99).

This may be an intentional echo of Machiavelli, but if so, it is a watered-down example of Machiavelli's influence since there is no evidence of Montreux's first hand acquaintance with the text of Il Principe. By the time that Montreux was writing, the theme of broken promises had passed into the tradition of debates on kingship and there is no need to see evidence of Machiavelli's direct influence on every writer who deals with this topic. Moreover, Massinissa's promise to Sophonisba is mentioned in both Appian and Plutarch since the problem of how he can keep it without at the same time breaking his oath to Rome, is the pivot of the anecdote in both authors.
Therefore, although the theme of perfidy runs throughout the play, there is no evidence that Montreux had Machiavelli specifically in mind here, since the theme figures in the sources and is often placed in the context of love and the power that love has to make men break their promise. The modern editor of La Sophonisbe has emphasised that the political ideas expressed in this play are traditional (introduction, p. 14). Similarly, in Montreux's earlier tragedy, Cleopatre, I have found no evidence of anything but traditional ideas in the treatment of the theme of kingship. Act II in particular deals with politics as Octavian discusses with his advisers what his behaviour should be in the face of victory. Octavian is presented as having ambitions to be absolute ruler, but this is placed within the context of the traditional debate on clemency and severity.

Pierre de Nancel

Pierre de Nancel published his Theatre Sacré in 1607. In his dedicatory epistle to the King, Nancel stresses that one of the aims of tragedy is to teach, and in particular, to give lessons on politics. The political subject matter of the first play in this collection, Dina, ou Le Ravissement, seems to owe something to Nancel's knowledge of Machiavelli. In this play, Nancel has invented characters for Simeon and Levi, Dina's two brothers mentioned in the Biblical account (Genesis 34). In Genesis 34, these two brothers are little more than names and by giving them definite character traits, Nancel is able to introduce a political note into the drama. In Act IV, Simeon and Levi discuss the importance of keeping promises, Simeon arguing that faith need not be kept with infidels, whereas Levi believes that,

Nous pouvons et devons ...
Garder à l'ennemy la foy toujours entiere,
Fust-ce à nostre dommage ...
(pp. 66-67).
In Levi's speech, Nancel depicts the horrors which result from perfidy and describes the breakdown of social relations in a way which recalls the arguments of Pasquier and Montaigne against the Machiavellian policy of breaking promises.  

Simeon accuses Levi of using simplistic arguments and of lacking knowledge of modern tactics. This in particular seems to be intended as an expression of Machiavellianism,

\begin{quote}
Vous monstrez bien n'avoir gueres d'experience
Des ruses de ce temps, de croire à des propos,
Non, nous ne sommes pas si simples et si sots.
\end{quote}

(p. 67).

The theme of perfidy dominates this scene between Simeon and Levi which has been added to the Biblical account and it seems as if Nancel may have had Machiavelli specifically in mind here.

However, later in the play, the theme of perfidy is placed in a wider, non-Machiavellian context, as Sichem is called 'perfide' and accused of treacherously breaking the laws of hospitality (p. 58), an accusation not found in Genesis 34. Similarly, the Israelites led by Simeon and Levi, break the laws of hospitality when they murder Sichem and his relations (p. 76). When Simeon reappears in Act V, he again resembles a Machiavel in that he is depicted as an opportunist relying on fortune. In contrast, Levi warns Simeon not to be puffed up with pride but to recognise that victory comes from God and show humility. It seems as if Nancel was deliberately endowing Simeon with some Machiavellian traits.

In the second tragedy in this collection, Josuê, ou le Sac de Jericho, there is a political debate in Act III between Hegemon, King of Jericho, and Eubulus, his adviser. Hegemon's brand of tyranny seems to owe little to Machiavelli however. In the third tragedy, Debora, ou la Delivrance, Deborah gives some political advice to Haber in Act IV which is not without relevance to the French situation (pp. 72-74), but I can find no echo of Machiavelli in this play. There is an epic poem by Nancel in the BN
titled De la Souveraineté des Roys where Nancel attacks people such as
the Jesuits for supporting tyrannicide, but there is no mention of
Machiavelli. 105

André de Rivaudeau

1566 saw the publication of Rivaudeau's tragedy Aman. The story of
Aman, Assuerus's evil counsellor, was a very popular subject for drama
in the sixteenth century. As a Reformer, Rivaudeau obviously intended his
readers to draw a parallel between the persecution of the Jews and those
of the Reformers. 106 His play was written to console persecuted Reformers
as were Bèze's Abraham Sacrifiant and Des Masures's Tragedies Sainctes.
The latter reveal anti-Machiavellian sentiment, but Rivaudeau's Aman
possesses the traits of a Senecan tyrant rather than a Machiavellian prince.
He is violent, bloodthirsty and full of revenge. The Choruses hold
Calvinist views on politics. At the end of Act I, for example, they say that
God appoints all rulers and that only he has the power to remove tyrants.
In Act V, they celebrate God's victory over Aman. As in the work of
Ronsard and Du Bellay, rulers are reminded of their ordinary humanity, see,
for example, the Chorus to Act III (p. 104).

In Act II (ed. cit., p. 86) the theme of the necessity of a King
keeping his promises is briefly dwelt upon but it is not developed in a
way one could classify as specifically Machiavellian. Nor is there any
trace of Machiavelli's influence in Rivaudeau's other works: I have used
the collected edition, Les oeuvres poetiques d'André de Rivaudeau ed. C.M.
de Sourdeval, Paris 1859.

Jean Robelin

Jean Robelin's play, Thebaide, dedicated to the Duke of Lorraine, was
published in 1584. 107 The portrayal of Etheocles in Act II appears to owe
something to the French author's knowledge of Machiavelli, or at least of
the popular notion of the Machiavellian ruler. Etheocles in his desire to remain King, breaks his promise to Polynices and tells Jocasta,

\begin{verbatim}
Trop sot seroit celuy qui pour regner craindroit
De renverser les lois, la justice, et le droit
Qu'on soit tant qu'on voudra juste en toute autre chose
Pourveu que sur le chef la corone (sic) repose.
\end{verbatim}
(D 3r).

There is something Machiavellian in Etheocles's desire to reign at the expense of law and morality.

Jocasta warns her son,

\begin{verbatim}
Un chacun publira vostre deloyauté
D'avoir vostre germain ainsi desherité,
\end{verbatim}

but Etheocles replies,

\begin{verbatim}
Mais chacun publiroit ma trop grande simplesse
D'avoir perdu le sceptre en tenant ma promesse.
\end{verbatim}
(D 3r).

The Chorus at the end of Act II comments,

\begin{verbatim}
Ou sera la foy seurement
Si d'un Roy le sacré serment
Avec les Aquilons s'en vole?
D'un Roy qui bien qu'il soit plus fort
Doit plusot courir à la mort
Que de manquer à sa parole.
\end{verbatim}
(D 4v).

Robelin's reaction to popular ideas on Machiavelli may have been responsible for the appearance of the theme of perfidy in an otherwise traditional play influenced heavily by classical sources.

**Tragedie Nouvelle Appellee Pompee**

This tragedy, published anonymously at Lausanne in 1579, takes as one of its themes, perfidy. The Chorus of Roman maidens at the end of the second section emphasises that Kings must keep faith but their remarks on perfidy are put in the context of the laws of hospitality, not a Machiavellian theme. Moreover, the examples of the treacherous rulers they give - Lycaon, Lycurgus, the Egyptians - owe nothing to Machiavelli. The theme of perfidy reappears in the final Chorus of the play where there is a long description of the punishment which inevitably accompanies the
breaking of promises. Again, the example given, Atreus, is not Machiavellian and leads one to believe that the author has the Senecan tyrant rather than the Machiavellian prince in mind.

A debate on politics occurs in the second section of the tragedy (Pompee is not formally divided into Acts) where Achilles and Plotinus, Ptolemy's two advisers, put forth different ideas on rule to the young King. Plotinus wishes Ptolemy to show clemency towards Pompey, whereas Achilles advances arguments of State and stresses the necessity of a King preserving his power. There is something faintly Machiavellian about Achilles's stress on the preservation of power, but perhaps this is inevitable and is merely the result of the traditional debate on clemency or severity.

Another possible echo of a Machiavellian theme appears as Pompey wonders (pp. 1-2) whether Ptolemy will remember his previous help and Ptolemy debates (pp. 13-14) whether he should take into account the benefits he has received from Pompey. In the light of Ptolemy's future behaviour towards Pompey, the former's attitude seems to reinforce Machiavelli's theory that men remember grudges more easily than benefits. But again, the presence of this theme does not prove that the anonymous author of Pompee was familiar with Machiavelli's ideas since it was of course historically true that in having Pompey assassinated, Ptolemy disregarded the help the former had given his father in regaining the throne.

There is, then, nothing in this play which establishes the author's first hand acquaintance with Machiavelli and I am inclined to believe that the debates on clemency or severity and on perfidy owe more to Seneca than to Machiavelli. The stress on the punishment of perfidy in the final Chorus is probably due to the author's wish to point forward to the future punishment of Ptolemy and thus provide a moral ending for his tragedy, rather than a desire to attack Machiavelli. Ptolemy's future
punishment is mentioned in the 'Argument' where his perfidy is put in
the un-Machiavellian context of the violation of the laws of hospitality,

Mais Ptolomee ... feit tuer Pompee si tost qu'il fut arrivé
vers luy, pensant gratifier à Cesar. Ce toutesfois dont il ne
se trouva puis apres gueres bien: mais en fut chastié et de Dieu,
et de Cesar: Car il avoit receu Pompee comme ami.
(p. v).

Le triomphe de la Ligue

In 1607 there appeared a play bearing the title of Le Triomphe de
la Ligue and published under the pseudonym of R.I. Neree. F.A. Yates
has suggested that the play was intended as a reply to Montchrestien's
tragedy, La Reine d'Ecosse. Nerce's play deals with contemporary
politics: it is set in 1588 and portrays the self-interested ambitions
of the Catholic League in wishing to ruin France and Henry III. The
League intend to make Giesu King in Henry's place. Giesu is obviously
an anagram of Guise, and in the list of characters, he is described as
'Roi Imaginaire'. One of the play's aims is to connect the story of the
League's activities in France with other events in Europe such as the
death of Mary Queen of Scots and the defeat of the Spanish Armada, and
to demonstrate that someone like Montchrestien who sympathises with Mary's
fate, must logically be an opponent of Henry IV and a supporter of the
League.

In Act I, scene 2, Jeusoie, an anagram of Joieuse, that is, the
Duke of Joyeuse, traces the progress of the Catholic League under
Francis II and Charles IX. He exults at the thought of the Saint
Bartholomew's Day Massacres and the description of him in the list of
characters is 'Aimefer'. He describes the League's cynical manipulation
of the populace by promising them lower taxes. This manipulation seems
vaguely Machiavellian and in fact Jeusoie utters the Machiavellian line,

Qui veut estre honoré, il se faut faire craindre.
(p. 14).
Jeusoie delights in the League's craftiness and opportunism,
Que nous sommes accorts, que nous sommes discrets
D'avoir tenu si long temps tant d'importants secrets.
D'avoir par le devant toujours pris la fortune,
De n'avoir négligé occasion aucune
Qui nous peust avancer ...

Possibly this opportunism is meant to be seen as a specifically
Machiavellian trait.

Opposition to the League in France is represented by Constance, a
devout Reformer who implores God's protection for France (Act I, scene 1)
and by Nicodeme, a Reformer who is afraid to worship openly in case he is
punished by the League. Nicodeme resolves the problem by feigning
worship of Catholic 'idols', whilst in his heart holding to the Reformed
faith. This Nicodemite policy (his name is obviously an allegory) is
condemned by Constance as a good follower of Calvin (Act II, p. 23).

In Act III, scene 1 as the Leaguers prepare to act against Henry III
they recognise that the only enemy they have to fear is Henry of Navarre.
Valardin, captain of the League army, says of the Bourbons,
Ils sont plains de valeur.
Numiade (Guise's brother, Mayenne) replies,
Nous de fraude et finesse.

(Act III, scene 1, p. 35).

As in Act I, the Leaguers rejoice in their manipulation of the populace,
this time in matters of religion:
Giesu: Nous sommes adorés du sot peuple de France ...
Numiade: On revere ce nom de Catholique seinct.
Valardin: On abhorre par tout nostre pretexte feint.

(p. 39).

Again, there is something Machiavellian in the League's attitude to
religion here.

In Act III, scene 2, a moderate Catholic, Montserpiné, joins with
the Reformer Constance to deplore Giesu's action in entering Paris and
forcing the King to flee (the Day of the Barricades, 1588). They accuse
the League of trying to ruin France by dividing the country and then
taking over the power themselves. There is further mention of the League's
dissimulation in religion when Montserpiné says,

Tous vos discours sont vains, ce n'est point
De la religion ou ce beau dessein butte,
C'est à l'Estat François.

(p. 49).

Of Giesu, Montserpiné remarks,

Son fard est descouvert, et son voisié visage
Ne peut dissimuler son perfide courage.

(p. 47).

Events go badly for Giesu as Catholics desert him to join forces with Navarre and the King, and Visteie, a 'harangueur seditieux' (his name is an anagram of Jesuit 'Iesvite' equalling 'Jesuite'), brings news that Mary Stuart has been executed. This is the scene (Act IV, scene 2) which represents the reply to Montchrestien's play lamenting the death of Mary Stuart. Here, Visteie describes her death in such a way as to make the reader lose sympathy for her. She is presented in the least favourable light as having murdered her second husband, Darnley, and plotted to subject England to Spanish rule. She is accused of hiring assassins to kill Elizabeth I and of giving help to the League in France. Giesu foresees his ruin through her death: In this way, as F.A. Yates points out, Neree demonstrates that anyone in France who opposed the execution of the Queen of Scots must logically be on the side of the League.

A messenger brings Giesu news of Navarre's victory at Coutras. Navarre's bravery and loyalty to Henry III are described at length. Visteie promises to go and win allies for Giesu by his preaching,

L'argent ne manquera j'userai d'artifices:
Le Pape permettra vendre les benefices ...
Et pour la vérité finement desguiser,
Je ferai le devot, le pleureur, l'hipocrite,
Et tout ce que peut faire un accort Jesuite.

(p. 95).

Act V sees Giesu preparing to attend the assembly of the General Estates at Blois (1588), despite presages of evil awaiting him there (the members of the League are depicted as all very superstitious, in contrast with the true faith of the Reformers). In scene 2, Numiade (Mayenne) is
brought the news that Giesu and Jeusoie, have been killed. Henry III's action in having Giesu assassinated is justified by claiming that the latter was plotting his death: compare the official justifications of the Saint Bartholomew's Day Massacres which claimed that there had been a Protestant plot to kill Charles IX. Catherine de' Medici is revealed as having been a supporter of the League. The play thus ends with the ruin of the League.

All through the play, the League is presented in a vaguely Machiavellian light as trying to deceive the populace by feigning religious fervour. But there is nothing specifically anti-Machiavellian and the charge of dissimulation is linked above all with the Jesuits. The League is accused of being influenced by foreigners but the accusations are directed against the Spanish rather than the Italians.

It would be useful to be able to ascertain the identity of the author. 'Neree' is probably a Reformer but a tolerant one, able to present moderate Catholics in sympathetic light. Interestingly, the prefatory epistle to Samuel Korecky, probably a made-up name, is signed N.N., the same initials as used to designate Henry III's adviser in Pierre Matthieu's play, La Guisiade, also on the subject of the assassination of Guise at Blois. In La Guisiade, Matthieu is sympathetic to the Guises and N.N. appears as the evil counsellor of Henry III. In this epistle to Korecky in a play hostile to the Guises, N.N. reveals his patriotism and trust in God. Is this reversal a deliberate criticism of Matthieu? F.A. Yates has shown that Le Triomphe de la Ligue was conceived of as a reply to Montchrestien's play, La Reine d'Escosse which in turn borrowed material for the portrayal of the characters of Elizabeth and Mary from Pierre Matthieu's Histoire des derniers troubles de France. Neree's play may therefore be a reply to Pierre Matthieu as well as to Montchrestien. The vaguely Machiavellian attitude of the League may be a deliberate opposition to Matthieu's presentation of Henry
III as a Machiavellian tyrant in *La Guisiade*.
The following is a list of plays I have examined and which reveal no trace of Machiavelli's influence.

Amboise, Adrien d'  
Holoferne, tragédie sacrée extraite de l'histoire de Judith, Paris, 1580, BN RéS Yf 4261.

Bounin, Gabriel  

Bousy, Pierre de  
Méléagre, tragédie française, Caen, 1582, BN RéS Yf 4326.

Bretog, Jean  
Tragédie Françoise à huit personnages: traitant de l'amour d'un Serviteur envers sa Maistresse, et de tout ce qui en advint, Lyons, 1571, B. Arsenal Rf 1199. This volume contains Bretog's Déploration faicte par Republique pour la mort du Catholique Roy Henry Dengleterre, s.l.n.d.

Brinon, Pierre de  

Chantelouve, François de  

Chantelouve, François de  
Tragédie de Pharaon et autres oeuvres poétiques contenant hymnes, divers sonnets et chansons, par François de Chantelouve, Paris, 1577, BN RéS Yf 3878.

Coignac, Joachim de  
La Desconfiture de Goliath tragédie, Geneva, 1551, BL C 65 c 11.

De Beaubreuil, Jean  
Regulus, tragédie dressée sur un faict des plus notables qu'on puisse trouver en toute l'histoire Romaine, Limoges, 1582, BL 11737 aa 7.

Du Duc, Fronton  
L'Histoire tragique de la Pucelle de Dom Remy, aultrement d'Orléans, Pont-à-Mousson, 1859, BL 11739 f 20 (first published at Nancy in 1581).

Fiefmelin  
Les Oeuvres du Sieur de Fiefmelin, Poitiers, 1601, B. Arsenal Rf 1236.
Filleul, Nicolas  

Fragmens extraits du premier acte d'une nouvelle Tragédie intitulée Henri IV, ou la réduction de Paris, Leyden, 1768, BN Yth 8378.

Heyns, Pierre  
Le Miroir des Vefves. Tragédie sacrée d'Holoferne et Judith, Amsterdam, 1596, BL 11737 aaa 4.

La Croix, Antoine de  
Tragi-comédie. L'argument pris du troisième chapitre de Daniel, avec le cantique des trois enfants chanté en la fornaisa, s.l.n.d.(the dedication is dated 9 August, 1561, Paris), BN Rés P Yc 1198 (2).

La Péruze, Jean de  
La Medée, tragédie, et autres diverses Poésies, Rouen, 1596, BL 11737 a 4.

Laudun, Pierre de  
Les Poésies de Pierre de Laudun d'Aigaliers, contenant deux tragédies, la Diane, Meslanges et Acrostiches, Paris, 1596, BN Rés Ye 4284.

Le Saulx, Jean  
L'Adamantine ou le Desespoir, Rouen, 1608, B. Arsenal BL 13841.

Mainfray, Pierre attrib.  
Cyrus Triomphant, ou la fureur d'Astiages, roy de Mède, tragédie, Rouen, 1618, BN Rés p Yf 524.

Marcé, Rolland de  
Achab, tragédie, Paris, 1601, B. Arsenal Rf 1369.

Pageau, Margarit  
Les Premières œuvres poétiques, Paris, 1600, BN Rés p Yf 98.

Percheron, Luc  

Perrin, François  
Sichem Ravisseur, ou la circoncision des incirconcis: tragédie, Rouen, 1606, BL 163 b 37.

Pouillet, Pierre  
Tragédie, Orléans, 1595, B. Arsenal Rf 1444.

Romain, Nicolas  
Maurice, tragédie, Pont-à-Mousson, 1606, B. Arsenal BL 13988.

Thierry, Pierre, sieur de Mon-Justin,  
Les Œuvres premières, Pontoise, 1601, BL Cup 406 g 44. This collection contains two tragedies, David persecuté and Coriolanus. The latter play touches on the theme of perfidy, but not in any specifically Machiavellian way.
Tragédie de Jeanne d'Arques dite la Pucelle d'Orléans, Rouen, 1611, BL 163 b 57.

Tragédie du Sac de Cabrières ed. F. Benoît and J. Vianey, Marseilles, 1927, B. Arsenal Rf 1146.

Tragédie François du Bon Kanut Roy de Dannemack, (dated 1575), B. Arsenal Ms 3630.

Tragédie Nouvelle de la perfidie d'Aman, mignon et favoris du Roy Assuerus, Paris, 1622, BN Yf 6536.

Tragédie Representant l'odieus et sanglant meurtre commis par le maudit Cain, à l'encontre de son frere Abel: extrait du 4 chap. de Genese, Paris, 1574, BN Rés Yf 3876.

Trissino, Giangiorgio

La Tragédie de Sophonisbe, reyne de Numidie ... traduite d'italien en françois par Claude Mermet, de Sainct-Rambert en Savoye, Lyons, 1584, BN Rés p Yd 11.

V. Valigny, P. de

Henri IV, ou la reduction de Paris, poème en trois actes, Leyden, 1768, BN Yth 8377 (written in the sixteenth century).

Virey, Jean de

La Machabée, tragédie du martyre des sept frères, et de Solomone, leur mère, par Jean de Virey, sieur Du Gravier, Rouen, 1596, BL 840 a 8.

Tragédie de la divine et heureuse victoire des Macabées sur le roy Anthiocus. Avecques la Répurgation du temple de Hiérusalem, Rouen, 1620, BN Rés p Yf 524.
FOOTNOTES


3. See, for example, Chant de Triomphe in Oeuvres Poétiques ed. Marty-Laveaux, Paris, 1878, vol. 1. Other poems in which Belleau reveals ideas on politics similar to those of Ronsard are his Epitaphe d'Anne de Montmorency, Epitaphe de Monseigneur le Duc de Guise, L'ombre du sieur de Sillac aux soldats François (all published in Petites Inventions et autres poësies), Ode à la Royne, pour la paix, Ode à Monseigneur le Duc de Guise, Tombeau de Monseigneur François de Lorraine (all published in La Bergerie of 1572 dedicated to Charles of Lorraine, marquis of Elbeuf).

4. Published Poitiers, 1589, BN Lb 34 611, p. 19.

5. Paris, 1589, BN Lb 34 593.

6. Refutation des Calomnies et Impostures des Huguenots, Politiques, et Atheistes de ce temps, pour colorer le massacre inhumainement et traitreusement commis ès personnes de Messeigneurs le Cardinal et Duc de Guise s.l., 1588, BN Lb 34 586, p. 23.


15. Châlons, 1592, BN rés Ye 3756.


17. Antwerp, 1559, BL 1073 i 6 (1).


22. See, for example, the 'Advertissement' in La Muse Christienne where Du Bartas says,

   je m'asseure que tous hommes de bon jugement reconnoistront que de propos deliberé j'ay omnis plusieurs choses pour n'aigrir par un stile partial et envenimé les esprits des hommes de ce siecle, qui sont assés et par trop aigris à cause des presents controverses de la Religion - lesquelles je desire voir non seulement esteintes, ains mesme ensevelies sous un eternel oubli. (The Works, ed. cit., vol. II, p. 3).

23. In James VI's preface, 'The Authour to the Reader' in His Majesties Poeticall Exercises at vacant houres, Edinburgh, 1591. This volume contains James VI's translation of the Furies and his poem The Lepanto, together with a French translation of the latter by Du Bartas.

24. La Judit, first published at Bordeaux in 1574, was begun much earlier when Du Bartas was studying law at Toulouse (1563-64), see the life of Du Bartas in The Works, ed. cit., vol. I, ch. 1.

25. Moreover, other sixteenth-century poets portrayed Holofernes without giving him Machiavellian traits, see Adrien D'Amboise, Holoferne, Tragedie sacree extraite de l'Histoire de Judith, Paris, 1580, BN Rés Yf 4261 and Pierre Heyns, Le Miroir des Veves, Amsterdam, 1596, BL 11737 aaa 4. In Heyn's play, Judith's debate (Act 3, scene 2, pp. 48-51) as to whether the end (honour of God and the salvation of her people) justifies the means (deceit and lies) could have been an opportunity to express anti-Machiavellian sentiment but nothing is made of it.

26. See my chapter on D'Aubigné pp.300-302.

27. See also Babylone, iii, p. 122 for a description of another tyrant, Nimrod, who tries to retain his subjects' obedience by keeping them poor. Du Bartas was originally hostile to the French monarchy but later came to regard monarchy as the best institution for France. J.C. Lyons has shown how he altered his views on regicide from the first version of La Judit (1574) where he seems to be advocating regicide to the second version (1579) where he opposes it. See 'Conceptions of the Republic in French literature of the sixteenth century', Romanic Review, XXI, (1930), pp. 296-307.

28. Compare Jean de La Jesseee's attitude to these four methods described by Machiavelli, in my chapter on that poet, p.178.

29. See Du Bellay's definition of the author of epic poetry in Book II of the Deffence et Illustration de la Langue Françoyse where he says that the author should be doué d'une excellente felicité de nature, instruict de tous bons Ars et Sciences, principalement naturelles et mathematiques, versé en tous genres de bons aucteurs Grecz et Latins, non
Sonnet 72 of the Regrets is dedicated to Gohory as is an ode in Poésies Diverses, Œuvres poétiques ed. H. Chamard, Paris, 1910, vol. 5. Except where stated, this is the edition of Du Bellay's works used.


For example, V.L. Bourrilly in Guillaume Du Bellay, seigneur de Langey (1491-1543), Paris, 1905, ch. 3, pp. 324-326. G. Dickinson in her edition of the Instructions attributes this work to Raymond de Fourquevaux, as does J. Parkin in his thesis on The Impact of the work and theories of Machiavelli (see note 21). However, Michel François disputes Dickinson's attribution in BHFR, 1954, pp. 218-220 and his arguments are convincingly taken up by Giuliano Procacci in Studi sulla Fortuna del Machiavelli, Rome, 1965.


Paris, 1596, BL 521 c 18, Book III. See also René de Lucinge, De la Naissance, Duree et Cheute des Estats, Paris, 1588, BL 8007 aaa 25, Book I, p. 9, cited in note 3 of my chapter on Ronsard.


Guicciardini argued that the Roman court was corrupt and that the power of the Church prevented Italy from being united under one leader, but he believed that Italians naturally preferred freedom to monarchy and he concludes therefore that the Church had preserved Italy in accord with her ancient customs and wishes. The author of Le Cabinet du Roy de France, Paris, 1581, BL C 125 aa 1 (attributed in the BL catalogue to Nicolas Barnaud), extends Machiavelli's criticism of the Popes,

Machiavel formellement tient que l'Eglise Romaine est cause de toutes les calamitez d'Italie, qui souloit estre (dit-il) la plus florissante province de l'Empire Romain, aujourd'hui elle est desmembrée et decoupée en petites seigneuries, comme on le void, d'autant que cette tresaincte Cour ne fait qu'y semer des partialitez et desordres. Machiavel a tres-bien dit jusques là: mais il devoit passer bien plus outre, et dire que l'impieté, et Poligamaie sacrée du Pape sur tout a terni le lustre que souloit avoir l'Italie, aussi bien qu'aux autres provinces et Royaumes de la Chrestienté.

(p. 252).


42. See p. 56 of the Screech and Joliffe edition of the Regrets and the notes to lines 2 and 4 for an explanation of this comic exaggeration of a very prestigious classical model, Persius.


44. La Deffence et Illustration ed. L. Terreaux, Paris, 1972, pp. 17-18. See also Book II, ch. 12, where Du Bellay says,

\[\text{la mesme loy naturelle, qui commande à chacun defendre le lieu de sa naissance, nous oblige aussi de garder la dignité de notre Langue ...} \]

(p. 106).


46. Machiavelli stresses that it is only when the borrowed words become really integrated into the language that the latter becomes enriched,

\[\text{Ma quella lingua si chiama d'una patria, la quale convertisce i vocaboli ch'ella ha accattati da altri nell' uso suo, ed è si potente che i vocaboli accattati non la disordinano, ma ella disordina loro; perché quello ch'ella reca da altri, lo tira a sé in modo che par suo.} \]

(ed. cit., p. 723).

Du Bellay makes the same point in Book II, chapter 6.


48. A. Bruel, Essai sur le sentiment de la Patrie dans l'oeuvre de Joachim Du Bellay, Angers, 1931, p. 17.

49. In writing this series of love sonnets, Du Bellay had ambitions for himself as well as for his country: he hoped to gain the patronage of Margaret of France and the title of the collection is probably a tribute to her - in court festivities Margaret was often represented as Minerva the goddess of wisdom whose attribute was the olive branch.


52. See the dedicatory sonnet Au Roy in Les Antiquitez, p. 271.


54. See the passage from Machiavelli's letter of 10 December 1513, quoted in chapter 9, p. 529.

55. Discorsi I, 9,

... dico come molti per avventura guidicheranno di cattivo esempio che uno fondatore d'un vivere civile, quale fu Romolo, abbia prima morto un suo fratello, dipoi consentito alla morte di Tito Tazio Sabino, eletto da lui compagno nel regno: ... La quale opinione sarebbe vera, quando non si considerasse che fine lo avesse indotto a fare tal omicidio ... Conviene bene che, accusandolo il fatto, lo effetto lo scusi; e quando sia buono come quello di Romolo, sempre lo scuserà: perché colui che è violento per guastare, non quello che è per racconciale, si debbe riprendere ... Considerato adunque tutte queste cose, conchiudo come a ordinare una republica è necessario essere solo; e Romolo per la morte di Remo e di Tito Tazio meritare iscusa, e non biasimo.

(pp. 153-155).

56. See M.C. Smith, Joachim Du Bellay's Veiled Victim, Geneva, 1974, section vii for this distinction between a poet and a historian.


60. Machiavelli's name was often linked with that of Numa by French authors, for example, Innocent Gentillet, Discours contre N. Machiavel, ed. A. D'Andrea and P.D. Stewart, Florence, 1974, Part II, maxime ix, and Estienne Pasquier, Le Catechisme des Jesuites: ou l'Examen de leur Doctrine, Villefranche, 1602, BL 4091 bb 28, Book I, ch. 18, p. 101. In the Trois Livres des Offices d'Estat avec un sommaire des Stratagèmes, Paris, 1596, BL 521 c 18, Jacques Hurault also criticises Machiavelli's use of the Numa legend. In Book I, Hurault stresses the need for God's guidance in politics,

... comme dit Machiavel au premier livre des discours, un peu mieux qu'il n'a fait en son Prince, depuis que la crainte de Dieu fault, il convient par nécessité que le royaume deschée.

(Book I, ch. 14, p. 135).
But, he says, Numa's method of using religion is all very well for pagans but not for Christians who are not allowed to manipulate their religion for State purposes (p. 149). Two authors well acquainted with Machiavelli's works praise Numa's use of religion for political purposes in terms very similar to those used by the Italian author, René de Lucinge in *De la Naissance, Duree et Cheute des Estats*, Paris, 1588, BL 8007 aaa 25, Book II, ch. 1, pp. 113-114, and Gabriel Naudé in *Considerations politiques sur les Coups d'Estat*, Paris, 1679, BL 522 a 20, pp. 83-84, and see p. 262 for Machiavelli's recommendation to feign religious belief.


63. Indeed Jamyn's poetry was not highly regarded by Henry III at this time and a court lady dared to criticise it in a letter to the King,

... la peur que j'ay, Sire, que sette proze vous soit aussy ennuiieuze que les rimes que Amadis vous lisoit le soir en Avignon, me fera finer se grant discours ...


65. Rheims, 1577, BL 1193 c 5.


70. I have examined the collected edition of his works, *Les oeuvres poétiques du sieur de Trelon*, Lyons, 1594, BN Rés p Ye 223 and *Stances extraictes du sieur de Trelon sur le désordre des humeurs et actions d'un prince mal conseillé, qu'il dit estre à la veille de son malheur*, Lyons, 1593, BN Ye 53110.

71. Rouen, 1608, BL 163 b 13.

73. This poem was published at the end of Le Ravissement de Cefale, Rouen, 1608, BL 163 b 13.

74. The BL has a copy at 11736 a 21.

75. This play was published at Chambery in 1589, BN Rés p Yf 76. For a suggestion as to the topical meaning of this play, see R. Thomas's thesis pp. 92-93.

76. Many of the echoes of Machiavelli in the plays examined are linked with the theme of perfidy. The importance of this theme in French drama towards the end of the sixteenth century and its links with anti-Machiavellianism was first discussed by R. Thomas in the thesis referred to in note 72 above, see especially chapter 3 of this thesis. It is, however, worth continuing her discussion of the theme of perfidy in these plays, with the focus more particularly on the Machiavellian aspects of this theme and distinguishing between those works which attack perfidy in a general way and those in which the attacks are specifically linked with criticism of Machiavelli.

77. See also Discorsi III, 12 and see my chapter on Jean de La Jessee p.124.


79. Examination of Favre's quatrains reveals no trace of Machiavelli's influence. These quatrains were often published together with those of Matthieu and Pibrac, as in the 1640 edition published at Paris, Les Quatrains des Sieurs Pybrac, Favre et Matthieu BN Ye 7401.


81. See my chapter on Robert Garnier, p.427.

82. I have examined the Nouvelles Oeuvres de Jan Edouard du Monin, Paris, s.d., BN Rés Ye 2053 in which he translates two of Petrarch's poems, and Le Quareme, Paris, 1584, BL 164 e 16. This latter work contains another tragedy, La Peste de la Peste, ou Jugement Divin, in which the theme of perfidy recurs, though not in any specifically Machiavellian way.

83. See Lucien Pinvert's biography of Grévin in his edition of the Théâtre Complet et Poésies Choisis, Paris, 1922. Except for César, this is the edition of Grévin's works referred to.

84. Paris, 1558, BN Rés Ye 1806.

85. Published by Léon Dorez, Paris, 1898, BN Ye 5783.

86. Paris, 1558, BN Rés Ye 1017.

87. See E.S. Ginsberg's analysis of Grevin's debt to these classical authors in her edition of César, Geneva, 1971. This is the edition of César referred to.

88. Rouen, 1606, BL 163 b 23.


93. In Claude Mermet's translation of G. Trissino's play on the same subject, there is likewise nothing specifically anti-Machiavellian in the theme of perfidy, La Tragédie de Sophonisbe, Lyons, 1584, BN Résp Yd 11. And see my discussion of the theme of broken promises in Nicolas da Montreux's play of the same name, La Sophonisbe.

94. It is true that the counsellor's advice to Elizabeth I to eliminate Mary for the safety of her kingdom could be seen as Machiavellian (Machiavelli advises his prince to exterminate all possible rivals) but there is no direct evidence that Montchrestien was thinking of Machiavelli at any point in his play. The portrayal of the Queens is remarkably unbiased, neither Mary nor Elizabeth being depicted as tyrants.


96. There is a modern edition of this play by G.O. Seiver, University of Pennsylvania, 1939.


99. See Act V where Sophonisba says that Massinissa is worthy to be King since he knows how to keep his promise,

\[\text{O vaillant Massinisse, ô digne d'estre roy,}\\ \text{Puisque tu sçais garder immortelle ta foy.}\\ \text{(p. 131).}\]

See also, pp. 133-134, 139., and 103.

100 Ed. cit., pp. 51-54, 104 and 112.

101. Published in Oeuvre de la Chasteté, Paris, 1595, BL 4409 aa 43.


103. See my chapter on Robert Garnier p. 421.

104. Another possible echo of Machiavelli in this play is pointed out by R. Thomas (op. cit., p. 246). Dina says that one should ruin one's enemies completely (p. 82), a Machiavellian policy, see also Act III, p. 53 of Debora, ou la Délivrance where Barac insists on the importance of thoroughly vanquishing the enemy.

105. S.I., 1610, BN Ye 7514.

106. See K. Cameron's introduction to his edition of Aman, Geneva, 1969, for an analysis of this play. All references are to this edition.

107. Pont-à-Mousson, 1584, B. Arsenal BL 14068.
108. Mentioned by R. Thomas (op. cit., p. 212). She points out that Pompey and Ptolemy are given as examples of perfidy by Gentillet when referring to Machiavelli's teachings on the breaking of promises.


114. Visteie's hypocrisy in religious matters is first revealed when he appears, rejoicing:

```
Combien d'hommes perdus,
Par mes fardés discours, par présens, par promesses
Sont credules tombés en mortelles destresses?
(Act IV, scene 1, p. 64).
```
CONCLUSION

It has been my aim in this study to show how some fiction writers in the sixteenth century used their knowledge of Machiavelli in a way which directly modified their drama and poetry. Close verbal echoes of Machiavelli have been found in each of the nine authors examined and in most cases, there are indications that these writers read *Il Principe* and the *Discorsi* in the original. One of the conclusions that can be drawn from this study is that French translations of Machiavelli's works were not very influential in disseminating his ideas, at least as regards fiction writers. Most of the authors examined seem to have gone straight to the originals and in some cases (such as Pierre Matthieu, Jean de La Jessee, Alexandre de Pont-Aymery and Jean de La Taille) they apparently wrote with Machiavelli's books at their elbow. From this, it can be concluded that some sixteenth century poets and dramatists had a more thorough knowledge of the Italian writer than they have been credited with.

The reason for underestimating French writers' knowledge of Machiavelli has lain often in the failure to discern the essential ambivalence of their attitudes towards the Italian author. To take the example of Pierre Matthieu: in *La Guisiade* he exploits popular hostility against Machiavelli, but examination of his historical prose works reveals a development in his attitude towards Machiavelli whom he comes to respect as a serious historian. By 1601, he is openly acknowledging his debt to the Italian author and from 1608 onwards, borrowings from Machiavelli proliferate in his writings and he is apparently so familiar with *Il Principe*, the *Discorsi* and the *Istorie Fiorentine* that he can turn with ease from one to the other.

*Footnotes on p. 632*
In Matthieu's case, his ambivalent attitude towards Machiavelli seems to be dictated by his political allegiances: during his period of adherence to the Catholic League, he apparently found it useful to exploit popular legends about Machiavelli when writing propaganda for the Guises' cause against Henry III. Examination of his prose works written around the same time as *La Guisiade* (1589) sheds light on the persistence with which he attacked Machiavelli for purposes of Catholic propaganda. Later, when he became royal historiographer, he seems to have found it more appropriate to deal with Machiavelli objectively as a serious historian.

Similarly, Estienne Jodelle's early hostility towards Machiavelli in *Didon se sacrifiant* (written around 1560) was dictated largely by his xenophobic attitude to Italian influence in France. His later works reveal a more objective use of Machiavelli. Jean de La Jessee's anti-Machiavellian stance in the *Odes-Satyres, et quelques sonets* of 1579 appears to have been determined by his allegiance to Alençon and the political programme of the 'politiques'. As in the case of Matthieu and Jodelle, La Jessee's early hostility towards Machiavelli, being provoked largely by his political beliefs, is rather superficial and as with these two authors, early anti-Machiavellianism in La Jessee gives way to a more knowledgeable and objective attitude in *La Philosophie morale et civile* of 1595.

In the case of Matthieu, Jodelle and La Jessee, then, their ambivalent attitude can be explained by their early political loyalties. The ambivalence of a writer like Jean de La Taille is more complex. La Taille finds Machiavelli appropriate for the political situation in France where a strong government was badly needed, yet at the same time, moral considerations limit the extent to which he feels able to follow Machiavelli. Ambivalence towards the Italian author is especially evident in the plays of both Jean and Jacques de La Taille. These plays hint at the necessity
In Matthieu's case, his ambivalent attitude towards Machiavelli seems to be dictated by his political allegiances: during his period of adherence to the Catholic League, he apparently found it useful to exploit popular legends about Machiavelli when writing propaganda for the Guises' cause against Henry III. Examination of his prose works written around the same time as La Guisiade (1589) sheds light on the persistence with which he attacked Machiavelli for purposes of Catholic propaganda. Later, when he became royal historiographer, he seems to have found it more appropriate to deal with Machiavelli objectively as a serious historian.

Similarly, Estienne Jodelle's early hostility towards Machiavelli in Didon se sacrifiant (written around 1560) was dictated largely by his xenophobic attitude to Italian influence in France. His later works reveal a more objective use of Machiavelli. Jean de La Jessee's anti-Machiavellian stance in the Odes-Satyres, et quelques sonets of 1579 appears to have been determined by his allegiance to Alençon and the political programme of the 'politiques'. As in the case of Matthieu and Jodelle, La Jessee's early hostility towards Machiavelli, being provoked largely by his political beliefs, is rather superficial and as with these two authors, early anti-Machiavellianism in La Jessee gives way to a more knowledgeable and objective attitude in La Philosophie morale et civile of 1595.

In the case of Matthieu, Jodelle and La Jessee, then, their ambivalent attitude can be explained by their early political loyalties. The ambivalence of a writer like Jean de La Taille is more complex. La Taille finds Machiavelli appropriate for the political situation in France where a strong government was badly needed, yet at the same time, moral considerations limit the extent to which he feels able to follow Machiavelli. Ambivalence towards the Italian author is especially evident in the plays of both Jean and Jacques de La Taille. These plays hint at the necessity
for acts of 'policy' yet imply that it is better for kings not to be tainted with Machiavellianism, and the conclusion - that they should leave such distasteful but necessary actions to subordinates, sidesteps the question of the extent to which Machiavelli's ideas are to be approved of and adopted.

It was left to the 'Prince of poets' to suggest some sort of solution to the conflicts of the sixteenth century reader of Machiavelli, torn between outmoded, idealistic theories of political behaviour which seemed to have no part to play in modern society, and an unwillingness to sacrifice moral principles for the good of the State. Ronsard adopts what he can approve of in Machiavelli - his imagery, his literary judgements - but rejects him as an author who laid down universally applicable rules for political science - and he rejects him not only on theological and ethical grounds, but on 'pragmatic' grounds as well, arguing that the observation of moral norms is intrinsically conducive to social harmony and hence political 'success'. Ronsard gives us a clue to a way of reconciling the ambivalent and conflicting feelings of sixteenth century readers divided between admiration and repugnance for the Italian author.

One of the conclusions of this study is thus that attitudes towards Machiavelli in French fiction of the sixteenth century were a good deal more subtle than has sometimes been supposed. The position adopted was not always one of downright hostility. Some writers, such as Ronsard and perhaps La Jessee, had made their minds up as to where they stood in relation to the Italian author, others like the La Taille brothers, were groping their way towards a resolution of their doubts. I hope, therefore, to have disproved the belief of an earlier scholar that there was little real knowledge of Machiavelli in the sixteenth century:
The criticism and denunciation of Machiavelli in sixteenth century writings is, for the most part, so ignorant, as to be hardly significant even of revolt against his actual doctrines.\textsuperscript{2}

On the contrary, this study reveals that sixteenth century writers often read Machiavelli's works in the original and, when unimpeded by political loyalties, they were able to form an impartial and reasoned opinion of his ideas.\textsuperscript{3}

However, the concept of ambivalence is not sufficient to cover the entire range of attitudes towards Machiavelli examined in this thesis. One of the contributions of my study is to have uncovered a group of soldier-poets writing towards the end of the sixteenth century and who all display some kind of hostile response to Machiavelli. These writers are D'Aubigné, Du Bartas, Claude de Trellon, Pont-Aymery and La Jessee. Of these, D'Aubigné, Du Bartas and Pont-Aymery belong to the Reformers' party and reveal a hostile attitude towards Machiavelli. In particular, D'Aubigné and Pont-Aymery seem anxious to point out in their poetry the dangers for Reformers if Machiavelli's ideas were adopted by French rulers. This Protestant propaganda against Machiavelli is foreshadowed by Louis Des Masures's trilogy of 1563, the Tragedies Sainctes, where the author singles out the dangers for Reformers of a ruler who recognises no restraints on his power. Des Masures's early warning is developed by D'Aubigné and Pont-Aymery who see Machiavelli's influence as particularly harmful for the nobility of France. That the criticism of Machiavelli encouraging rulers to crush the nobility was put forward by Reformers in particular is not surprising since many of the nobility belonged to the Reformers' party that is, it was a superficial criticism determined above all by political allegiance. This aspect of Protestant writing has perhaps been underestimated by previous researchers.
Another interesting conclusion to be drawn from the study of Machiavelli's impact on D'Aubigné and Pont-Aymery is that both these authors indict their Catholic opponents by presenting them as followers of Machiavelli, a more subtle and convincing way of opposing the Italian writer than the direct attacks of Innocent Gentillet. The fact that this method is used by at least two Protestant writers indicates that there may have been a semi-official campaign amongst Reformers to label their opponents Machiavellian, in the same way as the Catholic League mounted their more well-documented campaign to present Henry III as a Machiavellian ruler.

In addition, study of these poets' hostility towards Machiavelli reveals that they based their opposition not only on Il Principe but also the Discorsi, which belies J.W. Allen's statement that Few or none of those who, in the sixteenth century, denounced him, had read his works or had read any of them but the misleading Principe.

(op. cit., p. 447).

Indeed, I feel that it is one of the values of this study to have extended considerably documentation of the range of passages in Machiavelli known to the sixteenth century. This is particularly so in the chapters on Matthieu, Pont-Aymery and La Jessee. It can be established that fiction writers did not only see Machiavelli as the author of Il Principe but took into account his other works as well, notably the Discorsi and the Istorie Fiorentine.

Moreover, they frequently possessed sufficient knowledge of Machiavelli's works to realise that in Il Principe he is dealing with a new ruler who has to establish his government on strong foundations, rather than with a tyrant in the traditional sense. The theme of the new ruler appears in Robert Garnier's play, Cornélie (1574) where Anthony is the Machiavellian adviser who urges Caesar to establish his new rule on strong foundations and is concerned with ways of maintaining and
preserving power. This theme is continued in Marc Antoine (1578) and Antigone, ou la Pieté (1580). As in these latter plays, the theme of the new ruler is often connected with the topic of the Machiavellian prince as usurper for example in Jacques de La Taille's play Daire (1573), in Adonias (1586), in Antoine Du Favre's Les Gordians et Maximins ou l'Ambition (1589) and in Du Bartas's poem Les Capitaines (in Premiere et Seconde Sepmaines). Examination of fiction writing of the sixteenth century thus reveals that Machiavelli's prince was often seen specifically as a new ruler and usurper. This is a theme whose importance in sixteenth century France has been underestimated, perhaps because it is much less frequent in prose pamphlets of the time. These latter were concerned largely with exploiting popular hostility towards Machiavelli, one element of which was to portray Machiavelli's prince as an out and out tyrant in the Aristotelian sense.

Above all, perhaps, the value of this study on Machiavelli's influence is that it deepens our appreciation of sixteenth century poetry and drama. This is most obvious in the case of Robert Gamier where examination of Machiavellian themes in his plays helps to counterbalance the traditional view of Gamier as a conservative author, indebted mainly to Seneca (a view, incidentally, which does not fit in very well with what we know of Gamier's involvement in contemporary politics). Analysis of Machiavelli's influence on Gamier's portrayal of historical figures (in particular, Caesar in Cornélie and Marc Antoine) helps to highlight the consistency of Gamier's motivation of these characters whose psychology might otherwise be seen (and indeed, has been seen) as contradictory and insufficiently developed. Study of Machiavelli's influence emphasises, for the first time perhaps, Gamier's modernity and his boldness in using Machiavelli to up-date the Senecan tyrant and to inject greater topicality and political awareness into traditional Senecan debates on government. Likewise, the analysis of Guillaume
Du Bartas's response to Machiavelli in his poetry reveals that his treatment of political themes is occasionally updated by the addition of attacks on Machiavellianism.

Similarly, analysis of the complex web of Machiavellian themes in Jacques de La Taille's play, Daire (published in 1573) highlights the depth and sophistication of this author's treatment of politics and the subject of imperialism. There has been a modern edition of Alexandre but not of Daire, despite the fact that in Daire the author's doubts and questionings about the drive for power which sets aside all other considerations, make for a much subtler play. A modern edition seems overdue.

Study of Machiavelli's influence on D'Aubigné likewise gives a new view of a major sixteenth century author. For examination of the Histoire Universelle (1626) provides a key to the correct interpretation of his poetry, the history completing and explaining in many cases passages in the Tragiques. It also reveals that the Histoire is not as unbiased as D'Aubigné liked to claim.

Another contribution made by this thesis is the attempt to make a clear distinction between what authors owed to classical sources and what to Machiavelli. A striking instance of the value of such a method is in the case of Du Bartas where examination of Biblical sources reveals that what in his poem Premiere et Seconde Sepmaines has been attributed to Machiavelli, can in fact be found in Biblical passages. At the same time, the attempt to uncover precise textual echoes of Machiavelli has revealed several in Du Bartas which previously went unnoticed.

Similarly, analysis of the sources for the plays of Garnier and Jean de La Taille has enabled us to draw a distinction between the Senecan tyrant and the Machiavellian ruler, and has revealed how easily certain traits in Seneca's tyrants (particularly Ulysses of the Troades)
could be adapted to the portrayal of a more up-to-date Machiavellian prince. Examination of classical and Biblical sources also proved useful for the interpretation of Des Masures's *Tragédies Saintes*, *Adonias*, Jacques de La Taille's *Daire* and Jodelle's play *Didon se sacrifiant*.

In addition, analysis of sources can be helpful in certain plays where apparent Machiavellian themes such as perfidy, ruse, vengeance, turn out on closer examination, to owe more to Seneca, as in Jan-Edouard Du Monin, *L'Orbecc-Oronte* (1585), Jean Heudon, *Saint Clouad* (1606), André de Rivaudeau, *Aman* (1566) or to other classical writers such as Suetonius and Plutarch in Jacques Grévin, *César* (1561) or Appian and Plutarch in Nicolas de Montreux, *La Sophonisbe* (1601) - see chapter 10 for further details. In this way, study of sources is valuable in clearing up the question of the precise influence of Machiavelli.

This problem of the direct influence of Machiavelli is particularly important in drama of the sixteenth century. As was pointed out in the introduction to this thesis, the Machiavels in the plays of Christopher Marlowe and John Webster bear only a superficial resemblance to the real Machiavelli. By contrast, separation of Senecan elements from Machiavellian themes in French drama of the same period, reveals that several playwrights (Garnier, the La Taille brothers) display a much profounder and subtler knowledge of Machiavelli than is apparent in the plays of their English counterparts. Reading these French plays, one has the impression that the authors are sincerely attempting to grapple with the problems posed by the novelty of Machiavelli's approach to politics, rather than merely exploiting popular legends about the Italian author. Moreover, this serious reaction to Machiavelli makes its appearance in French drama (in the *Tragédies Saintes* and *Didon se sacrifiant*) some twenty years before there is any trace of a Machiavel on the English stage. The first mention of Machiavelli in English drama
(according to E. Gasquet, *op. cit.*, p. 231) comes in Marlowe's *Jew of Malta*, performed around 1589.

The short accounts of the authors' lives may have helped to increase understanding of their work, particularly in the case of La Jessee, Pont-Aymery and Matthieu for whom, as far as I know, this study provides the first attempt to construct such biographies in any detail. Their value perhaps lies precisely in the way they focus attention on lesser known writers of the period who nevertheless do not wholly deserve to be neglected. In particular, the study has emphasised the historical importance of the poetry of Pont-Aymery and La Jessee, providing as it does, an insight into the events and upheavals of the time by two writers who were very much involved. The work of La Jessee seems especially important because he was one of the few French poets in Alençon's entourage. His possible connections with the Familists at Antwerp and their links in turn with Machiavelli would seem to merit further investigation.

Examination of the political and religious allegiances of these authors reveals that any classification of an author's reaction to Machiavelli on the basis of his religion is purely arbitrary. Both Reformers and Catholics are frequently aware of the same aspects of Machiavelli's work, for example both Des Muses (a Reformer) and Ronsard (a Catholic) stress the evils of absolute power and the necessity for the king's actions to be governed by moral or religious restraints. Both La Jessee (a 'politique') and Ronsard borrow Machiavelli's imagery. Like the Catholic dramatist Robert Garnier, Du Bartas (a Reformer) used Machiavelli's ideas to update the political debates found in his sources. And of course both Catholic writers (such as Matthieu) and Reformers (D'Aubigné, Pont-Aymery) were aware of the way popular hostility towards the Italian author could be exploited as a means of making their propaganda more effective.
During the period dealt with in this study, French kings were frequently accused of surrounding themselves with courtiers who gave them Machiavellian advice on how to govern. Again it seems the charge could be brought against courtiers of both the Catholic and Reformed religion: in this thesis, there are three poets who could fall into the category of courtiers instructing their king in Machiavellianism — Estienne Jodelle in *Les Discours de Jules Cesar avant le passage du Rubicon* (written around 1561-62 and addressed to Charles IX), Jean de La Taille in *Le Prince Necessaire* (written between 1568 and 1572, and addressed to Henry of Navarre), and Alexandre de Pont-Aymery in *Le Roi Triomphant* (published in 1594 and dedicated to Henry IV). Similarly, both Des Masures and Ronsard warn Charles IX against the evils of adopting Machiavelli's political theories (in the *Tragedies Sainctes* of 1563 and the *Institution pour l'adolescence du roy treschretien Charles neufviesme de ce nom* of 1562, respectively). Indeed, the closeness in time of these warnings is striking and confirms that reaction to Machiavelli cannot be categorised on the basis of religion.

During the course of my research, I have come across several minor prose writers who are familiar with Machiavelli's work for example, René de Lucinge, Jean de Marnix, Jacques Hurlaut, Jacques Ribier, François de Gravelle, Claude Duret, Regnault D'Orleans, Pierre Poisson and the author of the *Considerations sur les troubles, et le juste moyen de les appaiser* (s.l., 1591, BL 9200 aaa 45). Future investigation of Machiavelli's influence in France might well include some comparison of these minor prose writers' attitudes to Machiavelli with those of major historians such as Jean Bodin, Louis Le Roy and Estienne Pasquier in order to complete the account of reaction to the Italian author in French prose of the sixteenth century.
One possible area for future research into Italian influence on French Renaissance literature might be an examination of the impact of other Florentine historians, in particular, Francesco Guicciardini whose approach to history is similar to that of Machiavelli in that it is founded on his personal experience of the political situation in Florence. Guicciardini's work was quite well-known in France: during the course of his commentary on the Ricordi, for example, Jacopo Corbinelli established several links between Guicciardini and Machiavelli.5 Other writers express their opposition to Guicciardini in terms similar to their criticism of Machiavelli.6

Investigation into the treatment of Machiavelli in sixteenth century neo-Latin poetry might be another fruitful area of research. Henri Estienne, for instance, wrote a whole poem, Principum Monitrix Musa (1579) attacking Machiavelli. The poetry of Marc Antoine Muret could also be investigated since Muret, like Jodelle, wrote a liminary poem for Guillaume Cappel's 1553 translation of Il Principe. There is also the neo-Latin poetry of Michel de L'Hospital to be considered: L'Hospital was directly involved in political events of his time as Chancellor, and indeed he was sometimes accused of acting in a Machiavellian way on account of his tolerant policy (for example, by Jodelle).

There is one common link between most of the authors examined in this study, namely that they were nearly all directly involved in the political events of their time. Writers of fiction they may have been, but in most cases the claims of their art were not allowed to supersede concern for their country. D'Aubigné, Pont-Aymery, Jean de La Taille and La Jessee were all involved in the fighting. Des Masures had to flee persecution several times; Garnier held an important government post and at one point associated himself with the Catholic League, as indeed did Pierre Matthieu. Jodelle attempted to gain favour with the king by commenting favourably
on official policy in his poems. Ronsard entered into battle with his
*Discours des misères de ce temps* which, it was said, did more to defend
the Catholic faith than all the works of theologians put together.7

Most of these writers, regardless of their religious persuasion,
were concerned with finding the right kind of political and military
leaders for France: D'Aubigné and Matthieu when they criticise the
Machiavellianism of contemporary rulers, Ronsard when he holds up a
picture of an ideal king in the hope that Charles IX will be inspired
to follow it, Des Mases in his search for restraints on a ruler's
power, Pont-Aymery, Jean de La Taille and Estienne Jodelle in the poems
of advice addressed to their respective rulers, and Garnier when he
presents characters who embody alternative methods of ruling.

These writers mostly propose differing solutions to the problems
in France, but they all find it useful to oppose or borrow from
Machiavelli's works when giving their advice. In this way, Machiavelli
can be said to have been at least partly responsible for determining the
direction treatment of politics took in French fiction writing of the
latter part of the century. It seemed impossible for major thinkers
and writers of the period, when discussing politics and the art of
government, to ignore the controversy over Machiavelli's theories. As
T.S. Eliot said,

> What influence the work of ... Machiavelli seems ... to exert
> on that time ... is an influence toward a kind of self-
> consciousness that is new.8

Their reading of Machiavelli gave French poets and dramatists a
greater awareness of the ambivalence of many political actions and
forced them into examining the implications of the open separation of
politics from a traditional ethical and religious framework. They all
try to come to terms with the Italian author in their own way, but one
thing at least is clear: the enduring interest and fascination Machiavelli's
works held for the major poets and dramatists of the French Renaissance.


Detailed examination of these writers' knowledge of Machiavelli disproves A. Stegmann's belief that 'Machiavel auteur politique n'exerça aucune influence immédiate directe sur le théâtre' (L'Héroisme Cornélien, Paris, 1968, p. 196).

In Le Courant Machiavélien dans la pensée et la littérature anglaises du XVIe siècle (Paris, Brussels, Montreal, 1970), E. Gasquet points out a similar phenomenon in Christopher Marlowe's Jew of Malta (first performed around 1589) where Marlowe uses the popular notion of the Machiavel to inject greater topicality into his portrayal of Barabas:

Le Machiavel est encore et toujours le Vice, mais dans une ultime phase de son évolution continue vers le réalisme. Il a ici, pour ainsi dire, revêtu un costume nouveau qui l'agrémente du piquant de l'actualité et lui communique ainsi un puissant attrait.

(p. 268).


Montaigne, Essais Book II, 10; Discours merveilleux de la vie, actions et déportemens de la Reine Catherine de Médicis (written 1574), Archives curieuses de l'histoire de France ed. Cimber and D'Anjou, tome 9, p. 8.
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